

	<p align="center">London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham</p> <p align="center">COMMUNITY SAFETY, ENVIRONMENT AND RESIDENTS' SERVICES POLICY & ADVISORY COMMITTEE</p> <p align="center">13 JANUARY 2015</p>
<p align="center">THE RESIDENTS' COMMISSION RESPONSE TO THE AIRPORTS COMMISSION CONSULTATION ON ITS SHORT-LISTED OPTIONS FOR ADDITIONAL RUNWAY CAPACITY IN THE SOUTH-EAST OF ENGLAND</p>	
<p>Report of the Divisional Director</p>	
<p>Open Report</p>	
<p>Classification - For Policy & Advisory Committee review & comment Key Decision: No</p>	
<p>Wards Affected: All</p>	
<p>Accountable Executive Director: Jane West, Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Governance</p>	
<p>Report Author: Tom Conniffe, Principal Policy & Strategy Officer</p>	<p>Contact Details: 020 8753 2195 tom.conniffe@lbhf.gov.uk</p>

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. A group of Hammersmith & Fulham residents formed a local commission, the Hammersmith & Fulham Commission on Airport Expansion, to:
 - assess the impact on H&F of the two Heathrow-based proposals for airport expansion as set out in the Airports Commission (AC) interim report of December 2013, and
 - provide a response to the AC's consultation on its final shortlisted options, which was launched on 11 November 2014 with a deadline for responses of 3 February 2015.

- 1.2. At its meeting on 4 November 2014, the Community Safety, Environment and Residents' Services (CSERS) PAC agreed to the establishment of the H&F Commission, approved its terms of reference and voted to provide it with a secretariat and small budget. As part of this, the Commission was required to report back with its findings in January 2015.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. A near-final draft of the H&F Commission's report that, when finalised, will form the response to the Airports Commission consultation, is appended to this report. Its main findings are that the impact on Hammersmith & Fulham of expansion at Heathrow would be as follows:
 - Hammersmith & Fulham would enjoy limited economic benefits by way of inward investment and new jobs and apprenticeships. Given other developments in the borough, these benefits are not essential to our prosperity.
 - Safety considerations cast uncertainty on all other assumptions.
 - There would be additional flights, additional flight paths and additional noise.
 - Congestion would increase and access to public transport, already problematic, would deteriorate further.
 - Air quality, already exceeding EU limits, would deteriorate further.
 - Residents' health and quality of life would be adversely affected.
- 2.2. Despite extensive publicity from "Back Heathrow", a majority of H&F residents responding to calls for feedback and evidence continue to oppose expansion at Heathrow.
- 2.3. CSERS PAC members are invited to review and comment upon the report and its contents.

3. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 3.1. The Airports Commission (AC) was set up by Government in September 2012 to examine the scale and timing of any requirement for additional capacity to maintain the UK's position as Europe's most important aviation hub and to identify and evaluate how any need for additional capacity should be met in the short, medium and long term.
- 3.2. It was charged with:
 - identifying and recommending options for maintaining the UK's status as an international hub for aviation and immediate actions to improve the use of existing runway capacity in the next 5 years by the end of 2013 (Interim Report)
 - assessing the environmental, economic and social costs and benefits of various solutions to increase airport capacity – considering operational, commercial and technical viability – by summer 2015 (Final Report)
- 3.3. The Interim Report was published on 17 December 2013, announcing that three options would be subject to further detailed study. One option was for a new south runway at Gatwick Airport. Two options were Heathrow-based: one was for a new 3,500m runway to the northwest of the northern

runway at Heathrow Airport (Heathrow Airport Ltd.) and the other for an extension to the existing northern runway to at least 6,000m, enabling the extended runway to be operated as two independent runways (Heathrow Hub).

- 3.4. On 2 April 2014 the AC published its Appraisal Framework for assessing the three options for additional capacity shortlisted in the Interim Report. The Appraisal Framework explains how the AC expects scheme designs to be developed, and how it will appraise the schemes.
- 3.5. A separate exercise, to evaluate proposals for a new airport in the inner Thames Estuary, was carried out by the AC during 2014. On 2 September, the AC announced its decision not to add this airport proposal to its shortlist of options.
- 3.6. On 11 November 2014, the AC published its consultation on the three short-listed options with a deadline for responses of 3 February 2015. This prescribed a set of questions relating to all options. On the same day, the H&F Commission met for the first time to begin the process of responding to the consultation. The attached near-final draft report will, when finalised, form its response to the Airports Commission consultation.

4. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

- 4.1. The Council will need to formally respond to the appraisal on shortlisted options while setting out a longer-term policy position on Heathrow expansion.
- 4.2. The Council's previous position has been to oppose Heathrow expansion on the grounds that it would severely impact on the quality of life of our residents. The attached H&F Commission report, produced after gathering and analysing evidence from residents, the business community, expert witnesses and other stakeholders, can inform both the Council's position and its response to the Airports Commission consultation.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1. As part of the process of evidence gathering, the H&F Commission wrote on 21 November to over 250 residents' associations, civic societies and community groups inviting them to submit written evidence by 13 December. Additionally, a news page on the Council website was given prolonged prominence in order to encourage individual submissions.
- 5.2. Expert witnesses from eight stakeholder organisations – Heathrow Airport Ltd., Heathrow Hub, HACAN, Friends of the Earth, West London Business, H&F Chamber of Commerce, Transport for London and the Civil Aviation Authority – were invited to attend an oral evidence hearing on 10 December. Six of these organisations accepted and sent representatives to answer questions set by the H&F Commission. This evidence hearing was open to the public.

- 5.3. The attached report is in near-final draft state and its inclusion on the CSERS PAC agenda forms the latest stage of consultation.

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.	None		

LIST OF APPENDICES:

Appendix A:

Response to the Airports Commission Consultation on its Short-listed Options for Additional Runway Capacity in the South-East of England – A report by the Hammersmith & Fulham Commission on Airport Expansion. (Near-final Draft, 31 December 2014)