

Committee	Sustainable Development Select Committee	Item No.	4
Report Title	Integrated Transport – Bakerloo Line Extension		
Ward	All Wards		
Contributors	Scrutiny Manager		
Class	Part 1	Date:	25 April 2012

Reason for Lateness and Urgency: This report is late due to the need to wait for further input in order to enhance the report.

1. Summary

- 1.1. The item will give a chance for the Committee to further consider the possible Bakerloo Line Extension that could come through the London Borough of Lewisham and possibly beyond

2. Purpose of the Report

- 2.1. To update the Committee on the status of a possible extension to the Bakerloo Line into the London Borough of Lewisham. Information was provided at the September 2010 and March 2012 meetings of the Committee by Jonathan Roberts of JRC Consulting

3. Recommendations

- 3.1. The Select Committee is recommended to note the information presented here and at previous Committee meetings and use it to inform discussion on what future action could take place in regards to the Bakerloo Extension.

4. Background

- 4.1. Within the London Mayor's Transport Strategy (published May 2010) the Bakerloo Line is acknowledged as having an important role in London's transport geography, serving the strategic northwest-southeast corridor. It states that a Bakerloo southern extension "would allow the line to serve inner and outer southeast London. This would create a new southeast to northwest strategic route through the Capital, serving areas with poor transport accessibility and freeing up National Rail capacity at London Bridge for other service Improvements".
- 4.2. Within the strategy, proposal 22 states that the Mayor and associated partners and stakeholders will seek longer-term enhancements and extensions to the Underground network, including a potential southern extension to the Bakerloo line. This would "utilise spare line capacity, improve connectivity and journey times, while providing relief to congested National Rail approaches to central London from the south/southeast, subject to resources and the results of further study". It is anticipated that the cost of the scheme would be high, with a completion date post 2020.

- 4.3. At the September 2010 meeting the Committee heard from Jonathan Roberts, who outlined the background to underground line extensions in general, and the Bakerloo in particular as well as potential route options. Members were informed that a Bakerloo extension is in the London Mayor's transport strategy as a possibility, but that it is competing for funding and was unlikely to be affordable until the late 2010s or 2020s. There is also potential for a Crossrail 2 project at a similar time, and HS2, the high speed national rail project (now given the go ahead). It was pointed out that a project such as this would need more than one borough to support it. There would need to be a strong case put forward from a wide range of places across the region, with all-party political support as well as strong support from community groups.
- 4.4. Members discussed a series of issues surrounding a potential extension including whether it would be possible to extend the DLR southwards to provide a more extensive Canary Wharf link. This could be a complementary addition to a possible Bakerloo extension, as the DLR line to Lewisham was designed with potential for extension, and this is not a 'classic' central London access route. In addition the benefits of the East London Line were discussed, which included redevelopment, and whether there are enough opportunities for this in such a suburban setting. It was felt that Section 106 contributions or equivalent could help with paying for construction of the extension, but that every item of added revenue and benefit that could be made would help to make a business case. The future spatial and economic growth strategies would be important.
- 4.5. Jonathan Roberts also raised a number of points with the Committee concerning the implications that a Bakerloo extension could have including freeing up capacity at London Bridge, the replacement of a mainline route wholly with a tube route if the extension goes ahead and issues around capacity of smaller tube trains running frequently or larger rail trains running less frequently.
- 4.6. Jonathan Roberts indicated that a key idea was to think of what London will look like in 10 to 20 years time and design a service that will be fit for purpose then not now. It was pointed out that London Bridge station could still be overwhelmed due to increased population in the south east of London and the south east in general.
- 4.7. At the end of the meeting the Committee resolved that the information presented should be referred to Mayor and Cabinet in order for them to be made aware of it. Lewisham Council should consider whether a Bakerloo extension would benefit Lewisham, whether it would be practical to pursue it and whether it should start contacting other local authorities and/or relevant bodies across London and the south-east in order to start lobbying for it to be a top priority for approval and construction.
- 4.8. The London & South East Route Utilisation Strategy published by Network Rail in July 2011 identifies a Bakerloo Southern extension as a gap, stating that 'The established Kent RUS identified that a potential scheme to convert the Hayes branch for use by London Underground services could alleviate main line and suburban routes via London Bridge, with services on this line rerouted via a southern extension to the London Underground Bakerloo Line. Such a line would also provide additional capacity in inner South London, greatly improving travel opportunities for areas such as Denmark Hill and Camberwell.'

There may also be capacity relief to the Elephant & Castle corridor to Blackfriars, depending on the specific route chosen.

4.9. At the Council meeting on 21st September 2011, the following motion was agreed:
“This council believes the proposed southern extension of the Bakerloo Line to Hayes via New Cross and Lewisham would be a significant and historic improvement to the strategic transport links in this borough. The construction and operation of the line would be a major economic boost for the residents and businesses both in Lewisham and the other boroughs along the route, providing development and regeneration opportunities along the way. We welcome the inclusion of this extension in Network Rail’s London and South East Route Utilisation Strategy of July 2011 and urge all relevant local and national government and transport bodies to pursue its construction with commitment and vigour.”

