

## THAMES GATEWAY BRIDGE – PUBLIC INQUIRY

### INSPECTOR'S QUESTIONS: 20 OCTOBER 2005

INQ/15

#### 1 Assessment of Economic Benefits

- 1.1 On Day 25 the Assistant Inspector asked: "What I am eager to understand is how the approximately £2.4 billion net transport economic benefit of the scheme as presented in your evidence is made up and if it relies on the reassignment of trips or new, or different trips being made, how that has been assessed in a way which is consistent with Government guidance?"
- 1.2 In reply, TfL presented documents TfL/168 and TfL/168A.
- 1.3 TfL/168 indicates, among other things, that the modelling considers re-distributed trips as being those which are redistributed as a result of travel time changes and that benefits arise where travel time is reduced (paras 7, 8 and 9). The maximum additional benefit would be a function of time saving. This reflects Figure 3 of TfL/168a.
- 1.4 TfL/168 makes no mention of re-distributed trips where the reason for the re-distribution is not primarily travel time saving. Yet it is part of TfL's case that the scheme would facilitate cross-river trips to new employment opportunities: some people would re-distribute their trips so that instead of travelling wholly on one side of the river, to a less worthwhile destination, they would cross the river via the scheme to a better job, or shop, or school, or other facility. In deciding whether to use the scheme, these individuals would perhaps base their travel decision on the overall personal economic equation:

Total personal benefit = Increased salary (or other personal  
benefit) *plus* travel time saving *minus* toll

If this were so, it is not yet clear to the Inspector that any time saving associated with the Scheme would be the prime reason for re-distributing trips. Rather, the personal benefit could be other than suggested by TfL/168; and the estimated traffic flows associated with the scheme may differ from those presented to the inquiry. Perhaps they would be larger.

- 1.5 Questions:
- a) TfL's comments are invited.
  - b) How were the numbers of cross-river trips on the TGB identified? Please provide the analysis.
- 1.6 TfL/168 provides no breakdown of how the present value of the scheme is made up. The net value of the scheme includes the sum

of benefits to various users, some of which Mr Smith identifies at the following references in his proof of evidence:

- a) Those who would divert from other river crossings (9.1.3)
- b) Those who would adapt their travel patterns by changing the time, or mode, of travel (9.1.3)
- c) Those who would adapt their travel patterns by changing one or both trip ends (9.1.3)
- d) Those who would newly make cross-river trips as a result of the scheme (9.1.4)
- e) Those who would save time on trips that do not (and would not) cross the river (9.1.6)
- f) Those who would save time while continuing to use the Blackwall Tunnel (9.5.13)
- g) Those who would save time while continuing to use the Dartford Crossing (9.5.13)
- h) Perhaps there are other groups of users not identified here who would experience a transport economic benefit or disadvantage as a result of the scheme.

#### 1.7 Questions:

- a) How much, in £ net present value, of the reported benefits from the scheme would accrue to (i) public transport users and (ii) other travellers in group a) identified above? And in each of the other groups?
- b) If item h) above is material, what should it include?
- c) How should the information presented in response to a) and b) above be combined to achieve reconciliation with the total net present value of the scheme?

## **2 The "Package"**

2.1 It is part of TfL's case that the scheme is part of a wider package of transport measures. The Mayor's Transport Strategy (D630) identifies (at 3.37, for example) the following schemes: Crossrail, a rail crossing at Woolwich, a multi-modal crossing at Thamesmead and a third road crossing with public transport priority at Blackwall.

2.2 If the scheme is to be considered in that light then the Inspector should understand how the combined effect of the whole package would differ materially in any respect from the effect of the scheme viewed in isolation.

2.3 Questions: Particularly, the Inspector asks:

- a) Whether the "package" would result in higher traffic flows at any location than would the scheme alone, and what the environmental, congestion and other effects of such increases would be, taking into account any proposed mitigation.
- b) Would the implementation of the whole "package" materially affect the scheme economics of the TGB? If so, what would be the effect?
- c) That TfL summarise their view of the other effects that the package would have beyond those associated with the scheme alone.