

**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING and TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD**

**18 November 2014**

**Supplementary Report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health**

**Part 1- Public**

**Matters for Information**

**1 THE AIRPORTS COMMISSION – PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE SHORTLISTED OPTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL RUNWAY CAPACITY (NOVEMBER 2014)**

**Summary: This report briefly summarises the Airports Commission consultation, which was launched on 11<sup>th</sup> November and runs to 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2015. At this stage only the headline points are covered and a full response will be prepared by the deadline.**

**1.1 Background to the Airports Commission and Purpose of this Consultation**

1.1.1 The Airports Commission is an independent body established by the Government in November 2012 to review airport capacity in the UK. An interim report was published in December 2013, which included a shortlist of three options for increasing airport capacity in the long term (two at Heathrow, by different proposers and one at Gatwick). This consultation seeks views on the options and the Commission's assessment of them.

1.1.2 The proposal for a new airport in the Thames Estuary was not shortlisted for final evaluation by the Commission and does not form part of this consultation.

1.1.3 The Commission's remit is to examine the scale and timing of any necessary steps to maintain the UK as Europe's most important aviation hub. The preliminary findings are that the UK faces no immediate capacity crisis and the country is currently one of the best connected in the world, with London having the largest origin and destination market. However, problems are beginning to emerge with Heathrow operating close to capacity. London's airport system is likely to be under considerable pressure by 2030 and demand will significantly exceed total available capacity by 2050.

1.1.4 The Commission considered how best to address this and concluded that there was a case for at least one net additional runway in London and the South East by 2030. The consultation document also notes that there may be a demand case for a second additional runway by 2050, but the Commission is not inviting views on

this. The Commission will make recommendations to the Government in its final report in the summer of 2015.

1.1.5 The consultation documents explains the Commission's work so far, summarises the three shortlisted options and asks 8 set questions although more general comments are also welcomed.

1.1.6 At section 2.80 it states:

'The Commission is not attempting to set out in these documents which of these impacts is the most important, or matters most to people's lives. Its intention is to provide comparable data and analysis, so that the people reading these documents can make their own judgments.'

## **1.2 Summary of the Three Options**

### Gatwick Airport Second Runway

1.2.1 This proposal is for a second runway at Gatwick to the south of the existing. In the space in between there will be a new terminal, main pier and satellite for accessing aircraft. The new terminal will have capacity for 50 million passengers per annum (the combined capacity of the two existing terminals is currently 45mppa).

1.2.2 The land take would be in the region of 624 hectares plus up to 78 hectares for surface access improvements. 168 residential properties and 9 hectares of Green Belt would be affected.

1.2.3 The new runway will allow for Gatwick to accommodate up to 560,000 ATMs (air traffic movements) per year, which is approximately double the current capacity and sufficient to meet the Commission's assessment of need for new capacity to 2030.

1.2.4 The wider economic benefits are estimated to be between £42-127 billion, although the Commission acknowledges that these estimates should be 'interpreted with caution' given the innovative methodology used. At the local and regional level the number of jobs directly and indirectly related to Gatwick's expansion is estimated to be between 500 and 23,600 higher by 2030 compared to the 'do minimum' scenario, rising to between 7,900 and 32,600 in 2050.

1.2.5 The extra jobs will have an impact on future housing need for the 14 Local Authorities nearest to the airport (this does not include Tonbridge and Malling). The upper end of the jobs growth estimates would require up to an additional 18,400 new homes.

1.2.6 The new runway will have a significant impact on the numbers of people affected by noise compared with the 'do minimum' scenario, with some metrics indicating a

doubling or trebling of affected populations. However, the numbers affected even at the higher end are significantly fewer than those affected by noise at Heathrow. The Commission does recognise however that areas around Gatwick are rural and have higher levels of tranquillity that would be adversely affected.

- 1.2.7 The Commission estimate the cost to be up to £9.3 billion (this is higher than Gatwick Airport Ltd's estimate of £7.4 billion).

#### Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

- 1.2.8 The first of the two Heathrow options is to extend the existing northern runway to the west, in effect creating two, 3,000m, in-line runways, with a 600m safety zone in between (total length 6,600m). The extended length enables the runway to be used for both departures and arrivals at the same time to increase capacity. This proposal will also incorporate a new terminal building (35-45mppa) located to the west of existing terminals 1-3.
- 1.2.9 The extension would increase the airport's capacity by 220,000 ATMs to 700,000, sufficient to meet the Commission's assessment of need for additional capacity by 2030. Passenger numbers could reach between 126-142 million by 2050, which would be larger than any current airport and compares with plans for Istanbul's new airport, which is being designed to accommodate up to 150 million passengers per year.
- 1.2.10 The land take will be 724 hectares with an additional 330 hectares for surface access improvements and 60 hectares for flood storage areas. 238 hectares of this land will be in the Green Belt. There will also be some losses of commercial and residential property, but no numbers are included in the consultation document. A section of the M25 would have to be diverted and bridged by the new runway.
- 1.2.11 Benefits to the wider economy are estimated to be between £101-214 billion. Jobs forecast are between 47,400-96,200 higher than the 'do minimum' in 2030 and 54,800-92,900 in 2050. The upper end additional housing need to meet the requirements of these extra jobs would be 60,600 homes. The Commission recognises that this 'may present challenges for local authorities' but that these are likely to be achievable.
- 1.2.12 The Commission believes an extended northern runway will lead to a significant growth in the number of people affected by aviation noise compared to the do minimum scenario due to the number of extra flights.
- 1.2.13 The estimated cost is approximately £13.5 billion (Heathrow Hub Ltd's estimate was £10.1 billion).

#### 1.2.14 Heathrow Airport North West Runway

- 1.2.15 The second Heathrow proposal is for a new full length runway (3,500m) to the north west of the current northern runway. Although this configuration could allow for fully independent mixed mode operations on all runways, a system of alternating runway usage would be maintained. The proposal also includes a new terminal with a capacity for 35 mppa (similar to T5, currently 30 mppa).
- 1.2.16 Land take would be 569 hectares plus 294 hectares for surface access and 43 hectares for flood storage. 431 hectares is designated Green Belt and at least 783 residential properties would be lost.
- 1.2.17 This proposal would increase the airport's capacity to 740,000 ATMs, 260,000 more than current movements, sufficient to meet the Commission's estimated additional need assessment by 2030. Passenger numbers could reach 132-149 million by 2050.
- 1.2.18 Wider benefits to the economy range between £112-211 billion. Total job creation forecast to be 47,400-112,400 higher in 2030 compared with 'do minimum' and 64,100-108,300 higher by 2050. This could require up to 70,800 new homes.
- 1.2.19 The Commission believe that this proposal would lead to a growth in the number of people affected by noise compared to the do minimum. However, there may be a decrease in night noise (between 2300 and 0700) due to the ability of late evening and early morning arrivals to land further to the west.
- 1.2.20 The estimated cost is approximately £18.6 billion (Heathrow Airport Ltd's estimate was £14.8 billion).

### **1.3 Conclusions**

- 1.3.1 All of the shortlisted options will meet the Commission's estimated need for additional capacity for 2030 and all will have significant costs and benefits.
- 1.3.2 Gatwick is the least expensive option at £9.3bn and represents a smaller impact in terms of land take (approx. 700ha) and loss of Green Belt (9ha). However, the wider economic benefits are significantly less than the two Heathrow options (up to £127bn and 32,600 jobs) and there would be a more noticeable noise impact.
- 1.3.3 Of the two Heathrow options, the extended northern runway has a larger land take at nearly 1,100ha, but much less Green Belt would be lost than the new north west runway option (238ha compared to 431ha).
- 1.3.4 The wider economic benefits and job creation are similar (in the region of £200bn and 100,000 jobs in the higher end scenarios). Both are considerably more expensive than Gatwick, with the north western runway topping the scale at £18.6bn.

- 1.3.5 In preparing a response to the Commission we will need to consider in some more detail the cost, impact and benefits of all the options.. In particular the Council will need to have careful regard to the environmental considerations that might impact on the Borough, particularly in connection with the option for a second runway at Gatwick, as well as economic and development impact. We should also consider which option, on balance, represents the best solution for resolving the predicted shortfall in the UK's future airport capacity.
- 1.3.6 It is intended that a response to the Commission's consultation, including addressing the specific questions will be compiled over the coming weeks. That period will also enable some account to be taken of other views that are expressed locally. It is intended that the response is prepared in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport and be reported for ratification to the Cabinet meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> February, the closing day for the consultation.

#### **1.4 Legal Implications**

- 1.4.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

#### **1.5 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

- 1.5.1 There are no financial and value for money considerations arising from this report.

#### **1.6 Risk Assessment**

- 1.6.1 Failing to respond to the consultation will mean that the Council's comments will not be taken into consideration.

Background papers:

contact: Ian Bailey

Nil

Steve Humphrey  
Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health