

**SOUTH EAST ENGLAND PARTNERSHIP BOARD
REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD**

Date: 12 March 2010

Subject: **Papers approved following the cancellation of Regional Transport Board on 8 January 2010**

Report of: Regional Transport Board Manager

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Board:

- i) Notes the Board's approval of three papers following the cancellation of Regional Transport Board on 8 January 2010
- ii) Agrees that the approval of these papers should be recorded in the minutes of March's Regional Transport Board.

Purpose of Report:

To formally record the approval on the following three papers following the cancellation of the Regional Transport Board on 8 January 2010.

- Programme Management and Monitoring
- Gatwick Airport Station
- London Mayor's Transport Strategy Public Draft: Consultation Response

1. Context

- 1.1 The decision to cancel the meeting on 8 January 2010 was taken by the Chairman due to the adverse weather conditions across the South East.
- 1.2 There were three papers on the agenda for this meeting where a formal view from the Board was required before the meeting on 12 March 2010. Therefore Regional Transport Board members were asked to approve these papers by email. These papers were as follows:
 - Programme Management and Monitoring
 - Gatwick Airport Station
 - London Mayor's Transport Strategy Public Draft: Consultation Response
- 1.3 Twelve Board Members responded to the email and all three papers were approved without amendment.
- 1.4 Copies of the approved papers are annexed to this paper and are also available on the South East England Partnership Board website. It is recommended that the approval of all three papers will be formally recorded in the minutes of this meeting.

Rachel Barker
Regional Transport Board Manager
5 March 2010

rachelbarker@se-partnershipboard.org.uk
01483 555215

**SOUTH EAST ENGLAND PARTNERSHIP BOARD
REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD**

Date: 8 January 2010

Subject: **Programme Management & Monitoring**

Report of: Regional Planner

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Board:

- i) Note the progression of schemes in the regional programme as a whole;
- ii) Agree to support the virement of funding from the Access to Strategic Development in Southampton and South Hampshire to enable delivery of an improvement to Junction 5 of the M27;
- iii) Remind Milton Keynes Council that the proposed virement of funding in support of the Central Milton Keynes Public Transport System is only available for the current financial year.

Purpose of Report:

To advise the Board on the current status of the Regional Programme and to highlight future actions required to enable its successful implementation.

Key Issues:

The programme remains by in large the same as presented to this Board in October 2009. Monitoring reports for the second quarter of 2009/10 highlight the continuing trend for delivery milestones to slip. The fact that there are no substantial changes to the proposed implementation date for said schemes increases the importance of local authorities ensuring adequate resource is provided to take forward the development of individual schemes.

In light of on-going pressures on funding levels and a continuing trend of slippage in meeting milestones, it is important to understand the risk associated with the delivery of prioritised schemes. The Partnership Board is contacting relevant scheme promoters with a view to discussing the specific schemes.

1. Regional Transport Programme

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 Annex 1 sets out the latest version of the regional programme, based on the second quarter monitoring returns for 2009/10. Due to revised programming assumptions, the previously reported over-programming of 57% forecasted to occur in 2011/12 is reduced to 42%. This figure, along with the 44% over-programming for next year, must be set within the context of on-going budgetary pressures at a national level.
- 1.1.2 Over-programming is an important programme management tool. However, in the context of reduced public sector investment, there is a need to consider at greater length the affordability of the overall programme. It is increasingly important for promoting authorities to ensure that prioritised schemes are delivered to programme and budget.
- 1.1.3 All promoters with schemes scheduled to start by 2013/14 should be engaged with the Department on how to progress their scheme. As a result, programming assumptions are now becoming more clear and consistent; however there are a few schemes where further clarification is required. To achieve consistency across the programme, the secretariat is discussing the progress of schemes with the relevant promoters.
- 1.1.4 Scheme promoters are reminded that Programme Entry (which is dependent upon a successful Major Scheme Business Case submission) is not a commitment to fund from the Department. Early submission of a MSBC for Programme Entry does not offer any additional funding certainty, in fact doing so where the MSBC is not fully developed will only cause additional workload for the Department and the promoter.
- 1.1.5 In many cases it would be advantageous to await the completion of statutory processes – in particular planning consent – and submitting a more robust combined Programme Entry/Conditional Approval bid. It is ultimately up to the promoter to decide on their submission date; promoters are strongly encouraged to seek early advice from the Department before setting firm timescales for a MSBC submission.
- 1.1.6 Schemes that are being put forward for MSBC need to be accompanied by a letter of support from the region. All requests will be looked at carefully within the context of the agreed regional programme. In addition the secretariat will assess whether there are issues of affordability and/or deliverability that need further consideration.

