

Jacob Gemma

From: Nick Bowes <[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 September 2019 09:28
To: Rowe David (ST)
Cc: Alexander Heidi; Powell Gareth; Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)
Subject: RE: Silvertown - a better explanation of the missing back-check.

Thanks David

From: Rowe David (ST)
Sent: 20 September 2019 09:10
To: Nick Bowes
Cc: Heidi Alexander ; Powell Gareth ; Will Norman
Subject: RE: Silvertown - a better explanation of the missing back-check.

Nick

It is correct to say we tested the same user charges for Blackwall Tunnel only as we applied for Silvertown and Blackwall combined (£3 each way for cars in peak and £1 off-peak, with higher charges for larger vehicles in 2015 prices). However, [REDACTED] is wrong to suggest that simply increasing the charges further at Blackwall would resolve the problems. The results of the tests for Blackwall only showed that charging was not nearly as effective in tackling the issue of congestion, does not address the day-to-day reliability issues and does not allow for improved cross river bus connectivity. The tests also showed that introducing charges at Blackwall only sees a proportion of users switch to other unsuitable river crossings, such as the Woolwich Ferry (this does not happen with Silvertown and Blackwall combined, as users benefit from reduced journey times and better reliability). Simply increasing the user charges at Blackwall further as [REDACTED] suggests pushes even more traffic on to other river crossings over longer distances, which has more significantly greater negative effects on the environment and economy. The same argument that [REDACTED] makes is in a letter from [REDACTED] of Stop the Silvertown coalition to which a response is being drafted for Heidi that makes clear the above. Happy to answer any supplementary points. David

From: Nick Bowes [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@london.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk)]
Sent: 20 September 2019 08:15
To: Rowe David (ST)
Cc: Alexander Heidi; Powell Gareth; Norman Will (Will Norman, Walking & Cycling Commissioner)
Subject: RE: Silvertown - a better explanation of the missing back-check.

Morning David

I know [REDACTED] of old

What is the technical response to the points he raises? I know the policy/political response – without Silvertown you don't get the modal shift option as there is no crossing for bikes and buses

Thanks, Nick

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: 20 September 2019 00:18
To: Nick Bowes <[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk>; Heidi Alexander <[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk>; Rowe David (ST) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; Will Norman <[REDACTED]@london.gov.uk>

Subject: Silvertown - a better explanation of the missing back-check.

Dear Nick, Heidi, Will, David, Gareth

So - usefully, in the [traffic forecasting report - sensitivity testing](#) (p292) there's a better explanation of what TfL actually did in terms of looking at charging Blackwall only. As I suspected, they analysed charging Blackwall only *using the same charging regime as in the assessed case*.

So, they didn't find that charging Blackwall only can't remove congestion effectively. They found that *if you use the same charging regime as in the assessed case* you don't remove congestion as effectively as in the assessed case.

That's not surprising. The charging regime in the assessed case is designed to keep traffic down to more or less existing levels with both Silvertown and Blackwall open, not to de-congest Blackwall entirely. As you

can see on the attached graphic, to de-congest Blackwall completely, you need to increase the toll by a small amount over that used in the assessed case. TfL will be able to work out by exactly how much. The key goal of the scheme is to remove congestion (which also gives the opportunity for much better bus services). So the crucial back-check that needed to be done to understand the value of actually building the tunnel against the best possible alternative that achieves the same congestion reduction is a *cost/benefit analysis that compares the assessed case (building Silvertown and tolling Silvertown and Blackwall) to the case where you toll Blackwall just enough to remove congestion* (so getting the same congestion & bus reliability benefits as the Silvertown scheme, though less resilience benefits) - point 'B' on the attached graphic - and instead of building the Silvertown tunnel with the toll income, you use that income to get maximum possible benefit from other transport interventions (best possible is probably cycling infrastructure at a BCR of 13:1, as the recent TfL report suggests).

A back-of-an-envelope calculation here indicates that, just in value for money terms, there's really no comparison.

In both cases, you get the congestion removal benefits.

If you then use the toll income to build the Silvertown Tunnel, you get added resilience benefits of something less than £250m (much less if you actually act to reduce motor traffic as the climate emergency demands) - and no significant CO2 reduction or air quality improvement.

If you use the toll income, instead, to, for example, build cycle infrastructure that allows modal shift (or better public transport) - you get benefits of up to £13bn in return for that expenditure. And you get significant CO2 reduction and air quality improvements (which should be priced in as part of the cost/benefit analysis - AFAIK they're not right now.).

These calculations should've been done much earlier in the process - but it should not take a great deal of effort for TfL to do them in detail now. If they do, they will almost certainly find that tolling Blackwall to fully remove congestion and spending the toll income on high-value alternative transport improvements is a far better choice, economically and environmentally, than the assessed scheme.

Best,

[Redacted signature]

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

#LondonIsOpen

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY NOTICE:

The information in this email may contain confidential or privileged materials. For more information see

<https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/email-notice/>

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at postmaster@tfl.gov.uk and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at 55 Broadway, London, SW1H 0DB. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/>

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

#LondonIsOpen

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY NOTICE:

The information in this email may contain confidential or privileged materials. For more information see <https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/email-notice/>
