

BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)

REPORT TO: BLTB

DATE: 16 March 2017

CONTACT OFFICER: Roger Parkin, Interim Chief Executive Slough Borough Council, lead Chief Executive to the BLTB

PART I

Item 6: Airports National Policy Statement – Consultation Response

Purpose of Report

1. To report on the timetable and content of the government's Airports National Policy Statement consultation.
2. To set out a process and timetable for finalising the LEP's response to this consultation.

Recommendation

3. You are recommended to endorse the process for finalising the LEP's response to the government's Airports National Policy Consultation:
The draft version of the LEP's proposed response will be considered by:
 - BLTB on 16 March
 - TVB LEP Forum on 21 MarchThe final version will be presented to the LEP Forum for approval at its meeting on 24 May.
4. You are asked to comment on the content of the draft response set out in Table 1 below.

Other Implications

Financial

5. There are no direct financial implications of this report for Berkshire Local Transport Body.

Risk Management

6. There are limited risks for Berkshire Local Transport Body associated with the government's Airports National Policy Statement consultation process. It is a public process, and it is open to anyone and everyone to respond. The responsibility for a final decision on airport capacity expansion rests with the government. Even if the National Policy Statement identifies Heathrow as the preferred site, Heathrow Airport Limited will embark on a two-year process to secure a Development Consent Order. This process is itself subject to public consultation and examination-in-public.

Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

7. Slough Borough Council will provide legal support for the BLTB, should any questions arise.
8. In the event that legal challenges to the Airports National Policy Statement arise, it will be the government whose decision is challenged.

Supporting Information

9. The government published its [draft Airports National Policy Statement](#)¹ on 2 February 2017. The consultation period runs for 16 weeks and closes at 11.45pm on 25 May.
10. This report sets out the LEP's approach to responding to the consultation and invites further contributions from members of the Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Forum and the Berkshire Local Transport Body for incorporation in the final version.

The draft version of the LEP's proposed response will be considered by:

- BLTB on 16 March
- TVB LEP Forum on 21 March

The final version will be presented to the LEP Forum for endorsement at its meeting on 24 May.

The consultation process includes a series of [local meetings](#)² and a regional meeting (at Reading Town Hall on 12 April, you can register to attend by following the [link](#)³ here). The LEP's response is one of many ways in which businesses, residents, councils and other organisations can respond. For more detail, please go to <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/heathrow-expansion-draft-airports-national-policy-statement>

11. The process invites written responses to 9 questions. The questions are reproduced below, with an outline of the planned LEP responses.

Table 1: Outline Response

Heading	Question	Outline response
Question 1: The need for additional airport capacity	The Government believes there is the need for additional airport capacity in the South East of England by 2030.	Establish the role of aviation in sustaining TVB businesses. Refer to 945 Foreign Owned Companies in TVB and their role in sustaining SME supply chain (cite Industrial Strategy) and LHR's role in export (freight) Quotes from SEP ⁴ : "our international links via Heathrow Airport

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/heathrow-expansion-draft-airports-national-policy-statement>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/heathrow-airport-and-airspace-consultation-information-events/heathrow-airport-and-airspace-consultation-information-events>