1.2 Walton Bridge

- 1.2.1 The public inquiry into the scheme has now closed; the recommendation is expected imminently. An application for full approval is expected to be submitted in early 2010.

1.3 Bexhill to Hastings link Road

- 1.3.1 The public inquiry for the scheme is underway, and is expected to report by the end of this year (with a decision in spring 2010). Following the meeting on 23 October 2009, the Regional Transport Board has written to the Planning Inspector reiterating its support for the scheme. The Board also used this as an opportunity to stress the need to deliver the A21 Baldslow Junction at the earliest opportunity.

1.4 A21 Baldslow Junction

1.4.1 Ministers wrote to local MPs in December 2009, setting out two lower cost options for the scheme and advising them of the latest programme for delivery of the A21 Baldslow Junction scheme. Public consultation on these options will commence in late summer 2010 once the decision has been made on the Inspector's Report into the compulsory purchase and side road orders for the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road.

1.5 (Sussex) Coastal Transit System

1.5.1 A meeting has been held between the scheme promoters and the Department on how best to progress this scheme. Actions from this meeting, including the need to make progress on a joint basis need to be addressed. It is now envisaged that a combined Programme Entry/Conditional Approval business case will be submitted in summer 2010.

1.6 Ashford Smartlink

1.6.1 A submission for programme entry is expected in early 2010. Preliminary designs for the scheme have been completed, with costing and economic appraisals underway. Work to date has highlighted two options, a higher cost option with segregated routes, and a lower cost option predominantly within the existing highway.

1.6.2 The higher cost option offers more benefits but requires a compulsory purchase order – adding around a year to the proposed delivery timescales. The lower cost option does not require any additional land take, but will offer a lesser net benefit. Ashford Borough Council and Kent County Council will notify the secretariat when the options have been appraised further.

1.7 Thames Valley Bus and Coach Network (High Wycombe Coachway)

1.7.1 A Planning Application for the proposed Coachway and Business Park was submitted in December 2009. A meeting with the Department has taken place to discuss the business case submission to enable completion before the 2012 Olympic Games. A business case for 'Programme Entry' stage was submitted in December 2009, accompanied with a letter of support to the progression of this scheme from the region, providing it delivers to time and to budget.

1.8 A21 Tonbridge to Pembury

1.8.1 Draft Compulsory Purchase Orders and Highways Orders were published on 11 December; a Public Inquiry is expected to start in summer 2010. The central scheme estimate has increased by £5m to a total of £125m, of which £120m is expected to be incurred on the RFA. This increase is a £7m on the total incurred on the RFA. The Highways Agency have informed the Secretariat that this cost increase is attributable to 'risk calculations' applied to the scheme rather than an increase in the civil engineering cost of the scheme.

1.9 A23 Handcross to Warninglid

1.9.1 On 29 October 2009 the Secretary of State confirmed the Highways Orders for the scheme, subject to further consultation on some minor elements. The scheme is scheduled to begin advance mitigation works in the summer of 2010, with the main works in the summer of 2011.

1.10 Tipner Interchange

1.10.1 A planning application was submitted in December 2009. It is Portsmouth City Council's intention to submit a business case for Programme Entry in late December/early January. A letter of support has been provided by the secretariat.

1.11 Access to Oxford

1.11.1 A central component of the 'Access to Oxford Package' is to improve Oxford Station. Network Rail will soon be undertaking works to deliver an additional bay platform to the south of the station; however this does not include funding to deliver the transfer deck connecting the platform across the A420 Botley Road to the main station concourse. This will be funded from the Access to Oxford Package by means of a virement to Oxfordshire County Council. A delivery case from Oxfordshire County Council is currently being prepared, with the scheme proposed to start in summer 2010.

2.12 Vired Schemes

2.12.1 Promoters of schemes which have been identified for virement are required to submit a short 'Delivery Case' to the secretariat setting out the proposed works and delivery timetable. Once this has been agreed promoters are able to claim funds from the Department's Section 31 Grant Claims Manager.

2.12.2 The following schemes are still to submit a delivery case and should do so as a matter of urgency:

- Central Milton Keynes Public Transport System (for claim by end of 2009/10)
- A40 Abbey Way (for claim in 2010/11)
- Oxford Station (for claim in 2010/11)

2. Other Schemes of Regional Significance

2.1 Gatwick Station

2.1.1 A meeting was held on 25 November 2009 between the main interested parties to facilitate the implementation of Network Rail's proposals to improve the station at Gatwick. This is subject to a more detailed paper at Agenda Item 7.

