



## Silvertown Tunnel Development Consent Order

## London Borough of Lewisham

# Deadline 7 submissions

---

<b>PINS Reference</b>		
<b>Document Number</b>	LBL 15	
<b>Authors</b>	LB Lewisham, Project Centre, Phlorum, GVA	
<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
0	April 2017	Deadline 7 Version

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
2. Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy	4
3. Bus Strategy	6
4. Charging and Policies Procedures	7
5. Draft Development Consent Order	8

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Transport for London (“TfL”) submitted the application for the Silvertown Tunnel Development Consent Order (“DCO”) in April 2016. The DCO Examination began in October 2016 and closes on 11 April 2017. The final deadline for submissions to the examination is Deadline 7, 10 April 2017.
- 1.2 The London Borough Lewisham (“LB Lewisham”) has been involved throughout the examination, submitting documents at each deadline and attending and making oral submissions at the Issue Specific Hearings (“ISH”).
- 1.3 At Deadline 6, LB Lewisham submitted its Deadline 6 submissions titled ‘Post-hearing submissions and further comments’ (document reference: REP6-025), which set out the Council’s most up-to-date position on the Silvertown Tunnel DCO. TfL has only put forward minimal changes through their Deadline 6 submissions and the majority of these do not address LB Lewisham’s concerns and objections. Where a concern has now been addressed or where LB Lewisham has comments on TfL’s Deadline 6 amendments, this is set out below. Where no change is proposed by TfL, the comments and objections within LB Lewisham’s Deadline 6 submission remain. The comments within both submissions (including the reference to previous submissions) should therefore be considered by the ExA and Secretary of State in their respective recommendations and decision on the DCO.
- 1.4 For the avoidance of doubt, LB Lewisham objects to the Silvertown Tunnel proposal and asks the Secretary of State to refuse the DCO application for the reasons set out in LB Lewisham’s Deadline 6 submissions, summarised at paragraph 1.9 (document reference: REP-025).

## 2. MONITORING AND MITIGATION STRATEGY

- 2.1 TfL has proposed some updates to the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy Revision 1 (document reference REP6-068). Many of LB Lewisham's points have still not been addressed and these remain as per the Deadline 6 and previous submissions.
- 2.2 LB Lewisham's comments on the relevant updated sections are as follows.
- 2.3 LB Lewisham has previously raised concern with paragraph 2.3.3 of the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy in relation to the establishment of a 'long list' of locations for consideration of localised impacts. Whilst still not made clear in TfL's Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy, TfL confirmed at a meeting on 4 April 2017 with LB Lewisham that only one of the three criteria need to be met. This should be specified in the Strategy.
- 2.4 TfL's updated Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy addresses some of Lewisham's concerns with paragraph 2.3.3. Firstly, the first bullet point has been amended to refer to traffic flow increases by 15% and 60 vehicles per hour. This amendment is welcomed.
- 2.5 Secondly, the third criterion "*Areas where local highway authorities have flagged a potential concern that are included in the initial traffic monitoring plan*" remains unclear and perhaps indicates an opportunity for roads within Lewisham to be added to the list. It remains unclear whether local authorities have scope to flag additional concerns or whether the criterion is limited only to those routes which have already been assessed and are already included within Appendix A of the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy. LB Lewisham has flagged concern over particular routes in their borough and as such considers these should be included within the pre-scheme assessment, regardless of meeting any other criteria.
- 2.6 Paragraph 2.3.4 of the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy inserts some additional wording to state "*As part of this process a detailed review of the*
-

*outputs from the strategic transport modelling will be undertaken for each location*". LB Lewisham objects to this as the borough has concerns with the model and thus is not happy with it being used to determine to locations for monitoring.

