



## **Application by Transport for London for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Silvertown Tunnel Project**

### **Agenda for the Issue Specific Hearing on Traffic/Transport Modelling, Forecasting and User Charging and Economic Issues**

This document sets out the agenda for the issue specific hearing (ISH) on Traffic/Transport Modelling, Forecasting and User Charging and Economic Issues that was notified by the Examining Authority (the Panel) on 19 December 2016.

- Date:** Tuesday 17 January 2017  
**Time:** 10:00am, room opens from 09:30am  
**Venue:** ExCel London, One Western Gateway, Royal Victoria Dock, London E16 1XL.  
**Access and Parking:** By Underground and DLR via Jubilee Line to Customs House or Prince Regent. Paid parking available at venue and fully disabled accessible.

### **Purpose of the Issue Specific Hearing**

- I. To consider the design and performance of the Traffic and Transport Models employed by the Applicant to inform an understanding of the need for an additional Thames River crossing and generate forecasts for a range of public policy interventions associated with the Silvertown scheme.
- II. To establish the behavioral responses to such a proposal and inform understanding of the efficacy of the preferred scheme including user-charging.
- III. to identify and review Economic Issues:

### *Participation, conduct and management of hearing*

All Interested Parties (IPs) are invited to attend the hearing. Each IP is entitled to make oral representations at the hearing. However, this is subject to the Panel's power to control the hearing.

Guidance under the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) and the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 provide that at hearings it is the Panel that will probe, test and assess the evidence through direct questioning of persons making oral representations. Questioning at the hearing will therefore be led by a member of the Panel, supported by other Panel members. For most matters the Panel will conduct the hearing in a round table format.

Cross-questioning of the person giving evidence by another person will only be permitted if the Panel decides it is necessary to ensure representations are adequately tested or that a person has had a fair chance to put their case.

The hearing will run until all IPs have made their representations and responded to the Panel's exploration of the matters in accordance with the agenda set.

Please note that the following agenda is indicative and may be amended by the Panel at the start of the hearing session. Furthermore, the Panel may wish to raise other matters arising from submissions, and pursue lines of inquiry in the course of the discussion which are not on the agenda.

The Panel would welcome the participation of the Applicant, London Boroughs of Newham (LB Newham), Tower Hamlets, Southwark, Lewisham, Hackney and the Royal Borough of Greenwich, the Greenwich Society, the Westcombe Society, the Campaign for Better Transport and other IPs who wish to make oral representations at the hearing.

## Agenda

- 1. Welcome, introductions and arrangements for this Issue Specific Hearing.**
- 2. Invitation to the Applicant to provide a *brief* summary of the case for the Silvertown Tunnel consistent with Her Majesty's Treasury's (HMT) 'Five Case Model' as referred to in the Outline Business case Document 7.8<sup>1</sup> [APP-100-104]**

*After hearing from the applicant (maximum 10 minutes), contributions will be invited from the host boroughs, other local authorities and other IPs who have points to make.*

*The Examining Authority (ExA) may wish to pursue aspects of the appraisals undertaken in order to ensure consistency and the breadth of coverage.*

---

<sup>1</sup> \*The Appraisal of Public Projects: The Government's advice to departments and others considering transport and other public projects is based on principles set out in the Treasury "Green Book", 2003, revised 2011. The essential requirement is option appraisal, whereby government intervention is validated, objectives are set, and options are created and reviewed, by analysing their costs and benefits. While the Green book remains the basis of public sector appraisal practice, in 2015 supplementary guidance was issued known as the Five Case Model. (Public Sector Business Cases, Using the Five Case Model, Green Book Supplementary Guidance on Delivering Public Value from Spending Proposals, HM Treasury 2013). The Green Book and the 'Five Case Model' recommend adoption of a cost-benefit analysis approach to appraisal. The effects of transport interventions are often complex. Thus transport appraisal draws together information on a wide range of impacts – it does not just consider the direct impacts on the transport users and service providers affected by the intervention, but also the impacts of the intervention on the environment, wider society and government. To support the development of evidence required in cost-benefit analysis, WebTAG provides guidance on modelling techniques alongside the guidance on appraisal. Some impacts, including noise, air quality, and landscape, social and distributional impacts are not easily modelled and subject to considerable uncertainty. Transport models are unable to directly measure their impact. In such cases additional analyses outside of the transport model are recommended.

### **3. Matters arising from Issue Specific Hearing on Traffic and Transport Modelling, Wednesday 7 December 2016 and Confirmed Action List**

Documents that may be referred to will include the Applicant's responses to first written questions on Traffic & Transport - Document 8.16 [REP1-074], on Air Quality - Document 8.4 [REP1-151], Growth Assumptions - Document 8.48 [REP2-48] and Commentary on the Interface between Strategic and local modelling - Document 8.42 [REP2-050].