2.2 East West Rail

2.2.1 The South East England Strategy Board on 26 November 2009 expressed its support for East West Rail as a critical piece of enabling infrastructure. This is subject of a separate paper at Agenda Item 6.

2.3 M27 Junction 5

2.3.1 At its last meeting in October 2009, the Board directed the Secretariat to assist in delivering the planned improvements to Junction 5 on the M27. The junction serves as a key access point from the Strategic Road Network to Southampton International Airport and strategic development sites in the PUSH area.

- 2.3.2 Funding for the scheme was originally envisaged from a mixture of Growth Point Funding, Hampshire County Council and developer contributions – totalling to £8.8m. The scheme is proposed for delivery in three phases and work has already begun on ‘phase 1’ which is due for completion in March 2010.
- 2.3.3 The remaining phases will cost £6.2m to deliver, the majority of which was originally envisaged to be funded by PUSH, particularly through Growth Point funding. With recent cuts to this funding stream, PUSH can only secure £2.7m to the scheme, leaving £3.5m as yet unfunded. The failure to close this gap would result in the cessation of work.
- 2.3.4 The regional programme includes an allocation to £40m to improve ‘Access to Strategic Development in Southampton and South Hampshire.’ The planned improvements to Junction 5 would certainly meet this objective, and therefore a pragmatic solution would be to advance, and vire, £3.5m from this package to Hampshire County Council to enable the completion of the project.

3. Regional Infrastructure Fund

- 3.1 A legal agreement between SEEDA (as the accountable body for RIF) and Ashford Borough Council is due to be signed by the end of this year to enable the delivery of improvements to M20 Junction 9 (£8m) and the A20 Drivers roundabout (£7M). It is anticipated that both schemes will be completed by spring 2011. A further meeting of the RIF Investment Panel is scheduled for early March 2010.

James Renwick
Regional Planner

8 January 2010

Contact: James Renwick, Regional Planner
T: 01483 555205
E: jamesrenwick@se-partnershipboard.org.uk

**SOUTH EAST ENGLAND PARTNERSHIP BOARD
REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD**

Date: 8 January 2010
Subject: **Gatwick Airport: Station Improvement**
Report of: Director of Regional Investment

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Board:

- a) Agree to support a contribution of £5m from the regional programme of investment towards the cost of delivering the proposed enhancement to Gatwick Airport Station; this being conditional upon the remainder of the funding gap being addressed by contributions from other partners, including an appropriate contribution from Gatwick Airport Limited.
- b) Delegate the Chairman to deal with any outstanding matters associated with this proposal as required.

Purpose of Report:

To update the Board on the situation with regard to the proposed enhancement of Gatwick Airport Station and in particular to set out the current position in respect to the funding package required to enable its delivery.

Key Issues:

Network Rail has developed a scheme that will enhance the capacity of Gatwick Airport Station, consistent with the objectives of the Airport Surface Access Strategy. The enhancement has been costed at £53m. Network Rail has identified funding of £40m towards the cost of delivering the scheme; the funding gap is therefore £13m.

Agreement on the funding package is required no later than March 2010 if it is to be delivered in parallel with programmed re-signalling works. Failure to secure the funding package will result in the re-signalling works being undertaken on a like-for-like basis. This will preclude the likelihood of additional capacity at the station being secured for the medium term.

1. Context

- 1.1. At its meeting on 23 October this Board received an update on the proposal that would provide additional capacity at Gatwick Airport Station; details of the proposed scheme were set out in the paper to that meeting.
- 1.2. In summary, Network Rail is scheduled to renew the signalling in the Gatwick Station area in 2012-13. The need to undertake this work provides the opportunity to deliver additional capacity at the station at the same time. Once the re-signalling works have been undertaken the opportunity to deliver a capacity enhancement will be severely constrained in the short/medium term.
- 1.3. All interested parties are agreed as to the desirability of ensuring that we take advantage of this opportunity to realise benefits for the Airport as an international gateway, for the region (through the removal of a bottleneck on a key transport corridor) and locally (through improvements in public transport that support delivery of the aspirations for the Gatwick Diamond).

