

Transport Committee – 9 February 2016**Transcript of Agenda Item 6
Rail Infrastructure in London (National Infrastructure Commission)**

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): We are talking about rail infrastructure. Can I welcome back our old friend and colleague, Lord Andrew Adonis, who has been kind enough to come to this Committee on a number of occasions? We last saw him talking about Crossrail 2, for which this Committee gave its warm support and gratitude for the work that he has done to help to kick-start that and get it moving again. Welcome, Andrew. Can we call you 'Andrew'?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): You can. Thank you, Chair, and thank you very much for your submission to the National Infrastructure Commission as well.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Thank you for coming along today. It would be helpful to us if you could just talk us in, Andrew, by giving us an overview of the role of the National Infrastructure Commission and what you are doing there at the moment.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): The National Infrastructure Commission was set up at the end of last year. Its job is to advise the Government and Parliament on national infrastructure priorities through the National Infrastructure Assessment, which will be conducted once per Parliament and will horizon-scan the scenario options and so on for the main economic infrastructure in the country – transport, water, energy and so on – and also to look specifically at issues referred to it by the Chancellor.

The next phase of major transport infrastructure investment in London was specifically referred to us with reference to proposals for Crossrail 2. We have been examining that in the last three months and will be making a report to the Chancellor just before the Budget. I am very grateful for your submission in that regard. We are also looking at how this fits in with other transport investments that are planned for the capital in the context, of course, of massively increasing demand, growth and population growth, and seeking to identify – with, I hope, the co-operation and collaboration of the Greater London Authority (GLA) – a way forward for investment that looks at not just the next few years but what the capital needs and the country needs, which is an investment strategy for the next 20 to 25 years.

The underlying philosophy of the Commission is that we have been very bad at planning infrastructure over a generation. We are delighted that Crossrail is in the final stages of being constructed, but it was 1974 that Crossrail started its life. I spoke at the Federation of Small Businesses last week and pointed out to them that it was their 42nd anniversary; it was the year that Crossrail 2 started. 1974 is also significant in infrastructure terms because it is the year that the Channel Tunnel was cancelled and the year that the proposed third London airport was abandoned. It was not a great year for thinking in the medium and long term about infrastructure planning. It is a standing warning of what happens if we do not get a long-term plan in place. That is not to say, of course, that that plan does not change over time, but I think almost everybody would agree that Crossrail being delivered 10 or 15 years ago would have been preferable in terms of the ability of London to meet congestion and growth challenges and, indeed, the demand for new housing. It would be much better if it had happened 10 or 15 years ago than now. The extra cost that has been incurred by it being reincarnated for the third time has not been beneficial either to the capital or to the country.

I am a professional optimist. My hope is that the National Infrastructure Commission may enable us to take a more constructive and consistent long-term approach that spans not just governments, which is important, but also central and local government and the emerging strand of regional government that we are seeing in England with the development of the city regions where of course London has been a pathfinder with the mayoralty and the GLA.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Is it your expectation that the National Infrastructure Commission is going to be a permanent institution, then?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): How permanent any state institution is in our system of government is hard to predict. Things come and go. However, the plan is that it will be set up on a statutory basis and so that will give it, I hope, some longevity.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): How big is this body going to be? How many staff do you see it having?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): There will be 25 to 30 permanent staff and so quite small, rather like the Office of Budget Responsibility, but of course it will be able to draw on other staff, consultants and secondees for particular projects, which is what we are doing in the case of the current project we are doing on London.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Do you think it will have any role in delivery as well as planning in actually ensuring delivery?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): No. The role of the Infrastructure Commission, which is why it can be kept so small, is to advise on infrastructure priorities and plans. Delivery is then a matter for the delivery authorities and within the Treasury for a new infrastructure and major projects authority, which advises on delivery.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Presumably, you would be looking at the vexed topic of co-ordination and things having to happen in the right order when there is a knock-on impact?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Yes. We need to have a view when we make recommendations on how things will be delivered and, in the case of Crossrail 2, learning the lessons from other big London projects – the Olympics, Thameslink, Crossrail – in how you set up a delivery authority that can execute effectively. The Olympic Delivery Authority and the Crossrail company are clearly, in terms of their effectiveness, good models to look at in terms of how you turn a plan into a delivery vehicle. We have been studying those closely.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): How do you define what a national piece of infrastructure is? When is it nationally significant? Crossrail 2 is terrifically important to us. Why do you think that that is a piece of national infrastructure? Does it mean that everything in London is going to end up as a piece of national infrastructure?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Let us be clear. To some extent, this is in the eye of the beholder and London is a special case because of course its major projects are so large and have connectivity with the rest of the country.

There are two aspects of Crossrail that give it a particular national – or, I should say, greater than London – significance. The first is its interaction with the major London rail termini, which is a significant national issue, and how we are going to cater for future demand at the London termini and dispersal from them.

The second aspect is that Crossrail 2 goes well beyond the Greater London boundaries, particularly in the northeast where the proposal is that it will link up with the suburban and regional lines going northeast. The proposed suburban services in the southwest to come into Crossrail 2 also go outside the Greater London boundary. Like the original Crossrail 1, it is all three at the same time: it is clearly a London project, it is a regional project and it also has national significance.