³ <http://www.aviationconsultations.com/user/register>

Heading	Question	Outline response
	Please tell us your views.	<p>are the principal reason why inward investors choose to locate in TVB and they are a crucial underpinning of ongoing re-investment” (p17)</p> <p>“However, the transport and communications infrastructure on which we rely is simultaneously a local, national and international resource. It is very congested. This in turn is threatening to undermine our intrinsic growth potential. It is therefore essential to invest in it and also to encourage local sustainable transport networks that promote active travel on foot, on bicycle and on public transport.” (p13)</p>
Question 2: The Government's preferred scheme: Heathrow Northwest Runway	Please give us your views on how best to address the issue of airport capacity in the South East of England by 2030. This could be through the Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme (the Government's preferred scheme), the Gatwick Second Runway scheme, the Heathrow Extended Northern Runway scheme, or any other scheme.	<p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP maintains that none of these are bad options, but that expansion at Heathrow is a superior option to expansion at Gatwick.</p> <p>Reference to “London Heathrow Economic Impact Study” September 2013 by Regeneris for “Western Wedge” LEPs⁵ and its main findings that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At present (2013) the activity at Heathrow Airport supports 120,000 jobs and £6bn in economic output across the western wedge economy; a further 170,000 to 230,000 jobs are dependent on the good air connections offered by Heathrow. • By 2040 an extra 35,000 jobs could be created if Heathrow expands compared to a do-nothing option and the region would see annual GVA boosted by £3 billion as a result of the extra activity at Heathrow. • The better air connections could deliver business productivity benefits of £230m to £300m pa from reduced delays and more frequent services, with around 50 additional long and short haul services offered. The expansion of Heathrow would help secure the many jobs in international firms clustered around the airport. <p>We further conclude that there are significant disadvantages for the Heathrow Extended Northern Runway scheme when compared to the Northwest Runway in respect of the surface access proposals, in particular access to the Great Western mainline.</p> <p>We have also concluded that the surface access proposals for the Gatwick option are over-reliant on routes via London. There are no significant investment proposals to expand capacity on east-west access routes.</p>
Question 3: Assessment principles	The Secretary of State will use a range of assessment principles when considering any application for a Northwest Runway at Heathrow Airport.	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP supports the proposed approach of comparing the “ <i>potential benefits, including the facilitation of economic development (including job creation) and environmental improvement, and any long term or wider benefits</i> ” with the “ <i>potential adverse impacts (including any longer term and cumulative adverse impacts) as well as any measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for any adverse impacts.</i> ” (paragraph 4.4 of the draft NPS)

⁴ http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Strategic_Economic_Plan

⁵ <http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Portals/0/FileStore/StrategicInfrastructure/StrategicInfrastructure/Heathrow%20Economic%20Impact%20Assessment%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf>

Heading	Question	Outline response
	Please tell us your views.	
Question 4: Impacts and requirements	The Government has set out its approach to surface access for a Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme. Please tell us your views.	<p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP supports the government's objective, "<i>to ensure that access to the airport by road, rail and public transport is high quality, efficient and reliable for both passengers and airport workers who use transport on a daily basis.</i>" (para 5.5 of the draft NPS)</p> <p>Transport requirements generated by airport expansion</p> <p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP is aware that not all road and rail users who travel towards, or away from, the airport are passengers or airport workers. The existing road and rail networks help meet a wide variety of non-airport transport needs. We ask that the transport impact assessment (including the air quality impact assessment) takes full account of these non-airport journeys in both the "2-runway" and "3-runway" states.</p> <p>This point is raised by the requirement set out at paragraph 5.15 of the draft NPS, "<i>The applicant should demonstrate in its assessment that the proposed surface access strategy will support the additional transport requirements generated by airport expansion.</i>"</p> <p>This point is engaged again in paragraphs 5.18 and 5.19 of the draft NPS which refer to "<i>the upgrading or enhancing of road, rail or other transport networks or services which are physically needed to be completed to enable the Northwest Runway to operate</i>" either prior to opening or as "<i>additional [runway] capacity becomes fully utilised</i>". These paragraphs go on to introduce the possibility that some of these enhancements might be joint funded by the applicant and the government.</p> <p>We suggest that some care will need to be taken in defining the phrases "<i>additional transport requirements generated by airport expansion</i>" (5.15) and "<i>where a transport scheme is not solely required to deliver airport capacity</i>" (5.18, 5.19) in order to distinguish between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the demands already in the wider economy of London and the "Western Wedge"; • the likely increase in demand from general economic growth; and • the likely increase in demand created by airport expansion. <p>We consider it would be a perverse outcome if the applicant was required to mitigate adverse impacts that arise from demands already in the wider economy, or mitigate adverse impacts that result from the projected future growth of the wider economy.</p> <p>Western Rail Link to Heathrow</p> <p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP argues that the case for investment in the Western Rail Link to Heathrow is clear and based on the needs of a two-runway airport. This view was endorsed by the Airports Commission. (see Final Report⁶, para</p>