2. Update

- 2.1. A meeting was held on 25 November between the interested parties at which the proposal to improve Gatwick Airport Station was discussed. A summary of the outcome of that discussion is attached (Annex 1).
- 2.2. Subsequent to that meeting the airport has been sold to Global Infrastructure Partners; the new owners taking over the reins as from 4 December. GIP has already made it clear that their aim is to make Gatwick Airport a truly competitive major European airport and the airline of choice for airlines and passengers in its market in London and the South East.
- 2.3. They have also set out their intention to provide a competitive alternative to Heathrow, Stansted and Luton Airports. A key part of this will be providing more efficient operations for airlines and a better experience for passengers.
- 2.4. Providing additional capacity at Gatwick Airport Station that will improve the overall level of accessibility and the passenger experience would appear to be consistent with the aspirations of the new owners. Early indications are that the support expressed by Gatwick Airport Limited at the meeting held on 25 November remains the position of the airport.

3. Next Steps

- 3.1. We are now at a stage where there is broad agreement on the need to deliver a capacity enhancement at Gatwick Airport Station. There is also broad agreement as to the scale and nature of that enhancement. The key issue remains funding.
- 3.2. In order to deliver the proposed enhancement Network Rail need to be confident that an appropriate funding arrangement is in place. It needs to have this assurance that this is in place no later than March; this is necessary in order to provide sufficient time to complete the detailed designs for the additional capacity so that the work can be co-ordinated with the renewals work that will take place.

- 3.3. Members will recall that the cost of the enhancement scheme is £53m. Network Rail has been able to identify additional money from within its funding settlement such that a total of £40m is available to contribute towards the cost of the enhancement. Therefore a funding gap of £13m needs to be bridged if the enhancement scheme is to happen.
- 3.4. The proposed scheme is at an advanced stage in its development. Consequently Network Rail is confident that the cost estimate is robust. Both Network Rail and Gatwick Airport Limited are committed to driving down any contingency costs to the absolute minimum. Hence the current cost estimate should be viewed as an upper limit.
- 3.5. There are clear benefits to the region arising from the provision of additional capacity at Gatwick Airport Station. The support of the regional partners, as expressed through this Board, has been a key factor in helping make progress with arriving at a deal that all parties are content with.
- 3.6. It is understood by all the key parties that ultimately delivery of the scheme is dependent upon a combination of Network Rail, Gatwick Airport Limited and regional funding. In the absence of any one partner failing to contribute the scheme will not go ahead.
- 3.7. Understandably the transfer in ownership of the airport has meant that it has not yet been possible to arrive at a final agreement on the funding package. However, it is clear that GIP accept that it will need to make a contribution towards closing the funding gap; a gap that may be reduced if the provision made for contingencies can be reduced.
- 3.8. Having looked carefully at the commitments already made in respect of the regional funding available, there is sufficient scope to recommend that the Board region makes a contribution of £5m towards the funding gap; this being conditional upon the remainder of the funding gap being addressed by contributions from other partners, including an appropriate contribution from Gatwick Airport Limited.
- 3.9. Under the flexibility offered to the region through the Regional Funding Advice process it is possible to 'vire' up to £5m from the 'major scheme' budget to either a Local Transport Authority or other delivery agency provided the region is satisfied that there is a robust business case. In this instance the proposed enhancement scheme developed by Network Rail provides the necessary level of supporting evidence.
- 3.10. If the Board is content with the proposed way forward the secretariat would continue to work with Network Rail, Gatwick Airport Limited and other partners as appropriate, to reach a final agreement on the funding package in time to meet the March deadline. Given the tight timescale it is recommended that the Chairman be delegated to deal with any additional matters on behalf of the Board.

Martin Tugwell
Director of Regional Investment

8 January 2010

Contact: Martin Tugwell Director of Regional Investment
T: 01483 555211 E: martintugwell@se-partnershipboard.org.uk

**SOUTH EAST ENGLAND PARTNERSHIP BOARD
REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD**

Date: 8 January 2010

Subject: **Mayor of London's Transport Strategy Public Draft:
Consultation Response**

Report of: Regional Planner

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Board agree the response set out in Annex 1 to form part of the overall response to the wider consultation on the Mayor of London's 'Shaping London' consultation.

Purpose of report:

To brief the Board on the Mayor of London's draft revised Transport Strategy, and to agree a response that will form part of the wider consultation response to be considered by the South East England Partnership Board at its meeting on 9 February 2010.

Key issues:

The proposed revisions to the Mayor's Transport Strategy largely confirms Mayor Boris Johnson's commitment to Transport for London's (TfL) already-established long term programme of capital investment through to 2017/18.

Although there is a wealth of proposals for improvements to London's transport system there are no new proposals of cross boundary significance within the Greater South East context.