I accept that there is a huge London interest in this, reflected in the fact – which is hugely important as we have been assessing Crossrail 2 – that the proposal of the Mayor is that London should pay a substantial part of the cost of Crossrail 2, which is a reasonable approach given that it will gain a substantial part of the benefits. Also, pragmatically, London being prepared to pay a substantial part of the costs, in the same way as it has done for Crossrail, makes it much more likely that it will happen while we are all alive rather than being entirely dependent on the Treasury over a long period of time, which makes it far harder to afford.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): A last leading question from me; this is a personal bugbear. We all love something new and we all need new infrastructure, but it has become obvious that we are not as a nation paying enough attention to maintaining, expanding or upgrading existing infrastructure. That has posed fundamental problems. Now that we are getting better at national infrastructure planning, co-ordination and development, how are we going to get better at making sure that we pursue the upgrade, maintenance and improvement of existing infrastructure at the same time?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Crucial to the case for Crossrail 2 is the fact that the north-south Tube lines are both becoming congested – in some cases are congested – and have also been or are in the process of being significantly upgraded: the Victoria line now due to run at 36 trains an hour; the Northern line with automatic train operation now running at a transformed capacity to only a few years ago; the proposals for the Piccadilly line upgrade.

One of the issues that we have been examining is the credibility of the Transport for London (TfL) argument that it is just not possible to squeeze, over and above the upgrades that are taking place at the moment, the new Tube trains and so on, much more capacity out of the existing lines. I certainly do not see these as either/or. London needs to be both upgrading its infrastructure and providing new infrastructure. In the case of the Tube, which is the major relief that Crossrail 2 provides, there has been and there is a significant programme of ongoing modernisation and upgrading. Could it have started sooner? Of course, all of these things could have started sooner, but it is being factored into our analysis and it is important to see the two together. Crossrail 2 emphatically would not be a substitute for continued upgrading and improvement in the Tube. It needs to run alongside it, as does the existing Crossrail scheme. That approach needs to be taken in other infrastructure areas in London, too.

I have to say that in London a good part of the Tube now is more than 100 years old. It is amazing the extra capacity that is being achieved by upgrading. Without that, it would not be possible to make the case for major new interventions.

When it comes, though, to Network Rail – and you have Sir Peter Hendy [CBE, Chair, Network Rail] speaking after me – Network Rail is very alive to the potential for increasing capacity on the heavy rail lines, particularly the suburban heavy rail lines serving London. The changes announced by the Government or proposed by the Government in the last few weeks – for enabling the Overground to expand and TfL to become essentially the

commissioning and managing authority for the more suburban services with a joint oversight arrangement for dealing with the longer distance services – are a very constructive step forward.

Looking at the capacity of London's metro system at large, the rail and Tube system, the area where the existing infrastructure could do most to increase capacity is on the south London suburban lines, which have not been modernised to anything like the degree that the Tube has been. If the example of the Overground in the last 10 years could be replicated across the commuter lines coming into the south London termini, it would transform the capacity and quality of service being offered to London commuters, who at the moment in many cases are offered a very substandard service on those suburban lines.

These need to go together. I certainly do not see Crossrail 2, which, as I said, we are examining the case for at the moment, as a substitute for the continued upgrading of the Tube and a radical approach to upgrading the suburban rail services. It needs to go alongside them.

Looking at really critical infrastructure priorities facing London, if I had to say what I think is the most significant one over the next 15 years, I would probably highlight the capacity to transform capacity and quality of service on the suburban heavy rail lines as the single most important and cost-effective improvement that could be made.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): I think the Committee would give three hearty cheers to that. They are absolutely the points that we have been making. I was going to move to Caroline [Pidgeon MBE AM] but I know Steve O'Connell wants to talk about Windmill Junction.

Steve O'Connell AM: Apologies for lateness. It is partly linked to the dreadful state of the service in the suburban south London lines. It is pleasing to hear that reflection and we will all --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): We will talk about it some more with Sir Peter [Hendy CBE].

Steve O'Connell AM: I know you will, but I just wanted to comment on that. Also, it is just linked to – and I know we will pick this up later – your point around funding for Crossrail 2. There is a whole swathe of south Londoners who have difficulty understanding a premium precept on council tax for Crossrail 1 when it was quite a challenge for many of us to sell the benefits of Crossrail 1 in their council tax bills, bearing in mind that they are suffering this deficiency across south London. It will be an interesting narrative again when we move forward about London being expected to pay substantially for Crossrail 2, which was your comment earlier and expectation. It is important that we do see a surge of enthusiasm for south suburban services because those great many thousands of south Londoners who have contributed towards Crossrail 1 see a contribution to Crossrail 2 coming their way, arguably, do not necessarily see the benefit to them and their families for Crossrail 1 and Crossrail 2 – a debate altogether – and perhaps we could get an added enthusiasm for some work around improving south suburban. That would be an important balance.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): You need to see three things going on at the same time, do you not? The first is the continued upgrading of the Tube. The subsurface lines are being done at the moment. The Piccadilly line is a high priority and in due course the Central line, too.

On the suburban services, there is, as I said, a transformation potential, looking at what has happened to the Overground which is bursting at the seams and, indeed, is creating part of the pressure on the Tube that needs to be dealt with by Crossrail 2. Highbury & Islington station almost seizes up because of the interchange with the Overground and so that is important. Then there is the case for a completely new piece of infrastructure that runs alongside the other two.

Steve O'Connell AM: Many would not use the Underground. Many of my residents, obviously, will not touch the Underground. I will leave it there.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): I hate to curb your enthusiasm because I share it, but we have some specific questions --

Steve O'Connell AM: No, I have seen them. I was really grumpy coming in off the train, you see!

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): -- on those things scheduled, Steve, but we are absolutely with you. We are in the same space.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you very much. It was great to hear what you were saying about infrastructure, but I want to understand how the National Infrastructure Commission is going to work and how it is going to speed up decisions about upgrading infrastructure. You talked about 1974 when all these plans were cancelled and that was when Crossrail first came up, but how is your body going to speed up how we upgrade infrastructure and invest in infrastructure?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): In the specific case of London, we will be making recommendations to the Chancellor on the next big London investments, looking particularly, as I said, at the case for Crossrail 2. If you look at it in terms of the timeline for developing the project, we will be giving this advice comparatively early in the process. The current Crossrail 2 scheme is only about three years old.