- 2.7 TfL has inserted new sections into the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy to refer to '*mitigation at adjacent crossings*' in paragraphs 5.2.5 and 5.2.6. These paragraphs set out that TfL would consider the implementation of a user charge at adjacent crossings. This has not been discussed as part of the DCO examination process and LB Lewisham would need to be involved in any such discussions due to the impact on the borough's road network. TfL will also need to discuss potential concessionary user charges with the borough.
- 2.8 Appendix A has been updated to assess impacts for each hour as opposed to 24 hour data. This update is welcomed.
- 2.9 LB Lewisham has continued discussions with TfL on the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy throughout the examination process, and TfL confirmed prior to Deadline 6 that it would include some additional monitoring in the borough. The locations agreed by TfL prior to Deadline 6 have now been included in the Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy and this is welcomed. However, LB Lewisham remains of the opinion that all its requested sites should be monitored as the predicted impacts are based on contested modelling outputs. The remaining sites to include are;

**B218 Brockley – New Cross Corridor (to Rotherhithe)**

B218 Brockley Rise jw A205 South Circular Road

B218 Stondon Park jw Honor Oak Park

B218 Brockley Road jw Adelaide Ave

B218 Malpas Road jw A20

**A21 Catford – Lewisham Corridor**

A21 Lewisham High Street jw Adelaide Ave

Lewisham Road jw Lewisham Hill

### **AIR QUALITY**

- 2.10 Since LB Lewisham's Deadline 6 submissions, TfL has made no concessions to the borough's on going air quality concerns and requests for monitoring along key routes.
- 2.11 LB Lewisham remains concerned that the fundamental methodology of the air quality assessment is not robust and relies on uncertain traffic data.
- 2.12 LB Lewisham notes in TfL's Post-hearing Submission Document (document reference: REP6-073) that Figures 24 to 27 of the 'Development Consent Order Application Response to ExA's Second Written Questions: Traffic and Transportation' suggest that traffic impacts throughout Lewisham, particularly along the A200 are marked, in green, as being 1,000 vehicles AADT. This exceeds the DBRM air quality screening criterion used by TfL and appears to contradict their previous assertions.

### **3. BUS STRATEGY**

- 3.1 TfL submitted an updated Bus Strategy Revision 1 (REP6-067) at Deadline 6. LB Lewisham's comments and objections remain as per its previous submissions as TfL has not adequately addressed these concerns. LB Lewisham's additional comments on the updated Bus Strategy are set out below.
- 3.2 Commitment 3 has been amended to specify that the dedicated lane for buses is only required for the 'monitoring period', which is a three year period from the date on which the Silvertown Tunnel opens for public use. This is worrying as if TfL decide that they need more capacity within the tunnel the bus lane could be converted to a lane for general traffic after a three year period. If this is the case, then an increase in traffic could cause problems on the surrounding road network. The assertions from TfL are that the Silvertown Tunnel is not a scheme about increasing capacity, but this last minute change to the Bus Strategy indicates that TfL may see the Silvertown Tunnel as a capacity scheme at some point in the future. LB Lewisham request that the lane remains as initially

proposed, as a dedicated lane for buses, coaches and heavy vehicles for the lifetime of the tunnel rather than just a minimum three year period.

- 3.3 Commitment 5 has been amended to remove the reference to a minimum of 20 buses per hour and to cross refer to the requirement in Schedule 2 of the DCO which requires bus provision for the duration of the monitoring period. For the reasons sets out in paragraphs 5.7 to 5.9 of this submission on the dDCO, LB Lewisham object to this change to both the Bus Strategy and requirement 13(1).
- 3.4 Commitment 7 has been amended to refer to TfL consulting STIG members on its outline proposals for the bus network. Notwithstanding LB Lewisham's comments in section 5 of this submission on Article 65, Lewisham is supportive of this change to Commitment 7.
- 3.5 TfL propose amended wording to what was Commitment 8 and is now Objective 2. In LB Lewisham's most recent meeting with TfL (4 April 2017) discussions took place and it was agreed that TfL would amend this wording to focus on a wider group of boroughs rather than just the Growth Boroughs.

#### **4. CHARGING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

- 4.1 TfL updated its proposed Charging Policies and Procedures certified document (document reference: REP4-039) at Deadline 4 to include a new policy as set out below;
- *Policy 6: a 50% concession on the user charges will be available for eligible residents of host boroughs on a low income who register for an online account with TfL.*
- 4.2 LB Lewisham set out that it has serious concerns with this policy in its Deadline 5 submissions (document reference: REP5-008), its oral representations on this point at the ISH on 29 March 2017, and it is Deadline 6 submissions (REP6-025). Lewisham also discussed this point at a meeting with TfL on 4 April 2107.