It is proposed that the Partnership Board's response should highlight those elements of the strategy that are of cross-boundary interest, and emphasises the importance of the Mayor of London working closely with South East England on matters of shared interest.

1. Context

- 1.1. The Mayor of London published his public consultation draft Mayor's Transport Strategy ('MTS') in October 2009. This was done as part of a wider 'Shaping London' consultation spanning the proposed revised versions of the London Plan and the London Economic Development Strategy.
- 1.2 The closing date for responses is 12 January 2010. However, the South East England Partnership Board has received a dispensation to submit its formal response following the meeting of the Partnership Board scheduled for 9 February 2010.
- 1.3 The Regional Transport Board's advice with regards to the draft Mayor's Transport Strategy will form part of the overall response considered by the Partnership Board.

2. The draft revised Mayor's Transport Strategy

- 2.1 The draft strategy is over 300 pages long and divided into three parts:
 - 1) Vision and context (Chapters 2-3);
 - 2) Challenges, policies and proposals (Chapters 4-6);
 - 3) Delivery (Chapters 7-9).
- 2.2 This Board's proposed advice to the Partnership Board is set out in Annex 1.
- 2.3 Most of the 126 proposals set out in the document are worded in general terms and there are no major surprises or new policy positions that the region needs to make strong representations on at this time. It is therefore recommended that the consultation response concentrates on emphasising the importance of greater recognition of the need to address cross-boundary issues on a joint basis.
- 2.4 The document is long and comprehensive and omissions are few. One identified omission is regarding the future of the M25.
- 2.5 Although a stronger focus on Outer London was originally promised (with an 'Outer London Commission' report being commissioned, the proposal on outer London town centres and strategic rail interchanges is relatively subdued. The concept of 'superhubs' appears to have been dropped.
- 2.6 On airports, Mayor Johnson's opposition to expansion of Heathrow Airport is reiterated within the context of recognising that adequate runway capacity is necessary to London's competitive position in the global economy.
- 2.7 Heathrow Airtrack is supported 'subject to clarification of its impact on existing services to Waterloo' and it having 'a robust business case'.
- 2.8 The concept of a new airport in Thames Gateway or in the Thames Estuary ("Boris Island") is not mentioned.
- 2.9 Overall, traffic congestion across London as a whole is forecast to increase by 17% in 2031 compared to 2006 in the Reference Case; with implementation of the proposals in the revised strategy it is forecast to increase by 14%. The draft Strategy therefore concludes that further

investigation of pricing initiatives to manage traffic demand will be required. However, the only firm proposal in the draft Strategy is to shrink the central London congestion charge zone by removing the western extension.

Richard Walker
Regional Planner

8 January 2010

Contact: Richard Walker, Regional Planner
T: 01483 555245
E: richardwalker@se-partnershipboard.org.uk

REGIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD INPUT INTO THE SOUTH EAST ENGLAND PARTNERSHIP BOARD RESPONSE TO THE 'SHAPING LONDON' CONSULTATION

1. Introduction

- 1.1. There are a large number of policies and proposals in the document for improving London's transport system, many of which will be relevant to South East England local authorities when preparing their Local Transport Plans. However it is recommended that the Partnership Board's response focuses on matters of strategic cross-boundary interest.

2. Comments on Chapters 2–4

- 2.1. Chapter 2 - 'The Mayor's Vision' - is wide-ranging. The vision for the transport system refers throughout to developing the system for the benefit of Londoners. In the Mayor's Vision for the London Plan, 'Londoners' are described as anyone living, working or studying in the city, or visiting it (MTS para 26). This broader definition should be more explicit within the Transport Strategy vision to clarify that non-London residents have a stake in the success of London's transport system.
- 2.2. In Chapter 3 – Context - the importance of London within the wider Greater South East 'mega city region' is identified and, broadly speaking, given due weight. However:
- i) The role of London as an interchange point for trips across the Greater South East by public transport needs to be explicitly recognised;
 - ii) In the section on sub-regional and local travel, there is no consideration of local trips across the Greater London boundary to outer London town centres.
- 2.3. The description of South East England's regional governance arrangements and Regional Transport Strategy in s3.1.2 para 64 are incorrect; the first two sentences of paragraph 64 should be amended to read:
- "London has two adjoining regional bodies: the South East England Partnership Board (formerly the South East England Regional Assembly) and the East of England Regional Assembly. The Regional Transport Strategy for South East England is contained within the South East Plan, published by the Government in May 2009, and that for the East of England is contained within the East of England Plan, published in May 2008."
- 2.4. The terms 'South East England' and 'East of England' are not consistently spelled or used throughout the document. This needs to be corrected.
- 2.5. In Figure 16, the forecast regional population growth in the South East over the period 2006-2031 should read 1.6 million, not 1.3million (the region's population is expected to increase from 8.2m to 9.8m). This figure then sums with the figure of 1.4m for the East of England (which is correct) to the total of three million for both regions quoted in para 108.