The following topics appear to warrant further examination in the light of the comments made on 7 December and in post-hearing submissions:

- Modelling framework and strategic model structures;
- Local Modelling;
- Interface between strategic modelling and local modelling
- How the model addresses behavioral responses and mode choice;
- Behavioral responsiveness of the model to policy interventions including user charges;
- Uncertainties in forecasting: Model framework and model structures – Traffic and Transport Models, Air Quality Models/Tools and noise modeling;
- Interfaces between and compatibility of Traffic and Transport Models and Air Quality Models/Tools
- Interfaces between and compatibility of Traffic and Transport Models and Noise modelling

Among the matters that the ExA will wish to explore in relation to the Links Between Traffic and Transport Modelling and Air Quality and Noise Assessments in the Environmental Statement (ES) are the following questions:

- 3.1 Please can the Applicant provide up to date details on the current usage of the Blackwall tunnel, as follows:-
  - The current week-day daily average vehicle movements through the Blackwall tunnel;
  - The current week-end daily average vehicle movements through the Blackwall tunnel;
  - How these are split north-bound/south-bound;
  - How many of the south-bound vehicles, on average (for both week-days and weekend days) are over 4m in height; and

- What data was used to obtain these averages?
- 3.2 Figure 2.6 and paragraph 2.2.16 of the Applicant's Case for the Scheme [APP-093], identify an overall trend of increased traffic flows through the Blackwall tunnel, despite a "*vast increase in rail provision in East London*", and show that the average daily vehicle movement through the Blackwall tunnel in 2014 was circa 100,000 per day. Please can the Applicant therefore explain why the air quality and noise chapters of the ES assume that only circa 10,000-11,000 vehicles in each direction would use the Silvertown Tunnel in the opening year, if the Order was granted (that is less than 25% of all existing Blackwall tunnel vehicle movements)?
  - 3.3 Further to paragraph 8.14 of the Applicant's response to Action Points 8 and 9 arising from the Traffic and Transport ISH on 7 December 2016 [REP2-063], please can the Applicant explain why the modelled hourly flows used in the noise assessment are 18hr Annual Average Weekly Traffic (AAWT) but 24hr Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) in the air quality assessments?
  - 3.4 Further to Table 1 and Table 2 of the same document, please could the Applicant explain how the numbers in the two tables for peak period factors and off-peak period factors were derived and what are they used for?
  - 3.5 Further to paragraph 9.1.1 of the same document, the data that was used in the noise assessments based upon AAWT data for the opening year is less than the assumed traffic levels used in the air quality chapter of the ES [APP-031] (paragraph 6.6.32 states that "*The Tunnel itself is predicted to carry approximately 10,000-11,000 vehicles per day in each direction*"). Please can the Applicant clarify whether the difference between the input data used for noise assessments and those used for air quality assessments is due to the difference between the 18hr AAWT used for noise assessments and 24hr AADT used for air quality assessments, or whether any other factors relate to the differences in input numbers of traffic?
  - 3.6 Further to the Applicant's response to Action Point 8 and 9 from the TT ISH in December [REP2-063], paragraph 9.1.1 provides AAWT data used in the noise assessments for both the opening year (2021) and the design year (2034), with the design year traffic figures being some 30% higher than the opening year. Are

similar traffic growth assumptions used in the air quality modelling input data for the design year.

- 3.7 In the Applicant's Case for the Scheme [APP-093], it explains in paragraph 2.7.6 that if a long term closure of the Blackwall tunnel is required in the future, "*which is always a possibility*", drivers would have to plan their journeys to use other crossings or not make the journey at all. It further states that in this scenario, the impact on the wider road network and by extension the economic and environmental impacts would be significant. Also, the Applicant's response to the ExA's FWQ PN3 [REP1-178] states that, "*Paragraph 2.6.7 of the Case for the Scheme [APP-093] aims to make the point that, at some point in the future, a long term closure of the Blackwall Tunnel could be required, either as a result of a major incident or for the undertaking of maintenance.*" It goes on to explain that whilst a protracted closure of Blackwall tunnel is not currently envisaged, nevertheless the possibility of a significant closure being required at some point in the future, clearly cannot be ruled out, on the basis that the older the tunnel gets the more likelihood there is that major maintenance or refurbishment works will be required, and there is a relatively low but ever-present risk of a major incident. Given that one of the main reasons given in the Applicant's case for the scheme is to increase resilience to traffic disruptions and delays caused by problems in the Blackwall tunnel, please can the Applicant provide the following information:-
- In the case of a major extended closure of the Blackwall tunnel, due to maintenance/refurbishment works or a major incident, how much of the daily traffic flow currently using the Blackwall tunnel would be expected to use the Silvertown tunnel?
  - If it is not 100%, which other routes would the Blackwall tunnel traffic divert towards?
  - In this scenario, what would be the impact of the much increased number of vehicle movements at the nearest receptors to the Silvertown Tunnel portals and on the Air quality management Areas (AQMAS)?
  - Where is this documented in the ES?
  - If it is not considered in the ES, why isn't it, given the Applicant's wording "*at some point in the future, a long term closure of the Blackwall Tunnel could be required, either as a result of a major incident or for the undertaking of maintenance*"?