The fact that central Government is taking a very keen and in-depth interest in it and that the Government has asked this new Commission to give it specific advice on the case for Crossrail 2 could potentially speed up the project substantially. It depends. I cannot say at the moment what our advice will be. However, in the past, it has often taken - let us be diplomatic - decades for central Government to engage with proposals for major new infrastructure. I cannot make any predictions about the future. Maybe we will still be in 30 years' time discussing Crossrail 2. However, the fact that the Commission has been given this remit is a serious attempt at joining up London government and central Government in terms of planning for the next 25 years.

Also, it is very important to understand the remit that we have been given. It is to examine the case that has been made by the Mayor and TfL and it is not to seek to develop a new project from scratch, whereas in the past - again, I will put this diplomatically - central Government has often thought that it knows better than local government. Of course, for a large part of the last generation, there was not a London government. "What should be done?" You will remember the famous Tube contracts. I do not think that is a great starting point. What we need is much closer and effective collaboration between, in the case of the capital, London government and central Government. Nationally, I hope, with the development of new city regions, we will see this approach much more widely.

A very significant development in policy in the last year is the Chancellor's statement that other city regions besides London will be able to raise their own funds specifically for infrastructure projects. London is ahead of the game, of course. The Supplementary Business Rate was an absolutely crucial part of the Crossrail funding package. To be blunt, power tends to follow money and the fact that London has significant responsibility for raising and spending its own funds when it comes to infrastructure gives it a really important seat at the table when it comes to planning. I do not know if I could say with any degree of confidence that Crossrail would have survived the last 10 years with a change of national Government and a change of Mayor and huge pressure on public finances, particularly capital spending, if it were not for the fact that London was itself meeting a substantial part of the cost. The fact that you have the Supplementary Business Rate there, which

of course London businesses are paying for large parts, something like £4 billion out of the £16 billion cost, plus direct contributions being made both by London taxpayers and by major London businesses, was crucial to the continuation of Crossrail. As I look at Crossrail 2, I think it is going to be important for the next major projects as well.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): You have taken on this significant role and presumably you spoke to Ministers, the Chancellor and so on and you have confidence that they will listen and that it is genuine. So many things get set up and they come out with these wonderful reports and then they just sit on a shelf. You do not want to be, with your reputation, chairing something like that and so presumably you had some assurance that they are going to take seriously what you are going to recommend and put forward?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I have certainly had the assurance that they will take me seriously. I cannot say what will happen. The problem with commissions like mine is that they do not have control over what happens after they have recommended. It is a problem, but it is right and proper in a democracy that it should be the elected Government that takes the decisions. However, in this case, there are two elected governments. There is the elected government of London and there is the elected Government nationally. What I am very much hoping is that I may be in a position to promote consensus between the two. That is the most likely way that you will see a major project proceeding.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): It has to happen.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I would have thought that your decision-making needs to be open and transparent.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Will your meetings be in public? Is it very much in that spirit the work that you are doing?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): We have not had meetings of the Commission in public. There have been only four meetings so far. It is an interesting question. I do not know that I am particularly opposed to it, but it is an interesting question to look at. We have had a call for evidence and I have been actively engaged with stakeholders, as have my fellow commissioners. Of course, a key part in making the process transparent is that our reports will be published because in the past other governments have not done analysis of projects before making decisions; obviously, it has, but they have tended not to be published and, therefore, it has never been quite clear what has been the rationale on which decisions for and against projects have been made. Our report will be published and will set out the evidence and reasons.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Perhaps you might consider whether you want to hold some of your meetings in public and that openness because it is really important, particularly when you are developing your thinking on these large projects.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I am very interested in that suggestion.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I will cover the point I had about bureaucracy. Are you just going to add another layer of bureaucracy? That is one fear, is it not?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Yes, it is a fear. The test will be whether we improve the quality and speed of decision-taking and also the ability to forge consensus. Consensus, in my

experience, does not come just from saying that it would be nice if people tried to agree because, in the political world, there is often a sharp clash of policies and priorities. It is seeking to bring a strong evidence base to bear in support of major infrastructure projects. The expectation is that applying such an evidence base will make it easier to forge agreements on projects rather than at the moment what tends to happen, which is unwillingness often on the part of decision-takers to engage with the evidence because of a desire to put off decisions for as long as they can possibly be put off.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I am sure that we will come to one of those at the end of our questioning with you. High Speed 2 you were very involved in and that is something that had cross-party support.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Would that have benefited from a commission like yours? It seems to me that we had trouble engaging with High Speed 2 (HS2) when we ended up coming out overall in favour with submissions but --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): They would not attend the Committee.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): -- they would not attend our Committee to even sell the project. Is there something in terms of how projects are set up that you might recommend? Also, potentially, would you consider looking at something like HS2 to see how it could be improved and what lessons can be learned? It seems to me that a project that has so much support overall is just spending tons of money, upsetting lots of people and not listening. Crossrail, although equally challenging in some bits, has managed to listen very well to communities, to respond and to listen and work with politicians. It just seems to me that that is the sort of massive infrastructure project that feels like to me like it is going terribly wrong because they are not engaging properly.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I am on the board of HS2 --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I did not know that. Sorry.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): -- and I am very surprised that HS2 was not prepared to come before the Committee. I would have thought that it would be, to be blunt, a no-brainer.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, it was.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): It should have done so. If you were to extend a further invitation, I would use my best offices to see that HS2 does attend.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): That might be something for the next term to look at, yes.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): In terms of the process for HS2, it does bear some resemblance to the Commission. When I became Transport Secretary and we were looking at the case for high-speed rail linking up the major cities and conurbations in England, what I did was to set up the HS2 company, whose job was to give advice to the Government at arm's length. It was only later that it became a delivery vehicle. Its first job was to advise on the case for high-speed rail between London and Birmingham in the first instance and, if it was persuaded that there was a case for it, then to make recommendations in terms of routes and stations. As I said, that was set up as an arm's length body.