4.10. The Committee again heard from Jonathan Roberts at its March 2012 meeting. His presentation highlighted the basic costs to consider including the number of additional trains, type of station construction, complexity of interchanges, tunnelling costs in SE London and the costs of converting any surface railways. Facilities such as control centre extension, escape shafts, environmental mitigation, and depot /siding expansion are within proportional extra costs. An estimated cost schedule for Bakerloo extensions was provided to show the relative size of funding for options, and can be estimated to be:

- Stations - New in tube £100m, adaptation from main line £30m, extra interchange £50m
- Tunnels - £180m per twin-track mile
- Adaptation of main line - £40m /mile
- Trains - 7-car rounded £10m /train
- Other charges - £130m per twin-track mile for tunnel section, £30m per mile for surface section.

Potential costs for the project ranged from £2.06bn to £2.34bn for a first phase to Lewisham/Catford and £3.23bn to £3.6bn for a full line to Hayes or Bexleyheath, dependant on a combination of options and routes. The high level Benefit Cost Ratio is around 1.4 :1, with an option via Old Kent Road bringing a BCR of 1.9 :1 due to shorter journey times. However the DfT currently sets 2 : 1 as the value pass mark for new investment and new funding pressures, though phasing could present an opportunity for spreading costs and improving the BCR.

4.11. There are five main criteria for the project

- Business case
- Merits and priority against other projects
- Government and stakeholder backing
- Funding / financing
- Affordability

The case for an extension needs to be clearly made as the lack of a line doesn’t automatically justify an extension. However, it is in the Mayor’s revised Transport Strategy and the RUS for Network Rail and does not simply impact on SE London. The wider benefits need to be shown and it is unlikely to happen as a tube project in isolation, but more likely as part of wider strategy.

- 4.12. Previous projects have been driven by over-riding capacity and access priorities, such as the 1990s Jubilee extension to Docklands and Stratford and the 2010s Crossrail and Thameslink and this forms a part of the six main elements that can be seen to emerge from an extended Bakerloo:
- Regeneration & skills & access
 - Investment and economic growth zones
 - Capacity vs. demand on rail & transit
 - Housing & population growth
 - Environment / petrol prices / low carbon
 - Slots released on main line tracks
- 4.13. There is currently no funding or timescale for the Bakerloo. A preferred alignment has emerged that runs from Elephant & Castle to Beckenham Junction and Hayes via Camberwell, Peckham, New Cross Gate, Lewisham, Catford. The issue is that it serves fewer critical areas / objectives than some other rail projects, though there is an important NW-SE strategic role for Bakerloo and it does serve some regeneration zones such as Harlesden, Paddington, Elephant & Castle, inner SE London. However London's new priorities are already emerging which includes more Crossrail extensions, Crossrail 2 (possibly phased), increased orbital capacity and the Lea Valley. This means that the Bakerloo is not yet justifying priority attention.
- 4.14. Ultimately the extension is a matter for the Mayor of London. London needs to prioritise its own spend, but the Bakerloo would bring less national benefit than Crossrail or HS2. The question of whether it is good value to spend (net) £1.3bn on an outer extension to gain 6-8 peak slots per hr as well as a lack of clarity on the best value route. In addition, TfL has a long shopping list of projects and doesn't know where its funding will come from to 2021 let alone 2031. There is a good to strong, but not overwhelming case for a Bakerloo extension.
- 4.15. The Committee discussed a number of issues raised by the presentation. Tube lines get around three times the number of passengers compared to nearby train routes, though this may not be enough to justify a project around the margins. For example the Crossrail and Thameslink projects values are huge, as every extra space is an extra job and the stations are likely to be transformational. A big regeneration scheme to attract passengers and money for an extension is likely to be important. Simply reserving the suburbs with a tube will not be able to justify the costs involved, especially when lines have been extended to take 12 car trains. There is potential for the tube to help with the regeneration of Catford, perhaps even offering Catford as a destination or integrating a new station into the development. It would also improve access to Catford which is poorly served on weekends.
- 4.16. What a local authority can do to make a project like this happen. By bringing groups of shareholders together the project can build momentum. This would need Lewisham, Southwark and London Councils, as well as private groups all working together and lobbying same points. It is not long before organisations start planning the 2019-24 spending, . Bakerloo won't be able to start entering this arena until there has been money spent on project planning in detail and there is a space of about 5 years to get this all started, including a stakeholder group and getting clarity on what needs to be done.

4.17. Other options are, for example extending the DLR to Catford. This would need to be thought through, especially in terms of linkages and detail. Also whether spurs from an extended Bakerloo would be viable, for example to Beckenham or even to Croydon. In addition, there are comparisons with the East London Line, which people said wouldn't make a difference at first. But it is popular and usage has gone up, partly due to the interconnectivity of it. The Tube gets people using it more than rail. This is because people trust the tube, there are less gaps between trains, more reliable and people trust their lifestyle to it.

5. Financial Implications

5.1. There are no financial implications arising from this report.

6. Legal Implications

6.1. There are no legal implications arising from this report.

7. Equalities Implications

7.1. There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Background Documents

Minutes of the meeting of the Sustainable Development Select Committee held in September 2010

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 21st September 2011

Minutes of the meeting of the Sustainable Development Select Committee held on March 15th 2012