

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE BID – CIF 2

GREENWICH AND WOOLWICH FOOT TUNNELS – LONDON BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

I would be grateful for your responses to the following Transport policy questions, which relate to your CIF2 bid, Greenwich and Woolwich foot tunnels. The questions are split into Policy and Economics.

Policy Comments

1. Further details of potential impact of proposed scheme on new housing development. How will tunnels be utilized to ensure long-term environmental and social sustainability of the surrounding area? For example, are developers expected to consider the promotion of the tunnels in their business strategy and development proposals?
2. CIF 2 bids seek to provide funding for projects completed by March 2011. You explained that it was possible to bring forward your completion date. Please confirm whether this is a possibility. Are there any risks associated with this?
3. Could you provide further details of the proposed funding and management of the new CCTV monitoring for the scheme?
4. Confirmation of written approval from GOL for proposed works i.e. listed building consent.
5. CIF to provide full funding, however you are seeking funding via Section 106. Pls confirm details of funding including total sought and what this will be spent on.
6. Confirmation of tri-lateral agreement for works, LB Greenwich as project leaders and apportionment of risks between parties.
7. Confirmation that proposals meet DDA requirements.
8. You provide 2 options for operating costs – do minimum and proposed development. Do minimum suggests no cyclical maintenance – need to show existing cyclical plans. For example, you suggest a number of options for the refurbishments (pg 19). These options also need to be costed.
9. We need to compare like for like costs for the options provided. For example confirmation of cyclical maintenance over life of scheme – i.e. 60

years or confirmation of benefits of proposed options for 13 years. Also, we need to see a comparison of savings over 13 yrs when “do nothing” would see operating costs of £8.7m. And what would be the operating cost comparison over 13 years using proposed scheme.

10. Ideally do minimum should include general lift maintenance programme. Please provide these details
11. Would welcome proposals for annual surveys and monitoring to ensure scheme aligns with proposed delivery objective. Also would need to see proposed contingency plan in the event the project under achieves or fails to meet overall expectations.
12. We will need to see further details/confirmation that the scheme will meet required fire safety regulations and emergency lighting requirements.
13. We will need to see a robust risk assessment including plans to mitigate against costs and time.
14. Please provide details of resource commitment and maintenance plans for life of scheme.

Economics

1. It is not clear whether the scheme costs (which appear to have changed Slightly since the feasibility study) are expressed in outturn prices, whether they include allowance for risk / contingency (which they should), optimism bias allowance (which they should not). It would be helpful to have:
 - a) a spreadsheet (broken down by year of expected spend) starting with the cost base (egg such as Q1 2008), added risk / contingency, inflation assumptions to outturn costs
 - b) a comparable spreadsheet which takes the outturn costs and shows how these convert to the pvc figure for the bcr calculation, incorporating any real inflation assumptions (i.e. construction costs ahead of general inflation) deflation and discounting to 2002, conversion to market prices and addition of OB allowance.
2. It would be helpful to have a brief explanation of capex in the do minimum for 2014 and 2024.
3. It would be helpful to have a copy of the benefit calculation spreadsheet to test some of the assumptions as sensitivities.
4. With regard to the above we have a couple of observations on which we would welcome comments.
5. Using 34p per km for street lighting looks high. Should this be considered

applicable to the difference between having or not having street lighting, whereas here it is a difference of quality?

6. The lift availability benefit (29.1p 2002 prices) looks high if it originally related to a study where the difference was with / without lift. What is being provided here is, up to 2024, a better lift and more certainty it will work? This level of benefits seems more appropriate for the period after 2024 when lift is assumed to shut. Beyond that point the comparison should be the difference in generalised cost of having a tunnel (with the upgraded quality), and next best alternative routes or other choices?