Crossrail Cost-Benefit Analysis and Project Appraisal

Posted on November 4, 2026

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/crossrail-cost-benefit-analysis-project-appraisal/

Introduction

Crossrail, delivered as the Elizabeth line, is a major rail infrastructure project connecting London and the South East. Its central section opened to passengers on 24 May 2022 (Transport for London, 2022). This appraisal examines the economic, property, retail and environmental arguments used to assess the project, drawing on planning forecasts and literature available through 2023. Historical forecasts are considered as appraisal assumptions, rather than measurements of current outcomes. The analysis evaluates how benefits were identified, how alternative methods could strengthen the assessment, and what lessons other infrastructure projects offer (Tyner, 2022; Muruganandan et al., 2022; KPMG, 2019).

Key Factors in the Appraisal

A critical appraisal begins by identifying the costs, benefits and assumptions included in the analysis. Economic reasoning helps compare alternatives, while a broader assessment also considers who receives the benefits, who bears the costs and how uncertainty affects the result. The following sections examine the main components of the Crossrail appraisal.

Economic Benefits

Short-term and long-term impacts: The appraisal considered employment during construction and operation, alongside wider effects on access to jobs and economic activity (Crossrail, 2023). These effects need to be distinguished from one another to avoid counting the same benefit more than once.

GDP growth: The cited planning literature presented estimates ranging from £6 billion to £44 billion, depending on the approach used to assess the wider economic effects (City of London Corporation, 2015). Such forecasts depended on assumptions about productivity, agglomeration and tax revenues

(Crossrail, 2023). Their range illustrates why an appraisal should explain its scenarios and methods clearly.

Job creation: The cited appraisal material forecast 14,500 jobs during development and operation (City of London Corporation, 2015). Employment estimates should distinguish temporary construction work from continuing operational employment and wider changes in the labour market.

User benefits: Planning assessments emphasised reduced crowding and shorter journeys (City of London Corporation, 2015). The cited example anticipated a Heathrow–Liverpool Street journey of 35 minutes rather than 55 minutes. These figures are historical appraisal assumptions; they should be distinguished from current timetable information and measured journey times.

Tax revenue and supply-chain effects: The appraisal considered additional government revenue and economic activity among suppliers (Crossrail, 2023). Contracts awarded to British businesses could distribute activity beyond London. An evaluation should distinguish these effects from benefits already included in other measures.

Assessment of the Approach

GDP effects are useful but do not fully describe an infrastructure project's economic consequences. Distributional analysis can examine differences between income groups and regions, while employment assessment can consider job quality and duration. Appraisal assumptions should be transparent, and sensitivity analysis should show how results change when important inputs vary. These steps would strengthen the assessment of economic viability.

Alternative Approaches

A more thorough analysis of the effects of regional development would be an alternative strategy to be included in the CBA. Although the CBA recognises that the project has the potential to assist regional prosperity, a more detailed analysis would examine how the various regions along the Crossrail route fare in terms of economic growth. This would entail assessing changes in localised economic activity, property values, and employment prospects. In order to optimise the economic gains in regions that could otherwise be left behind, local governments and policymakers may get specific recommendations from a regional development assessment.

Resilience and risk assessment provide another complementary approach (Blockley et al., 2012). This would examine how the infrastructure responds to disruption, including natural hazards and economic shocks, and how quickly services can recover. Considering these risks can reveal long-term

consequences that a single central forecast may overlook.

Property and Retail

The planning literature anticipated increases in commercial property values near central London stations. The cited estimate was 10% above the baseline forecast (City of London Corporation, 2015). Knight Frank (2013) also anticipated residential capital values around central London stations rising by 25% above the baseline over the forecast period. These historical projections should be evaluated against their stated assumptions. An appraisal should explain its comparison areas, baseline trends and modelling methods rather than assume that all observed price changes result from Crossrail (Sigit et al., 2018).

Improved access was also expected to benefit shopping destinations, including One New Change, Canary Wharf and Stratford (GVA and Crossrail Ltd, 2012). Retail effects can be examined through changes in footfall, customer behaviour and business performance. Comparison with areas experiencing similar wider economic conditions would help distinguish accessibility effects from other influences.

Assessment of the Approach

Accessibility is a reasonable factor to include when assessing property development and retail activity. However, market trends alone do not establish that a rail project caused a change in values. The assessment would be stronger if it stated its baseline, comparison areas and treatment of other influences. It should also distinguish increases in land value from additional benefits already represented through travel-time or productivity measures.

Alternative Approaches

Spatial econometric modelling offers one way to examine relationships between properties and neighbouring areas (Xu and Lee, 2019). An accessibility improvement at one station can affect nearby communities, so observations may not be independent. A model that accounts for spatial relationships could help assess how property and retail effects spread across the route and surrounding locations.

Environmental Benefits and Costs

The CBA evaluates both the environmental benefits and costs associated with the project, considering its potential impact on the environment.

Sustainability and emissions: Modal-shift analysis examines whether passengers move from private vehicles or taxis to rail. The appraisal anticipated reductions in carbon dioxide (CO_2), nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and particulate matter (PM) associated with reduced road travel. These effects depend on passenger behaviour, energy use and the comparison scenario. A complete environmental assessment should also consider construction and operating impacts.

Assessment of the Approach

Environmental appraisal is appropriate when it considers both benefits and costs over the project's life. Modal shift, energy efficiency and emissions are relevant indicators, but their contribution depends on the assumptions used. Reporting those assumptions and testing alternative scenarios would make the environmental assessment easier to evaluate.