Heading	Question	Outline response
		<p>8.15, p 155).</p> <p>The scheme is included in the National Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016-21⁷ (para 5.8, page 41) under the heading “Projects in Development”, with the suggestion that construction might begin “early in CP6 (2019-2024)”.</p> <p>In launching the consultation, the Secretary of State said “<i>We are also bringing forward plans to deliver western and southern rail access to the airport as quickly as possible to provide greater flexibility, accessibility and resilience for passengers</i>” (Hansard Vol 620, 2 February 2017⁸).</p> <p>We urge the government to consider how the commitment to this scheme can be linked to the operation of a two-runway airport and not as a condition of expansion to a three-runway airport.</p> <p>Other Surface Access Projects</p> <p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP also supports the development of other major surface access schemes that will contribute to the reduction of road journeys. We support Southern Rail Access to Heathrow as recommended by the Airports Commission and taken up by Network Rail; and Slough Mass Rapid Transit we have invested Local Growth Funds in this scheme in Slough and we support the ambition to extend it onto the airport.</p> <p>Duty to Co-operate</p> <p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP notes the reference in the draft NPS to Heathrow Airport Transport Forum (para 5.8) and to the principles set out in the Aviation Policy Framework. The LEP has joined the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group⁹ (which includes LEPs and Local Authorities neighbouring the airport) in order to fulfil its Duty to Co-operate both with Heathrow Airport Limited, and with the similarly impacted authorities, in producing a co-ordinated response to the Development Consent proposals as they emerge.</p> <p>We suggest that the applicant be encouraged to use the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group in order to meet the expectation that “<i>the applicant should consult Highways England, Network Rail and highway and transport authorities, as appropriate, on the assessment and proposed mitigation measures.</i>” (paragraph 5.9 of the draft NPS) and similar expectations at paragraphs 5.10 and 5.11 of the draft NPS.</p> <p>Monitoring and Enforcement</p>

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/airports-commission-final-report-and-supporting-documents>

⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-infrastructure-delivery-plan-2016-to-2021>

⁸ <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2017-02-02/debates/35730F10-B97C-480B-B3B2-729D5D408BAC/AirportCapacityAndAirspacePolicy?highlight=airport%20expansion#contribution-DF61E014-7168-47BD-B041-B9ED022ADF66>

⁹ <http://www.heathrowstrategicplanninggroup.com/>

Heading	Question	Outline response
		<p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP agrees that the Surface Access Strategy should “reference the role of surface transport in relation to air quality and carbon” (para 5.8) and that it “must contain specific targets for maximising the proportion of journeys made to the airport by public transport, cycling or walking” (para 5.8) and that it “should also contain actions, policies and defined performance indicators for delivering against targets” (para 5.8). However, we are not convinced that Airport Transport Forum is the right body to “oversee implementation of the strategy and monitor progress against targets alongside the implementation and operation of the preferred scheme” (para 5.8). This reservation is made because the Airport Transport Forum is not independent of the applicant, and has no status or standing to enforce any agreements.</p> <p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP welcomes paragraphs 5.16 and 5.17 of the draft NPS which set out specific targets and expectations on recording and reporting performance relating to some elements of the surface access strategy. We suggest that these be re-drafted to give better coverage of the whole of the proposed surface access strategy, and include some indication of how an enforcement regime would work, including potential sanctions. (see also paragraph 5.37).</p> <p>Paragraph 5.28 quotes the Airports Commission’s recommendation that “Heathrow Airport should be held to performance targets” for public transport use, but this idea is not developed in the draft NPS.</p> <p>We suggest that a lead Local Authority be identified to take on the monitoring and enforcement role, acting alone, or in concert with other local authorities, possibly through the mechanism of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group mentioned above.</p>
Question 5: Impacts and requirements	The draft Airports National Policy Statement sets out a package of supporting measures to mitigate negative impacts of a Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme. Please tell us your views.	<p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP has identified the Western Rail Link to Heathrow (WRLtH) scheme as its number one transport infrastructure priority, and has been promoting this investment on the basis of a two-runway Heathrow. The Airports Commission supported the view there was a need for this scheme whether or not Heathrow expansion was allowed to proceed (see Final Report¹⁰, para 8.15, p 155).</p> <p>We do not regard WRLtH as a mitigation measure for the Northwest Runway Scheme.</p> <p>We fully support the ambition of achieving a three-runway airport with “no net increase in road traffic”: through the work of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group¹¹ we will work with Heathrow Airport Limited, national agencies and local authorities to deliver credible plans for Southern Rail Access to Heathrow, Slough Rapid Transit and other surface transport interventions that contribute to the goals of modal shift away from cars and improving air quality.</p>