Also, crucially - because this was in 2008/09 when, clearly, we were in the run-up to an election - I made it completely open to the then opposition party, the Conservatives, and encouraged the HS2 team in the new company to engage directly with the Opposition as well in order to promote consensus. It did have that effect. Crucially important to the survival of Crossrail 2 was that the Opposition had felt engaged in the process that led to its development. If this had all been done just by some civil servants inside the Department for Transport (DfT), it would have had much less chance of surviving the change of Government.

The thing about infrastructure projects, as I know from long experience now, is that it is one thing to will the end but it is another thing to will the means. Everybody in principle wants better transport and they want to be able to get between places more easily, but there is a world of difference between thinking that it would be great if we had better rail services between London, Birmingham and Manchester and being prepared to agree to a railway line that goes right through the Chilterns. These are the category differences. It is one thing to think that it would be a great idea to deal with the massive congestion on the Northern, Piccadilly and Victoria lines, but another to actually support a proposal for a new line with a tunnel going all the way from Wimbledon to Tottenham Hale. Getting from the grand aspiration to consensus on specific projects and being able to iterate and change is a big and difficult job.

Although I am sure it could have been more open and, as I said, I am very sorry that it has not appeared before your Committee, HS2 did do a good job of promoting consensus between the parties. To put this in perspective, the command paper that set out the plan for HS2, which has remained broadly intact - there has been more mitigation, extensions of tunnels and things of that kind, but the route, stations and so on have remained broadly intact - was published in March 2010. We are now nearly six years on and the legislation for HS2 is largely enacted. It is just about to complete its passage through the House of Commons and will take a few months to go through the House of Lords. It will be law, assuming nothing goes wrong now, by the end of the year. This is the largest infrastructure project in Europe: 330 miles worth of railway line and the core of it being London to Birmingham, which will have been agreed by Parliament by the end of the year with funding allocated and so on. When people say that we cannot do big infrastructure in this country, that is about as fast as it is possible to move. The Chinese can do a bit faster --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, it is slightly different.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): -- because they do not have quite the same planning constraints, but there is no country in Europe that has developed a high-speed network of the scale that we are building and has planned it and built it out any faster than we are doing with HS2. Crossrail 2, from the point at which a decision was taken to proceed with it last time, as moved remarkably swiftly, too.

Therefore, we can have confidence that where we can promote consensus and good quality planning we can move rapidly. Where the planning is not good and there is no consensus, then of course things get stuck.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): That was helpful. We would have found it very helpful on HS2 to have that dialogue because, yes, in principle, we supported it, but there were lots of issues that needed resolve and iteration. To want to talk about some of these problems in public is a very necessary part of the process. It was a shame that we could not get them to do that --

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I will certainly use my good offices to --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): -- because we were not intending to attack the project. We were intending to discuss the wrinkles and that was a shame.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): The HS2 story is very far from finished and so I am sure that there will be opportunities and I hope an opportunity soon.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Yes. We will need to come back to it and it will probably be in the next term.

Darren Johnson AM: Andrew, do you agree with the Mayor and TfL's published priorities in the Infrastructure Plan on the main infrastructure needs for London's transport network?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I would be jumping the gun if I gave a view on that since we are reporting shortly on the major infrastructure priorities in relation to Crossrail 2. The diplomatic answer for me to say is that I am engaging with it at the moment. I cannot at the moment say whether I agree with it.

Darren Johnson AM: OK, but will you be advising the Government on the investment needs for an enhanced national rail network in south London as part of that response?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Yes.

Darren Johnson AM: Good. What difference do you think the devolution of suburban franchises will make to the development of London's national rail infrastructure?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I think it has the potential to make a transformational difference for two reasons: firstly because you could have a public authority whose first priority is the London suburban services and that has not been the case in the past --

Darren Johnson AM: You clearly welcome the joint announcement between the Government and TfL?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Yes, I very strongly welcome it. In the past, of course, both British Rail going back a generation and also the privatised rail companies have seen the suburban services as part and parcel and often the poor relation of long distance services. Sir Peter Hendy CBE, who is coming after me, has put it in choicer terms than that, but they have not been the key priority.

The story of the North London Line is almost the textbook case. It was very nearly closed by Beeching [Baron Beeching, former Chairman, British Railways] and largely neglected. It was a Cinderella service under British Rail and then the privatised rail companies. However, once it became a key priority of TfL, the service was transformed.

Darren Johnson AM: It was probably one of the most dramatic rail transformations we have seen of an existing line.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): It is, although if you look at what has happened on the Tube it is not bad over the last 10 years. If you compare the Northern line now with 10 years ago that is a transformation, too. The second issue, which is still a big challenge, is how you get the investments in. If you look at the Overground, it was partly a question of management and prioritisation, but it was also a question of really significant investments. Of course, that is all for the future.

Darren Johnson AM: We are already seeing some of those issues that TfL is grappling with in the Anglia franchise that it took over recently where there is not the same amount of investment funding available as in the first tranche of the Overground. That is going to be a real challenge.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Yes. There needs to be an investment strategy as well as a management strategy.

Darren Johnson AM: We noticed over time when the Committee first began looking at this that there was a lot of sensitivity outside of London, particularly from Kent, about the impact that it would have on wider services beyond Greater London. We noticed when we came back to this that the mood had changed quite significantly and that there was far more of a consensus. However, there are clearly still tensions, are there not, between managing a wider national rail infrastructure and delivering a very effective commuter rail service for Greater London?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): There appears to have been an outbreak of peace and goodwill, which I am delighted to see. The arrangements that the Government has suggested for consultation and joint planning for services that go beyond Greater London, I hope, will prove robust. It is very much in the interests of longer distance commuters that the whole network is well managed and optimised and there need not be a conflict between the two.

