



London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

COUNCIL

30 January 2013

H&F RESPONSE TO THE TfL CONSULTATION ON THE CRITERIA FOR NEW AVIATION CAPACITY

Report of the Leader of the Council

Open Report

Classification - For Decision

Key Decision: No

Wards Affected: None directly affected

Accountable Executive Director: Nigel Pallace, Bi-borough Executive Director, Transportation and Technical Services

Report Author: Peter Smith, Strategy Manager

Contact Details:

Tel: 020 8753 2206

E-mail:

peter.smith@lbhf.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. Transport for London, in support of the ongoing work of the Davies Commission, is consulting on proposed criteria for the assessment of options for increasing aviation capacity in London and the South East. The selected criteria will be used to shortlist options for expanding aviation capacity and has been devised with input from an independent review panel.
- 1.2. This report seeks Council approval for an h&f response to the proposed criteria. If agreed, the draft response attached will be submitted to TfL via the online survey form posted on its website. The TfL deadline for submissions is 8 February.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1. Council is recommended to agree the attached draft response to the consultation, for submission to TfL.

3. REASONS FOR DECISION

- 3.1. The Council, in common with the Mayor of London, is opposed to the development of a third runway at Heathrow but recognises the need for expanded aviation capacity for London. The proposed assessment criteria, with the amendments suggested in the h&f response, will serve to define the most appropriate options for the expansion of aviation capacity in a forthcoming assessment of a longlist of options.

4. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 4.1. Council members will be aware of the long running debate over how best to deliver the extra aviation capacity that will serve to maintain London's position as a prominent international economic hub in future years. Heathrow is currently operating at 98% capacity, which does not provide sufficient scope to accommodate the desired future economic growth.
- 4.2. Early proposals for expanding aviation capacity focussed on the construction of a third runway at Heathrow and this Council lobbied hard to oppose such plans. Other options have since been proposed, including the Mayor of London's suggestion that a new airport situated in the Thames Estuary might reduce the social and environmental impacts that an expansion of Heathrow would impose on West London.
- 4.3. At Full Council on 24 October 2012 there was a special motion debated and passed as follows:
1. *This Council notes that:*
 - *A two and a half runway airport solution at Heathrow Airport can never provide the successful air transport hub which London needs;*
 - *Additional runway capacity at Heathrow would mean an unacceptable increase in aircraft noise for parts of Hammersmith and Fulham which have to date been less adversely affected, and that;*
 - *The recent operational freedom trials at Heathrow have proved to be highly damaging to borough residents who presently get some respite through runway alteration.*
 2. *This Council utterly rejects any revised plans to build an additional short runway at Heathrow Airport.*
 3. *This Council supports the Mayor of London in his bid to secure a new four runway airport to the east of London as the only practicable economic and environmental solution to London's requirement for a truly resilient international airport hub.*
- 4.4. The Government has now set up the Davies Commission to consider the various options for enhancing the UK's aviation capacity, to maintain its position as Europe's most important aviation hub, which is likely to have significant implications for London and the South East. In support of the Davies Commission, the Mayor of London has tasked Transport for

London with consulting on criteria that it has drawn up for the purpose of assessing the relative benefits of the various options now being considered.

5. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

- 5.1. The online consultation form (accessible from the following link: www.tfl.gov.uk/aviation) seeks views on the relative importance of the six different criteria headings (see attachment to Appendix A) and whether the specific criteria under each of the six headings and the corresponding metrics are appropriate for the assessment of benefits and impacts.
- 5.2. The draft h&f response (see Appendix A) addresses each of the six sets of criteria and deems all to be important in assessing options but applies the greatest importance to environmental criteria, which includes criteria relating to the impact of aircraft noise on local populations. This is the key concern of most h&f residents.

6. OPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

- 6.1. Officers have studied the proposed assessment criteria and believe that the h&f response best supports those criteria and metrics that will confirm the fact that expansion of Heathrow is not the right option for increasing aviation capacity for London and the South East.

7. CONSULTATION

- 7.1. The Council has consulted local residents on previous proposals for a third runway at Heathrow, which has revealed staunch local opposition to any such proposal. Residents are also opposed to any expansion of night flights from the airport and would wish to see these reduced. The council has called for these flights to be phased out in the past and will continue to do so due to the disruption they cause to residents' lives.

8. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. There are no equality implications to the h&f response to this consultation.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. There are no legal implications to the h&f response to this consultation.

10. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1. There are no financial implications to the submission of this response.

11. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 11.1. There is no risk associated with the recommendation.

12. PROCUREMENT AND IT STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS

12.1. There are no procurement or IT strategy implications.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT

No.	Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext of holder of file/copy	Department/ Location
1.	DfT Aviation Policy Framework Consultation Response (October 2012)	Paul Baker x3431	TTS, Planning Division

LIST OF APPENDICES:

Appendix A: Draft h&f response to the consultation and the proposed criteria.