- 3.8 Further to the issues tracker chart submitted by LB

Newham at Deadline (DL) 2 [REP2-011, at page 57], which states that *"it remains possible that elasticities (willingness to pay) has the potential to be higher or lower than assumed in the Assessed Case.."*, could the Applicant provide an assessment regarding how much confidence it has in the accuracy of the traffic data that was used for the noise and air quality assessments in the ES and explain what factors (other than willingness to pay) affect the accuracy of these environmental assessments?

**4. Key behavioural issues arising from Traffic and Transport Models and potential implications for policy and assessment/appraisal of interventions with particular reference to user charging, its impacts and effectiveness.**

Documents from the Applicant that that may be referred to will include Model responsiveness – Document 8.43 [REP2-049], River Crossings Behavioural Survey Report – Document 8.47 [REP2-055], Value of time discussion note – Document 8.44 [REP2-052] and Charging Policies and Procedures - Document 7.11 Revised [REP1-123/4].

*IP's will be invited to present any relevant observations they might have and the applicant will be given opportunity to respond (if required). The Panel may also seek additional information or evidence in support of claims/arguments raised by the Applicant or IP's.*

**5. Whether the Mitigation provided in the updated Traffic Impacts Mitigation Strategy [TIMS] is fit for purpose**

*IPs will be invited to provide observations on the proposed mitigation in TIMS v1 [REP2-032] especially Table A1- Initial Mitigation Triggers, in relation to transparency, accountability and how this fits with the traffic levels assessed in the ES.*

**6. Economic Issues:**

Transport Appraisal is a key element of the investment decision making process. This item will therefore consider the Transport Appraisal and the Transport Business Case for the Silvertown Scheme having regard to the HMT guidance referred to under item 1 and guidance on transport appraisal as set out in Transport Appraisal Guidance (WebTAG) including:

- Context: The Strategic Case, the Commercial Case, the Financial Case. The Management Case including strategic consideration of congestion, closures, incidents and network resilience, effects on transport and the wider economy, and environmental effects
- The Economic Case including:
  - User charging and the economic case
  - Transport economic efficiency

- Public accounts
- Distributional and Social Impacts
- Wider Economic Impacts.

Documents that may be referred to will include the Outline Business case and supporting documentation – Document 7.8 [APP-100-104], the Transport Assessment – Document 6.5 [APP-086] and Distribution of user benefits – Document 8.34 [REP2-042].

Among economic issues that the ExA will wish to explore are those on river users. Further to the Applicant's response to ExA's FWQ DN3 [REP1-169], which identifies Thames Wharf as the only safeguarded wharf which would be adversely impacted by the construction of the scheme, and the Port of London Authority (PLA)'s submission for DL2 [REP2-074], which describes potential impacts at other safeguarded wharves along the relevant stretch of the river Thames which are at risk of disruption to some degree and raises concerns that the Applicant's response to DN3 did not consider potential impact upon access to the other safeguarded wharves (Northumberland, Orchard, Peruvian, Manhattan, Sunshine, Angerstein, Murphy's, Victoria Deep Water Terminal, Brewery and Northumberland Wharves), please could the Applicant and PLA provide an update on this matter? PLA considers that disruption to some of these wharves could be significant and adverse.

The ExA will also wish to have an update from the Applicant on the reference to 'Further benefits for local residents who use the tunnel' as referred to in paragraph 2.17 of the Update Report of October 2016 [AS-021].

## **7. Any other matters**

## **8. Concluding remarks by ExA and confirmation of action points arising from today's hearing**

## **9. Close of hearing**

**Please note:** The agenda may be subject to change and elaboration at the discretion of the Panel. The Panel will arrange for comfort breaks and a one hour lunch break. The hearing will close at the conclusion of business. Interested parties who have registered to speak in advance will be provided with a seat at the table and microphone access. Individuals who have not registered in advance may participate at the discretion of the Panel.