Darren Johnson AM: TfL did give some very clear assurances about service levels beyond Greater London that it would not substantially reduce them.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Yes, absolutely. Of course, the DfT is still very much there and that also is the guardian of the wider interest.

Darren Johnson AM: I know that you do not want to comment in any detail on TfL's infrastructure plan, but in terms of orbital versus radial links in London, do you take a view on that? Do you believe that London needs better orbital transport links to support development outside London and in outer London or is it simply a need for, given London's population is growing, getting as many people into the centre as quickly and as efficiently as possible?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): It needs both, of course. It needs both better radial and better orbital services. Part of the success of the Overground is the orbital service. Of course, the two are complementary. The orbital services then feed into the radial services and so the Overground through its orbital routes has had the effect of radically --

Darren Johnson AM: Yes, people can adjust their travel patterns and work opportunities change and so on.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Places like Hackney, which have had terrible rail connectivity with the centre in the past, thanks to the Overground now have it. It has helped on both fronts.

However, never forget buses. The bus network is far more significant than the rail network in terms of passengers carried in outer London and has a crucial part to play there, too, in providing both orbital and radial services.

Darren Johnson AM: When you are doing your conclusions and your report on those, you will be looking for a balancing in terms of orbital and radial in London?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): We need to see an improvement in both, yes, although with the Crossrail 2 plan itself its impact will be mostly radial. It is mostly connecting the suburbs with the centre. Of course, there is a big central line as well, but quite a few of the suburban services – which, as I said, can be radically improved – are orbital.

Darren Johnson AM: OK. Thank you.

Tom Copley AM: I am moving on to Crossrail 2. Can you tell us how strong the evidence is in support of Crossrail 2?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): That is precisely what we are testing at the moment and so I will give you an overview of that in a few weeks' time.

The case that TfL makes in respect of congestion and the need for significant additional housing supported by transport infrastructure is a case – if I can put this without prejudging it – with which we are actively engaging. Clearly, anyone who uses London transport at the moment is well aware of the huge pressure on the existing network. The challenge facing London in terms of housing supply is huge with, as you know better than anyone, barely half the number of new homes being built each year that are needed. Planning the next generation of transport infrastructure with a particular view to promoting major housing developments and not just housing but new communities, which is at the heart of the Crossrail 2 scheme, is a hugely important priority for London.

Tom Copley AM: Crossrail 2 will be important in terms of unlocking and making sites for housing more viable?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): That is a very significant part of the case that is being made by TfL and the Mayor with which we are engaging, which is very different from the last Crossrail scheme.

Tom Copley AM: Excellent.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Although it in fact has had a major impact on development, it was seen largely as a transport scheme, not as a regeneration scheme.

Tom Copley AM: Is there a problem here with the way the Treasury looks at the value of schemes? Whereas TfL will take into account the benefits of regeneration, housing and things like that, with the way the Treasury looks at these schemes, am I right in saying that it does not take those things into account?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): It does in that it makes a decision and a judgement in the round on these major infrastructure projects. It is a criticism not so much of the Treasury as of conventional transport analysis that looks in a fairly narrow way at transport gains and developments, focusing in particular on journey time saved by existing passengers, presupposing that there is not a major increase in demand being the major underlying philosophy. When you are dealing with junction improvements and smaller-scale infrastructure, that may be a valid way of assessing the viability of projects. When you are dealing with major infrastructure – if I can put it diplomatically – it is not a complete way of looking at the evidence. The wider regeneration and development potential of these projects is hugely important.

Tom Copley AM: We have all, I think, received an email today about a petition with 10,000 signatures against there being a station at Chelsea King's Road and there is a big campaign led by Felicity Kendal [actor] against this. Given Crossrail 2 is dubbed the 'Chelsea-Hackney line', do you think it will be rather odd if there were not a station in Chelsea?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Do you mind if I pass on that one?

Tom Copley AM: I thought you might say that.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I would simply note that there are differing views within Chelsea.

Murad Qureshi AM(?): In the borough, yes.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I have noticed that the [Royal Borough of] Kensington and Chelsea is in favour of a station being there and so --

Tom Copley AM: As are the museums and a lot of other --

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): There is clearly a diversity of views in Chelsea on this issue and I am happy to let that show continue.

Tom Copley AM: We have probably covered that, but are there any gaps in the evidence base for Crossrail 2?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): We are engaging with TfL at the moment, as I said. Of direct relevance to you and of course the wider Committee is the issue of housing. A critical part of the case for Crossrail 2 is the argument being made by TfL and the Mayor that this will unlock up to 200,000 additional homes, not least because of the northeastern stretch going through the Lee Valley, which is an area ripe for development and regeneration. It is not being conceived and nor are we considering it as just a conventional transport scheme but also as a scheme having the potential for major regeneration, focused in particular on housing supply. As I said, that is absolutely central to the whole plan. The evidence supporting that we are looking at closely.

Tom Copley AM: I do not want to go too much into the financing because that is the next question but just because you have mentioned a point about the wider benefits, housing and things like that, do you think we need to be looking at more creative ways that we can perhaps claw back some of the increase in value that is going to arise from that because of the public investment that has gone into Crossrail 2? We had the mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), obviously, and we have had the Business Rate Supplement. Do we need to be looking creatively at things like that?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): There are two ways of looking at this. There is the issue of covering the cost and these schemes have to be paid for and the question of what is the balance between the funds that the Mayor puts up or has to borrow and central Government needs to be looked at. There are funding sources similar to those for the Crossrail scheme which need to be looked at in respect of Crossrail 2 as well. To be fair to the Mayor, he has looked at them and has said that his intention would be that at least half the cost of Crossrail 2 would be met by London sources.