- 4.3 TfL's updated Charging Policies and Procedures Revision 3 (document reference: REP6-060) does not propose any changes to include Lewisham or other neighbouring boroughs in this discount and thus does not address the borough's concerns.
- 4.4 TfL has included their explanation as to why LB Lewisham is excluded from this discount in Appendix A to its post-hearing submissions on the dDCO (REP6-075). LB Lewisham has already had sight of this note prior to Deadline 6, and for the reasons set out in LB Lewisham's Deadline 6 submissions, the borough does not agree with TfL's methodology and justification. LB Lewisham request amendments to the dDCO as specified in paragraphs 7.1 to 7.11 of Lewisham's Deadline 6 submissions (document reference REP6-025). LB Lewisham believes that TfL should have a fair and robust methodology for who is included in a concessionary discount, but this has not been done by TfL.

## 5. DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER

- 5.1 LB Lewisham's concerns on the wording of the dDCO remain as per its Deadline 6 submissions.
- 5.2 TfL proposed some further amendments to the dDCO at Deadline 6 in their dDCO Revision 5 (document reference: REP6-038) and LB Lewisham's concerns and objections on these amendments are set out below.

### *Article 65: Silvertown Tunnel Implementation Group*

- 5.3 LB Lewisham has commented on various iterations of this article and also had discussions with TfL on STIG throughout the examination.
- 5.4 TfL's Deadline 4 dDCO Revision 4 (document reference; REP4-025) proposed to remove the obligation within Article 65 for TfL to consult all of STIG members on its proposals for cross river bus services. LB Lewisham set out its concerns

with this in its Deadline 5 written submissions, its oral representations on 29 March 2017 and its Deadline 6 written submissions.

- 5.5 TfL's dDCO Revision 5 (document reference:REP6-038) subsequently amends Article 65 to state that TfL must consult the members of STIG on a number of matters including;

*“Article 65 (5)(b) the proposals for the initial bus services that will operate through the tunnels when the Silvertown Tunnel opens for public use;”*

- 5.6 Whilst this wording is an improvement on the dDCO Revision 4 (document reference: REP4-025) wording it does not go far enough to address LB Lewisham's concerns. It is of concern to LB Lewisham that TfL will only be required to consult STIG for the initial bus services and not any subsequent proposals for bus services. LB Lewisham request that the DCO wording is amended to be clear that STIG should be consulted on both the initial bus services and the bus services for a minimum of three years after the tunnel has opened to traffic. Three years is an appropriate period to include within Article 65 as this is the minimum monitoring period proposed by the dDCO and Monitoring and Mitigation Strategy. This would also be consistent with the initial wording proposed by TfL in earlier versions of the dDCO and would ensure that STIG members are effectively consulted on an issue as important as bus provision throughout the monitoring period.

*Schedule 2: Requirement 13*

- 5.7 LB Lewisham's detailed comments on this requirement are already set out in existing submissions and these objections remain.
- 5.8 In addition, TfL's Deadline 6 dDCO Revision 5 (REP6-038) proposes a further amendment to requirement 13(1) to require TfL to *“...secure the provision of not less than 20 buses per hour during peak periods in each direction through the tunnels ~~from the date on which the Silvertown Tunnel opens for public use~~ [for the duration of the monitoring period](#)...”*
-

- 5.9 Notwithstanding LB Lewisham's request that the minimum number of buses should be the 37.5 buses per hour as per the Assessed Case, LB Lewisham question and object to this amended wording as the minimum 20 buses per hour should not just be for the minimum three year monitoring period. It is a concern that bus numbers may therefore reduce after this, which would reduce the public transport benefits that the scheme claims to be delivering and which are part of TfL's objectives and priorities for the scheme. See also LB Lewisham's comments on the Bus Strategy in section 3 of this submission.
- 5.10 Requirement 13(2) has not been updated by TfL and the proposal remains for TfL to provide concessionary bus travel to only the host boroughs. As per LB Lewisham's Deadline 6 submissions, Lewisham strongly objects to this and does not agree with TfL's methodology and rationale for this approach.