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/airports-commission-final-report-and-supporting-documents>

¹¹ <http://www.heathrowstrategicplanninggroup.com/>

Heading	Question	Outline response
	Are there any other supporting measures that should be set out?	<p>Land use including open space, green infrastructure and Green Belt</p> <p>The LEP has joined the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group¹² (which includes LEPs and Local Authorities neighbouring the airport) in order to fulfil its Duty to Co-operate both with Heathrow Airport Limited, and with the similarly impacted authorities, in producing a co-ordinated response to the Development Consent proposals as they emerge.</p> <p>We suggest that the applicant be encouraged to use this group in order to meet the expectation that “<i>During any pre-application discussions with the applicant, the local planning authority should ...</i>” (para 5.112 of the draft NPS).</p>
	In particular, please tell us your views on: 5.1. Air quality supporting measures	<p>Transport requirements generated by airport expansion</p> <p>Paragraph 5.32 of the draft NPS says the applicant’s environmental statement should assess “<i>Any significant air quality effects, their mitigation and any residual effects, distinguishing between those applicable to runway construction and operation stages and taking account of the impact that the project is likely to cause on air quality arising from road and other surface access traffic</i>”.</p> <p>As we have noted above, we suggest that some care will need to be taken in defining the phrase “<i>the impact that the project is likely to cause on air quality arising from road and other surface access traffic</i>” in order to distinguish between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the demands already in the wider economy of London and the “Western Wedge”; • the likely increase in demand from general economic growth; and • the likely increase in demand created by airport expansion. <p>Monitoring and Enforcement</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.34 – 5.40 describe how the applicant might make proposals to mitigate any potential adverse effects on air quality. There are many overlaps with the suggested surface access mitigation interventions.</p> <p>We suggest that a lead Local Authority be identified to take on the monitoring and enforcement role, acting alone, or in concert with other local authorities, possibly through the mechanism of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group mentioned above.</p>
	5.2. Noise supporting measures	With respect to noise impacts that are generated by surface access arrangements, we repeat the comments made earlier about taking care to isolate the impact of airport expansion from other sources and causes of noise nuisance; and the need to create an appropriate monitoring and enforcement arrangements.
	5.3. Carbon emissions supporting measures	With respect to carbon emission impacts that are generated by surface access arrangements, we repeat the comments made earlier about taking care to isolate the impact of airport expansion from other sources and causes of carbon

¹² <http://www.heathrowstrategicplanninggroup.com/>

Heading	Question	Outline response
		emissions; and the need to create an appropriate monitoring and enforcement arrangements.
	5.4. Compensation for local communities	No comment
Question 6: Impacts and requirements	The Government has set out a number of planning requirements that a Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme must meet in order to operate. Please tell us your views.	<p>Monitoring and Enforcement</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10 of the draft NPS set out the mechanism for turning the general planning requirements into specific “<i>obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990</i>”</p> <p>We cannot pre-judge the deliberations of the Examining Authority or the Secretary of State in this respect, but we can ask for some thought to be given to identification of an appropriate monitoring and enforcement regime for any obligations that are eventually imposed.</p> <p>An expanded Heathrow Airport will directly impact a number of local authority areas, and it is important to all concerned that and Development Consent Order includes an effective and properly coordinated enforcement regime.</p>
	Are there any other requirements the Government should set out?	No suggestions
Question 7: Draft Airports NPS Appraisal of Sustainability	The Appraisal of Sustainability sets out the Government’s assessment of the Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme, and considers alternatives. Please tell us your views.	No comments
Question 8: General questions	Do you have any additional comments on the draft Airports National Policy Statement or other supporting documents?	No comments
Question 9: General questions	The Government has a public sector equality duty to ensure protected groups have the opportunity to respond to consultations. Please tell us your views on	No comments

Heading	Question	Outline response
	how this consultation has achieved this.	

Conclusion

12. Any colleagues wishing to contribute further to shaping the LEP’s response should contact richard@thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk. As noted above the [government’s consultation](#)¹³ remains open until 25 May 2017.

Background Papers

13. The source papers used in compiling this report have been referenced in the text.

¹³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/heathrow-expansion-draft-airports-national-policy-statement>