When it comes to the payback, though, the critical issue is whether there is significant growth and value coming out of these schemes. The evidence from Crossrail is of a massive increase in property and land values

associated with Crossrail and, once Crossrail is open but we are already starting to see it in advance, a big increase in employment associated with it, too. Of course, the Treasury yields a huge return from that, although we do not have land value taxation. With stamp duty now going up to 12% and properties changing hands on average once a decade, the Treasury is making a very big return from the increase in property values associated with Crossrail.

Tom Copley AM: That is true.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Assuming that employment in London continues to grow and part of that growth is because of Crossrail and it is not simply because – part of the Treasury concern – you will also be relocating jobs, there is good evidence that Crossrail is actually creating jobs by making it much easier to establish and staff businesses in central London. However, that again, with the taxes associated with employment, is a big gain to the Treasury. Therefore, Crossrail will turn out to be a huge money-spinner for the Treasury, particularly in terms of stamp duty. Part of the argument that the Mayor is making on Crossrail 2 is that the same could be true there, too. That is an argument that we are looking at.

Tom Copley AM: You are making the case that we all want to see, which is the devolution of property taxes. Can I ask finally if you can give us an update on the timeline for the Government to make a decision on Crossrail 2?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): We will be reporting at or before the Budget. I cannot say when the Government will take a further decision, but it has of course already provided some development funding for Crossrail 2.

Tom Copley AM: Which Budget, sorry? The next Budget?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): The coming Budget.

Tom Copley AM: The coming Budget this year?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Yes.

Tom Copley AM: When is that going to be?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): It is mid-March and so we are reporting quite soon. I cannot say, of course, when the Government will take a firm position. However, for Crossrail 2 there is already development funding there that the Government has provided and TfL has put significant funds there, too. The question is not about the development of the project that is taking place at the moment. It is when a decision is taken to proceed and the critical decision then would be when a decision is taken to apply for planning powers. I cannot say when that will be, but our report will give the Government options in that regard.

Tom Copley AM: Thank you.

Richard Tracey AM: Andrew, you of course were one of the real prime movers about the route of Crossrail 2. You probably were the prime mover along with London First and so on in suggesting the route. You have passed on the Chelsea question, but are you surprised at the amount of argument that is going on in south

London about the route? Particularly, there is Wimbledon, Tooting and Balham, all in my constituency and of some considerable concern.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I am not surprised, no, because there are genuine options there to be considered where we best put the junction with the Northern line, whether we want a junction with suburban services as well, which of course you would get at Balham, and what the impact is in terms of station developments. There are differing views there.

What is striking is that the fundamental concept has proved to be robust. The issue is not whether Crossrail 2 should provide a junction with the Northern line and then go on to Clapham Junction and Wimbledon; it is precisely what the route should be and where the stations should be. I take that as a big vote of confidence in the planning that has been done for Crossrail 2. I am not aware that anybody in south London is saying that it would be a bad idea to have a Crossrail 2 junction with the Northern line; the question is where it should be. I can see the arguments for and against both a Tooting and a Balham station.

Richard Tracey AM: Certainly there is nobody in those particular places who is arguing that it should go somewhere else completely. There are some arguments that some people in Streatham would like to see it moved across there.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Streatham would like it, yes.

Richard Tracey AM: However, the significant problem over Tooting, for example, is a geological fault, the so-called 'Wimbledon Fault', interestingly enough. Crossrail 2 is saying that of course there would be enormous extra costs in putting a station in Tooting, although - and Tooting people very much appreciate this - it would regenerate Tooting, which desperately needs a lot of regeneration. Obviously, you were not aware of the fault when you were first suggesting the route, but it is something that is being asked now for really very extreme costing details and so on to be published.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): The best evidence needs to be assessed. There is an argument about, as you say, geology. There is also an argument, as I said, about where it is best to have the junction with the Northern line and whether it is better to have a junction that also gives you the Overground connection at Balham or to go further south, which makes it easier to deal with congestion. Just as I was reluctant to give a definitive view on King's Road, my view is that it is probably not for my Commission to say precisely where the station should be. It is whether the concept of a line serving this broad alignment and purpose is a good thing.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): I think we understand that. You are operating at a higher level with the strategy.

Richard Tracey AM: I totally understand and obviously Crossrail 2 will have to reach some decisions pretty soon, given the sort of timeline you were just talking about earlier in answer to Tom [Copley AM].

Kemi Badenoch AM: My focus is a little bit more on Wimbledon because I live there.

The main argument about that is how the planned development would completely hollow out all of the businesses that would be there and that it would be almost impossible to regenerate given the length of time it would take to complete the station. Do you have any comments on that? It is not just the tennis but loads of financial services companies have just bought long leases to Wimbledon. If that whole area was knocked

down, it would not just affect residents who complain about noise but also jobs and so on. That is the first part of the question.

The second part is about just how much in the decision-making process residents' or communities' concerns have an impact on how you change your plans.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): There are two different issues here. The first is the line of route and the second is precisely how you then deal with stations and local concerns. As I said, the arguments behind the line of route have proved remarkably robust. There has not been any fundamental questioning of the concept of a line that goes from the southwest to the northeast connecting the suburban services at each end. TfL, I know, and the new Crossrail 2 team there are in serious engagement and listening mode when it comes to how they deal with options and station designs and I know that that includes Wimbledon, too. They need to be because there is a lot of work that needs to be done to see that they balance the effectiveness of the transport project with local concerns. I cannot comment in any detail on Wimbledon except to say that I know that TfL is engaging seriously with the community at Wimbledon on how it could mitigate those concerns.