It is notable that this is both a higher absolute level of growth and a higher rate of growth than that forecast for London itself.

- 2.6. Chapter 4 - Challenges and Strategic Policies - identifies a wide-ranging set of challenges and sets out a comprehensive set of 26 strategic policies to address those challenges. Of particular significance is the challenge posed by growth in demand for travel between London and neighbouring regions, in particular by rail. Growth of 30% in rail demand is forecast for 2006-31: a major challenge by any measure.
- 2.7. It is important that the Mayor of London acknowledges that this is a shared challenge. In seeking to identify solutions to this challenge it will be critical for the Mayor of London to work closely with the South East England Partnership Board to ensure that they take account of wider interests.
- 2.8. There should be more explicit recognition of the importance of addressing cross-boundary issues of joint basis. The lack of such recognition in the current document is deeply concerning. For example, Policy 2, which covers improving inter-regional, national and international links serving London (and is taken forward by 13 different proposals), does not mention the neighbouring regions. The Inter-Regional Forum, set up to co-ordinate planning across the three region area of the Greater South East, is not mentioned in the document at all.
- 2.9. It is important that these omissions are rectified in the final document. More fundamentally though it is important that the need for joint working is carried forward in a meaningful way into the future.

3. Comments on Chapters 5–8

- 3.1. Of the 126 proposals, the following are of strategic significance and have a cross-boundary dimension relevant to South East England:

From Proposals 1-14, covering National Rail:

- i) Proposal 2, which supports the development of rail freight terminals and strategic rail freight interchanges 'in or near London';
- ii) Proposal 3, supportive of the development of rail freight routes avoiding London for freight not destined there;
- iii) Proposal 4, supportive of HS2, and suggesting Euston as the terminus;
- iv) Proposal 6, to 'consider' future extensions of Crossrail;
- v) Proposal 7, seeking to ensure that the HLOS commuting capacity increase programme is delivered;
- vi) Proposal 8, identifying the South West and West Anglia Main Lines as the highest priority for further capacity increases post 2014;
- vii) Proposal 9, supporting new rail capacity in the southwest-northeast corridor, using the safeguarded alignment for the Chelsea-Hackney or Crossrail 2 tunnel;
- viii) Proposal 11, identifying the highest priorities for station capacity enhancements.

From all the other proposals:

- ix) Proposals 30 and 101, on smoothing traffic flow;
- x) Proposal 39, on new river crossings on the east side of London
- xi) Proposal 46, on strategic interchanges;
- xii) Proposals 47 & 48, on airport capacity;

- xiii) Proposal 53, on the Central London Cycle Hire scheme (enabling non-London residents arriving by rail to use cycle for trip-making during their visit or working day in a way that just is not possible at present);
 - xiv) Proposal 88, on air flight paths;
 - xv) Proposal 94, on the London Low Emission Zone and emissions standards for goods vehicles entering London;
 - xvi) Proposal 98, on freight;
 - xvii) Proposals 109-113, on resilience to climate change;
 - xviii) Proposal 126, on park & ride for Outer London town centres;
 - xix) Proposal 129, on developing road pricing options.
- 3.2. The final document should explicitly recognise the potential for detailed proposals brought forward under these headings to have cross-boundary implications. There should be an explicit commitment on the part of the Mayor of London (and his agencies) to work with the Partnership Board in ensuring that proposals that have a cross-boundary implication are developed in partnership. The role of the Inter-Regional Forum in providing a Political steer in such matters should be explicitly recognised within the final document.
- 3.3. With respect to the National Rail proposals, there is a particularly strong case for London to work with its neighbouring regions in pursuing the development of detailed proposals. The development of a joint Greater South East position on the key issues will bring added value when engaging with DfT and the rail industry.
- 3.4. Regarding matters of strategic cross-boundary significance not currently mentioned in the draft strategy, only one item has been identified.
- 3.5. The proposals on managing the road network are understandably mostly inward-focused on issues within the London boundary. However the significance of the M25 for route choices for London-bound traffic, and indeed for some movements within London, should be acknowledged.

January 2010