

Decision Maker: Environment PDS Committee

Date: 18th January 2012

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: FUTURE RAIL AND TRAM LINKS TO BROMLEY

Contact Officer: Iain Forbes, Head of Transport Strategy
Tel: 020 8461 7595 E-mail: iain.forbes@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Director of Environmental Services

Ward: All

1. Reason for report

This report provides background information in respect of recent developments and studies by TfL which seek to refine options for rail and tram links in south and south-east London, including Bromley.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 **That Members note and comment on the contents of the report.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: N/A.
 2. BBB Priority: N/A.
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
 2. Ongoing costs: N/A.
 3. Budget head/performance centre:
 4. Total current budget for this head: £
 5. Source of funding:
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional):
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: No statutory requirement or Government guidance.
 2. Call-in: Call-in is not applicable.
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected):
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? N/A.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

3.1 The Council has an aspiration to secure extension of the Tramlink network and the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) to Bromley town centre. This aspiration is indicated in the Council's LIP document as follows:

Project	Approx. date	Indicative cost	Likely funding source	Comments
Tramlink extension to Bromley town centre	2022-2030	£100M	TfL or joint venture	A previous high level feasibility studied has demonstrated a positive business case for this project.
DLR or Transit extension to Bromley North	2022-2030	£30M	TfL or joint venture	Feasibility study required – preferably of all transit-type options.

Recent indications are that the costs shown in the LIP are significantly under-estimated, particularly in regard to a DLR extension.

3.2 Currently these projects are unfunded. However, TfL has started to consider the business case for future transport projects across London, with a view to recommending priorities for investment after 2017.

3.3 In practice, projects for (say) Tramlink, DLR or the Underground do not just compete for resources as one mode against another, but within each category there are also a variety of proposals on which a view must be taken on costs, benefits, practicability and alignment with strategic policy, in particular the Mayor's Transport Strategy. Officials within TfL have started a process which examines potential projects against these factors in a broadly strategic way, with a view to identifying which projects have poor and which have good outcomes with the latter then being analysed in greater depth.

Tramlink

3.4 A series of Tramlink extension studies in the early 2000s led to the identification of an extension from Croydon to Crystal Palace as offering a good return in cost benefit terms. This had a proposed route from the existing tram stop at Harrington Road via proposed stops at Penge Road, Anerley Road, Crystal Palace railway station and terminating at Crystal Palace bus station.

3.5 A public consultation on route options for the Crystal Palace extension was undertaken by TfL in 2006. This offered three options, namely on-street, partially off-street and off-street. The outcome of the consultation was strongly in favour of the off-street option. This included responses from Council officers and from the Leader of the Council.

3.6 The Council's responses included the following points:

- The extension would be an important element in regenerating the Crystal Palace area.
- The extension would provide access to a wider range of employment opportunities, including access to jobs north of the river via the rail interchange at Crystal Palace station.
- The off-road option would minimise the potential disruption and negative interaction between trams and road vehicles, and have the least impact on the existing road network.
- TfL was urged to resolve the uncertainty over funding and commit adequate funding at an early date.
- The Council expressed extreme disappointment that the extension to Beckenham Junction had been withdrawn from consideration, and hoped to see this option reintroduced at an early date.
- The section running through Crystal Palace Park would require a very high standard of landscape and equipment design.

- 3.7 A further linked proposal was to include in the Crystal Palace extension an additional link from Crystal Palace to the existing tram terminus at Beckenham Junction. This was not included in the route consultation, but there were indications from TfL that this element might be re-introduced to the scheme.
- 3.8 Another possible extension which was considered in the early 2000s and revived at around this time was an extension from Beckenham Junction to Bromley town centre. It is understood that this option had not originally found favour with Bromley Members, but by 2006 / 2007 the emergence of the Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan had strengthened the case for this extension. An initial study by TfL, using information on the proposed expansion of the town from the Area Action Plan, indicated that there was potentially a good business case for this extension.
- 3.9 With the emergence of this option, the Council took the view that, given a direct choice between the extension to Crystal Palace and the extension to Bromley, the Council would favour the extension to Bromley.
- 3.10 Work by TfL on the development of Tramlink extensions continued until the election of a new Mayor of London in 2008. A review was initiated which led to a substantial number of unfunded transport projects (not just tram projects) being dropped from the TfL Business Plan, with the intention that potential projects would be reviewed for funding after 2017.
- 3.11 Staff at TfL have continued to examine the case for future Tramlink extensions and other projects with a view to identifying those which best meet the general criteria set out in paragraph 3.3 above, and eliminating those which perform poorly. This work has been assisted by the development of new sub-regional transport models, and one of the factors driving this work has been the need to develop firm proposals for the sub-regional transport plans which sit between the Mayor's Transport Strategy and the boroughs' LIPs.
- 3.12 It is understood that this process has reached the stage where a small number of potential extensions are seen as performing better than others. These options include the extension to Crystal Palace, which has now been prioritised following statements of support from both the present and previous Mayors. Other projects understood to remain under active consideration include Croydon to Bromley via Beckenham Junction, Wimbledon to Sutton, and Croydon to Thornton Heath.
- 3.13 Consideration of these major projects will not inhibit the development of lesser schemes which will improve service levels on the existing Tramlink network. These minor improvements include some minor track amendments which are currently under way which will result in improved service frequencies at Elmers End.