My understanding is that Wimbledon wants Crossrail 2 very badly because it could provide a transformational service for southwest London including Wimbledon, but of course seeing that this is sustainable in terms of development in and around the station is important.

Kemi Badenoch AM: Just finally, I know you said that you were going to pass on the Chelsea-Hackney line question, but is having a station at Imperial Wharf actually viable?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): There is a station at Imperial Wharf at the moment.

Kemi Badenoch AM: Sorry, I was making a Crossrail station point.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): There are number of sites in Chelsea that are viable. The question is which one the community regards as desirable rather than viable. Viability is a much lower test than desirability. The Crossrail stations are very large. That is part of the issue at Wimbledon, too. Inevitably those who are faced with development close by have concerns and they need to be dealt with. As I said, there are a number of options for a station in Chelsea and they will be looked at. Just as in the case of Wimbledon, there are a number of options for how you develop the station. Wimbledon is a very complex station because, as you know better than anyone, you have the Tube and you have the long-distance lines that have platforms at Wimbledon as well, even the trains that go through, and you have the proposed Crossrail 2 tunnel. How do you put all of that together? There are a number of different ways that that can be done. This is in a very early stage of development at the moment and it is absolutely right that all of the options are tested.

Can I bring up one thing when it comes to the stations? The size of the stations in many areas is an issue because of the impact on local communities and that needs to be worked through. However, in some cases it is an absolutely unalloyed advantage, the principal case being Euston, King's Cross and St Pancras. With Crossrail 2, the proposal there for a single station that encompasses the two will join up those three termini in one Underground station and a set of Underground connections, which will be of huge benefit. Whereas in the case of Wimbledon a big issue that needs to be addressed is how you reconcile development with the local community, in some other places the scale of the stations is a straightforward advantage.

Kemi Badenoch AM: Thank you.

Richard Tracey AM: We wanted to talk to you in a little bit of depth about the funding of the work that you are doing. Where is the money for the major infrastructure projects going to come from in the future? You had £300 million initially in the Transport Development Fund, but that is a fairly small amount. What are the prospects? How are you going to get hold of the funding for your future suggestions?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): It will be, clearly, a partnership. If Crossrail 2 proceeds, it will have to be a partnership between central Government and London government in terms of funding, as has Crossrail 1 been. The £300 million you referred to is a pot that is currently allocated within the DfT purely for development funding. When it comes to the capital funding, of course, that is a whole order larger and that will depend upon an agreement on funding sources between central Government and the Mayor.

Richard Tracey AM: I was not thinking specifically of Crossrail 2 just then. I am thinking of your future work and future suggestions of how you think various infrastructure projects may be delivered. For example, there is the impact of the reductions in the TfL grant coming from the Treasury and the DfT. How is that going to affect future London infrastructure? For example, last week the big idea of some road tunnelling came up, which I imagine is something that you will be looking at to reduce congestion. Where would the funding come from for that sort of thing?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): When it comes to major projects on the scale of Crossrail 2, there needs to be a bespoke funding package. It is not going to come, clearly, from existing budgets. The point about it is that of course the system is dynamic. Crossrail did not depend upon existing budgets but a special agreement was done, unlocking capital funding on the part of the Government but also a long-term commitment of new funds on the part of the Mayor and the GLA, most notably the Supplementary Business Rate. Some special deal would need to be done and I cannot say quite what the components would be but it would need to be done in respect of Crossrail 2, as indeed is proving to be the case with all of these major London projects. The extension of the Northern line to Battersea was part of a one-off and very substantial deal for £1 billion through tax increment funding (TIF). The proposal for the Silvertown Tunnel will be substantially paid for by tolls; that is a one-off package, too. For the Thames Tideway Tunnel, which is proceeding at the moment, again, there is a special one-off funding deal being done on that and water consumers will pay a contribution towards the cost. That is going to continue to be the case for these major projects and inevitably so.

Richard Tracey AM: That is with your approval, all of those various methods?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Yes. If you were simply dependent on existing recurrent funding, you would not be able to do any of these major projects. Also, the extraordinary thing about Crossrail, which would be true of Crossrail 2 as well, is that the London business community is paying a substantial tax for it and is doing so very willingly. Normally there is no bigger controversy, as you are only too well aware as local politicians, than on business rates. However, in fact, the Supplementary Business Rate to pay for Crossrail has proved remarkably uncontentious. The reason is that London business – and of course, let us be frank, some gain more than others from it – can see a direct connection between the tax that they are paying and the big improvement to transport infrastructure that they are getting. There is a lesson there: it is one thing to expect people to pay into a general pot but, when you can make a direct connection between contributions that businesses are paying and a transformation in the quality of infrastructure and service, then that makes it much less contentious. As I said, it is remarkable if you look back at the history of Crossrail how uncontentious the Supplementary Business Rate proved.

Richard Tracey AM: You will obviously be looking in your work with your colleagues at the wider economic benefits, the housing potential, regeneration and so on, I take it?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): That is a crucial part of the assessment.

Richard Tracey AM: Do you envisage a Crossrail 3 at some point? I wonder if you have any ideas on where that might go. You have talked about south London's problems. Any embryonic ideas at this stage?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Let us deal with one scheme at a time.

Richard Tracey AM: Yes, of course.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): However - Sir Peter Hendy CBE [Chair, Network Rail] has arrived on cue - if he does the job which I am sure he will do in transforming those south London rail services with TfL, it could have the effect of providing a Crossrail 3 in south London. Many of those services at the moment are massively underutilised. There are a lot of those routes coming in. You could have Crossrail 3, 4, 5 and 6 from big improvements in those services. It cannot come soon enough.

