

<b>Committee</b>	Sustainable Development Select Committee	<b>Item No.</b>	4
<b>Report Title</b>	Integrated Transport – Bakerloo Line Extension		
<b>Ward</b>	All Wards – depends on the routes selected for consideration		
<b>Contributors</b>	Scrutiny Manager		
<b>Class</b>	Part 1	<b>Date:</b>	14 September 2010

## 1. Summary

- 1.1 This item briefly introduces the background to the possible Bakerloo Line Extension that could extend to the London Borough of Lewisham.

## 2. Purpose of the Report

- 2.1 To give the Committee background information on the possibility of an extension to the Bakerloo Line into the London Borough of Lewisham. Information presented within Appendices A and B to this report and at the committee meeting will outline the process that will be followed if the extension takes place and allow the Committee to consider how it wishes to be involved with this.

## 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 The Select Committee is recommended to note the information presented in the Appendices and at Committee and use it to inform discussion on how to further scrutinise the issue.

## 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 If an extension to the Bakerloo Line were to come through the London Borough of Lewisham it would clearly bring many benefits for the area, as has been seen with the recently opened East London Line.

## **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.

## **Background Documents**

London Mayor's Transport Strategy – May 2010

(<http://www.london.gov.uk/publication/mayors-transport-strategy>)

## Appendix A

### Summary of Bakerloo Line SE extension options

This summary makes reference to JRC's September 2010 report, which is attached at Appendix B. JRC considers five main route options, and subsidiary options, which either have past precedent as Bakerloo proposals, or which could be relevant to the current day, starting from the Bakerloo Line's current terminus at Elephant & Castle in Southwark. There is a long history of studies into extending the Bakerloo Line, from the 1920s onwards. For example, powers were granted in 1930 for a line to Camberwell, while a Peckham extension was studied in the 1970s. Broadly, an extension has always been seen as a worthwhile possibility, but so far has never quite justified a full go-ahead.

The JRC commentary is arranged by geography, considering first extensions in inner London, then into the middle and outer suburbs. The table below brings together the route options. Capital costs are notional, based on recent projects, and should be considered as showing a relative cost difference between schemes. Lewisham is in the path of several options to extend the Bakerloo Line into SE London. There are other options which might not serve the Borough.

Scheme	Inner London	Middle and Outer Suburbs	Notional cost (£bn)	Parts of Lewisham possibly served?
B1	Elephant-Canary Wharf via Old Kent Road, Surrey Quays	-	1.6	-
B2	Elephant-Charlton via Canada Water	-	1.95	Deptford
B2 variant	Elephant-Charlton via New Cross	-	2.35	New Cross
B3	Elephant-Lewisham via Old Kent Road, New Cross	-	2.05	New Cross, Lewisham
B3 extend	As above	Lewisham-Blackheath	0.3 (total 2.35)	New Cross, Lewisham, Blackheath
B3 extend	As above	Lewisham-Catford	0.4 (total 2.45)	New Cross, Lewisham, Ladywell, Catford
B3 extend	As above	Lewisham-Blackheath-Bexleyheath-Slade Green	1.3 (total 3.35)	New Cross, Lewisham, Blackheath
B3 extend	As above	Lewisham-Catford-Beckenham Jcn/Hayes	1.3 (total 3.35)	New Cross, Lewisham, Ladywell, Catford, Lower Sydenham
B4	Elephant-Peckham Rye via Aylesbury Estate	-	0.95	-
B4 extend	As above, then to Lewisham	-	2.15	Nunhead, Brockley, Lewisham
B4 extend	As above, then to Lewisham	Further options as above (Blackheath shown costed)	0.3 (total 2.45)	Nunhead, Brockley, Lewisham, Blackheath
B4 extend	As above, then to Catford via tube (Honor Oak) or surface (Crofton Park)		2.15 (tube)	Honor Oak or Nunhead, Crofton Park, Catford
B5	Elephant-Peckham Rye	-	1.2	-

	via Camberwell/Denmark Hill			
B5 extend	As above, then to Lewisham	-	2.4	Nunhead, Brockley, Lewisham
B5 extend	As above, then to Lewisham	Further options as above (Blackheath shown costed)	0.3 (total 2.7)	Nunhead, Brockley, Lewisham, Blackheath
B5 extend	As above, then to surface (Crofton Park)	Catford via tube (Honor Oak) or surface (Crofton Park)	2.4 (tube)	Honor Oak or Nunhead, Crofton Park, Catford

The JRC report does not set out to provide a Benefit Cost Ratio. However it identifies for each option:

- the potential purposes of specific Bakerloo Line extensions
- a possible specification for each extension (there will be other options also to consider)
- a feel for costs and, if relevant, some other factors.

It is clear from the report that recent successful railway schemes have been driven by overriding capacity and access pressures:

- (1970s) splitting the Bakerloo Line into two railways, the new railway being authorised as the Fleet Line and opened as the Jubilee Line
- (1990s) the Jubilee Line Extension into Isle of Dogs, Lower Lee Valley and Stratford, primarily for local regeneration and new transport access to Canary Wharf and the Isle of Dogs business zone.

There are many tests which a railway must pass to justify powers and funding. Affordability and value for money are vital. There must be a clear rationale for the railway, generally these days expressed in terms of regeneration, accessibility, economic growth and net environmental gains as well as improving transport links and achieving a reasonable ratio of farebox income to operating costs.

Historically, suburban extensions of tube lines were authorised because of a combination of factors:

- overcrowding on other lines which a new railway would relieve
- opportunity to serve expanding populations or new centres of employment
- new links and connections which were strategically important.

These days, suburban extensions may need to generate additional benefits, such as freeing up valuable capacity on the main line rail network, and attracting travel from cars to public transport.

Any railway is costly, a railway in tube tunnel is very costly. The sooner a tube can surface and use an overground alignment, the better, but this is rarely the case in inner London. It is also generally true that tube railways are highly generative for passenger traffic, and have similarly high social benefits assisting regeneration and economic development because of the advantages with accessibility.

However that does not mean that any tube line is worth doing. The infrequency of tube schemes being funded and authorised, shows that there is an affordability barrier. Also there are often other options available, such as improving the existing modes of transport, whether those are main line railways or improving bus services and bus/rail interchanges. Schemes may not prove technically worthwhile or pass political 'sensitivity tests' on outcome and affordability, unless they can show a clear Value for Money case benefiting catchments which mostly are not part of other recent schemes.

The timescale for any extension could be lengthy. It took from the 1960s to 1999 for one SE London tube to arrive (as the Jubilee Line) - and there are still current works to increase that line's capacity. The Northern Line upgrade now has priority, including a Kennington to Battersea extension which might open in the mid-2010s. As with Canary Wharf, improved accessibility to a large-scale development is a major driving force behind that extension project.

Upgrading of the existing Bakerloo Line would be an essential precursor of a new SE London tube project, and this is not foreseen to begin until the late 2010s or into the 2020s. The Bakerloo Line is near the bottom of the sequence for line upgrading as part of the tube investment projects, which have been subject to cost and investment delays as the PPP funding and delivery process has foundered. However the planning and design of upgrading works in Central and NW London could make provision for a SE extension, so incorporating some possible costs within the upgrade rather than the extension.

It is assumed that an application for railway powers for an extension would be made through the rules then existing in the late 2010s or early 2020s. These are being reviewed by the new government, but would certainly involve extensive consultation, project options and design, and a public hearing. Planning for a extension should start soon if it is to be a serious contender by the late 2010s.