Bromley North station

- 3.14 For some time it has been the Council's formal policy to seek the extension of the Docklands Light Railway (DLR) to Bromley North to improve links to employment opportunities in Docklands, the City and east London. Other suggestions which have been mooted to improve links from Bromley North include restoration of a surface rail service to Lewisham or central London, inclusion in a further Tramlink extension from Bromley South to Lewisham, as part of a bus transit scheme which included segregated guided bus sections, and inclusion in an extended Underground network. The LIP extract included at the start of this report recognises the existence of a range of options through its reference to "DLR or transit".
- 3.15 Solutions involving restoring surface rail access from Bromley North beyond Grove Park are not currently being actively considered. At Grove Park there are four main lines, two up (towards

London) and two down (towards Kent). The Bromley North line creates a fifth line, terminating at Platform 1, although there is a junction with the main line, plus further points which allow trains to cross all the tracks if required (e.g. to the depot). However, the set of tracks closest to the Bromley North branch line are the fast up and down lines (i.e. non-stopping trains that go straight to one of the London Termini). There would be little benefit from a service from Bromley North non-stopping to central London: any service using the Bromley North line would need to cross the fast main lines in order to continue its journey. The fast main line is already operating at capacity and there is no time available for a train from Bromley North to cross these tracks. The only alternative would therefore be to provide a crossover using an overpass or a tunnel, which would be a very substantial (and expensive) undertaking.

- 3.16 The most recent studies made available by TfL are based around the South East London Rail Access Study, or SELRAS, which looks at improving rail-based connectivity in South East London, with a focus on the boroughs of Southwark, Lewisham, Greenwich and Bromley, although the impacts of some of the options extend to a wider area. SELRAS examined twelve options (four based on the Underground, three on the DLR, one bus priority and four National Rail). Those that have a direct impact on Bromley are:

Bakerloo Line extension:

- Elephant & Castle to Lewisham via Camberwell & Peckham or Old Kent Road and then:
- Lewisham to Beckenham Junction and Hayes
- Lewisham to Bromley North

DLR extensions:

- Lewisham to Bromley North via Hither Green

Bus priority measures:

- Hayes to Lewisham Bus Rapid Transit route, on current Hayes line, taking over NR route

National Rail:

- Divert services on the Hayes Line to other routes (if the Hayes Line is converted to another mode).

- 3.17 The conclusions of the SELRAS study are that the combination of Bakerloo Line extensions to Lewisham and then on to Hayes appear to show the strongest benefits when assessed against the MTS objectives. The option via Camberwell, Peckham, New Cross Gate and Lewisham performs better than the alignment via Old Kent Road. A key benefit from these options is the ability to deliver National Rail capacity improvements through re-allocating the Hayes line train paths to other routes, thereby easing crowding and congestion at termini.
- 3.18 The options of a Bakerloo line extension to Bromley North (via Camberwell or Old Kent Road) also scored well through serving Bromley Town Centre. However, the study identifies deliverability issues with the lack of an obvious depot location, as well as the additional cost of tunnelling to a portal south of Grove Park, two additional sub surface stations and no re-allocation of paths to National Rail counting “heavily” against these options.
- 3.19 The study says that the DLR options “have their own merits”, in particular, through delivering a significantly enhanced link between Bromley, Grove Park, Hither Green and Canary Wharf. However, these options did not perform as well as the potential Bakerloo Line extensions. This was, again, partly due to their lack of ability to deliver National Rail improvements through a reallocation of train paths. All the other SELRAS options all scored “worse overall”.
- 3.20 Within Bromley, the stations served by the Hayes Line (Hayes, West Wickham, Eden Park, Elmers End, Clock House and New Beckenham) are not in areas where substantial economic development is foreseen, nor where a change to Underground-style services would generate significant growth. This means that the Bromley end of the line is unlikely to contribute substantially to any economic benefits associated with the proposal.

3.21 Bromley's LIP refers to the Bakerloo Line options as follows:

"While the Council will consider alternative non-DLR options for improving service levels to Bromley North, we believe such consideration would be best undertaken in a way which compared all options on a "level playing field", rather than through individual operators each conducting separate and unco-ordinated studies. It should be noted that the Council is unlikely to support any extension of the Bakerloo Line service to Hayes which results in the loss of direct services to Charing Cross, Cannon Street or London Bridge."

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no policy implications arising directly from this report.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Legal Implications, Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Letters of response from Council to TfL consultation on Crystal Palace, December 2006 SRTP Technical Report – SELRAS (3), TfL October 2011 Bromley Final LIP, December 2011