Alternative Approaches

Social return on investment (SROI) provides a complementary way to examine social and community outcomes. Gosselin et al. (2020) discuss the method in another intervention setting; applying it to transport would require outcomes and valuation assumptions specific to Crossrail. Accessibility, participation and community development could be considered alongside the conventional economic appraisal.

Multi-criteria analysis (MCA) can compare alternatives across several economic, social and environmental criteria (Stachura and Kuligowska, 2021; Hamidreza, 2009). It can make non-monetised concerns, such as social equity and environmental quality, more explicit. The criteria and their weights would need to be transparent, since different choices could change the ranking of alternatives.

Lessons from Other Infrastructure Projects

The Channel Tunnel offers a useful comparison because it demonstrates the risks of relying on optimistic forecasts. Anguera's (2006) retrospective evaluation identified weaker-than-forecast

market growth, lower revenues and construction-cost escalation. For Crossrail appraisal, the relevant lesson is to test demand and cost assumptions and distinguish user benefits from the financial position of owners and operators.

Japan's Shinkansen provides a further comparative context for considering high-speed rail's economic effects (Ieda, 2019). Comparisons should account for differences in geography, network structure, demand and institutions. Lessons from another rail system can inform appraisal questions, but its results cannot be transferred directly to Crossrail.

Conclusion

This appraisal examines how Crossrail's economic, property, retail and environmental effects were represented in planning literature. The cited forecasts illustrate the importance of clear baselines, transparent assumptions and careful separation of benefit categories. They also show why predicted outcomes should be distinguished from evidence collected after a railway begins operating.

Distributional assessment, regional analysis, resilience testing, spatial modelling and complementary social or multi-criteria methods could strengthen project appraisal. Their value depends on suitable data, explicit assumptions and sensitivity testing. Comparing forecasts with subsequent outcomes would provide a firmer basis for learning from Crossrail and improving the evaluation of future infrastructure projects.

References

Adler, MD (2016). Benefit-Cost Analysis and Distributional Weights: An Overview. *Review of Environmental Economics & Policy*, 10, pp. 264-285.

Blockley, D., Agarwal, J. and Godfrey, P. (2012) 'Infrastructure resilience for high-impact low-chance risks', *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers – Civil Engineering*, 165(6), pp. 13–19. doi:10.1680/cien.11.00046.

City of London Corporation (2015). *The impact of Crossrail – The City of London Corporation, ReadkonG.com*. Available at: https://www.readkong.com/page/the-impact-of-crossrail-secondary-research-briefing-paper-2313137 (Accessed: 06 October 2023).

Crossrail (2023) *Crossrail Project 2019-2023: Completing the Elizabeth line, Major Projects*

Association. Available at: https://majorprojects.org/resources/crossrail-project-2019-2023-completing-the-elizabeth-line/ (Accessed: 08 May 2023).

Gosselin, V., Boccanfuso, D. & Laberge, S. (2020). Social return on investment (SROI) method to evaluate physical activity and sport interventions: a systematic review. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act,* 17, p. 26.

GVA and Crossrail Ltd (2012) *2012 property impact study, Crossrail Learning Legacy*. Available at: https://learninglegacy.crossrail.co.uk/documents/property-impact-study/ (Accessed: 07 October 2023).

Hamidreza (2009) 'An analysis of urban land development using multi-criteria decision model and Geographical Information System (a case study of Babolsar City)', *American Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 5(1), pp. 87–93. doi:10.3844/ajessp.2009.87.93.

Ieda, H. (2019). "The economic effects of the Shinkansen high-speed rail lines in Japan: lessons for the development of the Shinkansen in other countries." *Journal of Transport Geography*, 75, pp. 52-65.

KnightFrank (2013). *Action stations – Knight Frank*. Available at: https://content.knightfrank.com/research/520/documents/en/2013-1362.pdf (Accessed: 06 October 2023).

KPMG. (2019). *Independent review of Crossrail – governance*. Available at: Https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/Crossrail-project-updates. (Accessed: 06 October 2023).

Muruganandan, K. *et al.* (2022) 'The dynamics of systems integration: Balancing stability and change on London's Crossrail project', *International Journal of Project Management*, 40(6), pp. 608–623. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.03.007.

Sigit, F.F., Fachrudin, K.A. and Fachrudin, H.T. (2018) 'Analysis of factors affecting property value at residence with cluster concept: Case study – J city residence', *Proceedings of the International Conference of Science, Technology, Engineering, Environmental and Ramification Researches* [Preprint]. doi:10.5220/0010074313471351.

Stachura, P. and Kuligowska, K. (2021) 'Multi-criteria analysis of Urban Policy for Sustainable Development Decision-making: A case study for Warsaw City, Poland', *Procedia Computer Science*, 192, pp. 259–269. doi:10.1016/j.procs.2021.08.027.

Tyner, D. (2022) ‘Crossrail systems integration – lessons learned and good practice in managing interdisciplinary systems integration through each stage of the Crossrail programme’, *Crossrail Project*, pp. 137–144. doi:10.1680/cpidc.66502.137.

Wright, S., Palczynski, R. and ten Have, P. (2017) ‘Crossrail programme organisation and management for delivering London’s Elizabeth line’, Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers – Civil Engineering, 170(6), pp. 23–33. doi:10.1680/jcien.17.00016.

Xu, X. and Lee, L. (2019) ‘Theoretical Foundations for Spatial Econometric Research’, *Regional Science and Urban Economics,* 76, pp. 2–12. doi:10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2018.04.002.

Anguera, R. (2006). The Channel Tunnel—an ex post economic evaluation. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, 40(4), 291–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2005.08.009

Transport for London. (2022, May 24). All aboard the transformational Elizabeth line. https://tfl-newsroom.prgloo.com/news/tfl-press-release-all-aboard-the-transformational-elizabeth-line