Richard Tracey AM: All right. Thank you.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): In terms of big tunnels through central London, these happen once a generation. I do not see any prospect of another one after Crossrail 2 in the foreseeable future. If I can just get on one of my hobbyhorses, which is of huge importance to London, where we do need more tunnels and really substantial new infrastructure, though, is in the east Thames to get across the river. Crossrail 2 is important but crucially important for the future of London and also regional transport links, too, is the development of the Silvertown Tunnel and in due course more crossings, which could well be tunnels, in east London. Not only is it important for transport users, but in terms of unlocking more housing it could in due course prove to be as significant as Crossrail 2.

Richard Tracey AM: Good. Thank you very much.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): We have some questions on surface transport and airports.

Murad Qureshi AM: Thank you, Chair. Yes, the old chestnut of the airport expansion, but we are not going to go to that generally. We just want to go into the specifics of the surface transport upgrades. It was interesting that the Airport Commission suggested with Heathrow that the upgrades would be about £5.7 billion whilst TfL suggested it was in the order of £15 billion or £20 billion. Which figures do you believe are nearer to what is required to have the surface transport upgraded in the way that is needed?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): The basis for decisions will be the Davies Commission report because that took evidence from TfL and others on the requirements, but I am not going to pass judgement on precisely what the requirements are in respect of Heathrow in due course because this will be a dynamic situation. However, the job of the Davies Commission was to look at the evidence being put in by all of the parties, including Heathrow Airport itself but also including TfL, and it made its judgements.

Murad Qureshi AM: True, but you had to be struck, though, by the disparity. It is in the order of fourfold. I would have thought that transport people in the sector would be broadly in line. This is a substantial

difference. It is something that the Committee has noted and it is very surprising that the Airport Commission could see it any differently from TfL, for example.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): It does not surprise me that there were differing figures and aspirations out there. That is often the case with these big infrastructure projects. If you look at Crossrail 2 itself, in the early stages of the planning there were very different options tabled for the scheme and they had huge differences in terms of costs. It does not surprise me that there were different schemes and aspiration there, but that part of the job of the Airports Commission was to look at the evidence being supplied and to make its own judgements. That is the basis on which the Government needs to proceed, but of course it has the power to vary those judgements, too, in due course.

Murad Qureshi AM: I understand that you are going to sit where you are. It was interesting, though. One of the issues that has been highlighted recently is Crossrail 1 going into Heathrow. It is there to make a modal shift of about 1% onto public transport. One of the selling arguments was to get people from Canary Wharf into Heathrow very quickly --

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Which it will do.

Murad Qureshi AM: -- which it will do. Heathrow plc is insisting on £40 million annually for the cost of using their tracks going into Heathrow. Where do you stand on that?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): It is not for me to jump on that but there is plenty of commercial negotiation that will take place. When it comes to Heathrow, when the Government makes a decision on what it is going to do with airport capacity in the southeast, it will also need to make decisions in respect of surface access, too. Although there is an element of commercial negotiation, it is the Government that will have to decide on these issues and rightly so because of course there are major public policy issues.

Murad Qureshi AM: I am just surprised personally that there was not a compulsory purchase order (CPO) in the original Crossrail 1 Bill. It is interesting that Heathrow has distributed £2.4 billion in dividends over the last four years and paid only £24 million of corporation tax in the last decade or so, which sets its priorities very clearly and that should be emphasised. Can I go more generally? Are you advising Ministers about upgrading of surface access to airports in the South East?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I have not been asked to advise on that and so it has not been an issue for me. When it comes, as I said, to the decision on expanding capacity, the Davies Commission has made recommendations there and that is for the Government to make decisions upon in due course.

Murad Qureshi AM: You have not been asked about Stansted [Airport] and four-track rather than two-track?

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): No.

Murad Qureshi AM: You have not? OK. You do not envisage that being part of what the Infrastructure Commission --

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): I cannot say what we may be asked to look at in the future. In due course we will have to make the National Infrastructure Assessment and one of the key

issues that we will need to look at in that assessment is the accessibility of London's airports. Therefore, in due course, it will be something that we would look at but it is not going to be in the short term.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Thank you for those answers, Andrew. Just for the record, I will say that I know that airport expansion is very contentious and there are different views on which one, if either, or both to go for or none at all.

Darren Johnson AM: None.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): None; exactly.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): However, the one thing that we very clearly had a consensus on in this Committee was when we did go over the detail of TfL's analysis of what the surface transport impact would be of Heathrow expansion. It is true to say that we felt that its figures and analysis were very credible and very strong and that we observed a deal of double-counting in the Airports Commission's assessment of things. It would double-count the economic impact and then not do it when it was looking at the traffic impact. It seemed to us that you cannot have one without the other. Our sense was that TfL is extremely strong as a modeller and an identifier of potential impacts. I hope that you will look seriously at what TfL has said because we certainly did not feel that there was any truth in the allegation that TfL was behaving in a party political way --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): No, absolutely not.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): -- in relation to that issue. They did a very strong forensic job. It is one to dig into. That is the point.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): You might want to call [Sir] Howard Davies [Chair, Airports Commission] to give evidence.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): We did. We did at the Assembly and, yes, we were a bit disappointed on that aspect, I would say. Thank you very much indeed, Andrew, for coming today. I know that it is early days and there is much that you cannot comment on yet, but that was incredibly helpful and it helps to put the work of the Infrastructure Commission into the national arena for people to understand it. It makes it more accessible, certainly, to Londoners. We wish you well in your work and we greatly appreciate your time today and your desire to engage with elected representatives. Good luck.

Lord Adonis (Chair, National Infrastructure Commission): Thank you, Chair. As I said, we will be reporting shortly and I would be happy to come back again at a later stage.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Thank you very much indeed. Yes, thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank