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PURPOSE

This Task and Finish Group was set up to consider the impact of expansion of Heathrow Airport (LHR) on Elmbridge, with the aim of developing a Council position statement.

This report summarises the evidence gathered to date, the arguments submitted to the Task Group and it also considers whether the Council should come to a formal position on the expansion of LHR.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Group began gathering evidence in January 2016, most recently in two intense sessions undertaken in September following a period of inactivity between May and August due to local elections and the EU Referendum.

To date, the Task Group process has involved sixteen members, who have met on eight different occasions, totalling twenty hours of evidence gathering, which included presentations from five external organisations and other presentations from officers of the Council (Annex D).

The evidence gathered to date suggests the following conclusions (please see Full Report from section 2 (Page 6) below for further information):

- The strongest arguments against expansion at LHR, and areas of most concern to residents, are those of noise and air quality.

- There is a notable conflict between LAANC and LHR on the proposed expansion in regards to the current impact and future impact on air quality. LAANC said that before the Government decides to go ahead with LHR expansion it should set out its assessment of what would be required to ensure existing and future air quality targets are met. In addition, the Government must make a binding commitment that LHR will fund the infrastructure improvements necessary to accommodate an expanded LHR.

- The impact on Elmbridge of the noise from up to 250,000 additional flights is a significant concern, more particularly because:
The extent to which precision navigation will be used to either concentrate flights into narrow corridors or disburse them, is not determined.

The possible flight paths, aircraft heights and stacking arrangements remain unknown.

- Notably, LHR self-regulate the noise from aircraft using their noise monitors on the ground. The collected information is public knowledge. It was agreed that should expansion be approved, both LAANC and the Task Group believe that noise should be independently monitored.

- The proximity of LHR to Elmbridge has a beneficial effect on the local economy through job creation, business location and expansion. The evidence appears to show that LHR is a key factor in driving developments and deals in the Borough; for example, at Hersham Place Technology Park and Brooklands Business Park. The economic benefit of LHR expansion to Elmbridge presents the strongest argument in favour of Elmbridge supporting expansion.

- Further growth of LHR is conditional upon substantial investment in local and regional access and the provision of major rail investment, linking the airport with the Midlands, the West and the South, in addition to London. Greater clarity on the surface transport infrastructure proposals are required in order to see how it all fits together with the expansion.

- Based on a review of the key elements of the Airport Commission’s Final report and some of the supporting technical documents which it considered, along with selected other materials produced on or behalf of LHR itself, it does appear that the housing impacts for Elmbridge and its residents are limited – particularly in terms of issues such as additional housing requirements and demand for related infrastructure. This view is supported by officers in the Housing department of Elmbridge Borough Council.

- Having heard the case for Gatwick it is recognised that traffic, pollution and noise from a second runway at Gatwick would likely have a minimal impact on Elmbridge. Although, Elmbridge residents and businesses may welcome increased connectivity, it was agreed that there are probably few significant benefits for Elmbridge to a second runway at Gatwick.

- Populus surveyed 1000 Elmbridge residents in January 2016 and found that 54% felt positively about LHR expansion, whereas 8% were negative. 45% supported expansion at LHR whereas 34% opposed. In comparing the same study conducted in other areas affected by expansion, Elmbridge is placed in the ‘middle of the pack’ in terms of feelings regarding expansion (See Annex A).

- Elmbridge Borough Council undertook an online survey on its website between the 5th and 30th of September 2016. There were 836 respondents, of which 57% are opposed to the proposed expansion and 43% are in favour of the proposed expansion at LHR (See Annex B).
Based on the evidence gathered, the Task and Finish Group offer two responses for the position statement: one in favour and one in opposition to the proposed expansion at LHR:

Position 1:

Elmbridge Borough Council recognises the economic importance of the proximity of LHR to the Borough. Elmbridge supports the principle of expansion at LHR, on the provisos that:

i) environmental targets for noise and air quality, are met;
ii) a noise envelope is negotiated specifically for Elmbridge; and
iii) air quality and noise are respectively independently monitored.

Or:

Position 2:

Elmbridge opposes expansion at LHR, as happened in 2002 and 2008, based on the following:

i) the impacts of aircraft noise on Elmbridge already affect the quality of life for residents and a third runway could aggravate this.
ii) Air quality targets are breached currently and there is limited assurance that air quality limits can be met with the addition of a third runway.
iii) uncertainty of how many residents will be affected by unknown flight paths, frequencies, heights and stacking arrangements.
iv) it is not clear how the surface transport infrastructure proposals will mitigate the impact on the already congested road network in and around the Borough.

Making a position statement:

Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) is keen for local authorities to make public statements in favour of expansion, in the hope that such statements will bolster its case with the Government.

By way of encouragement, Heathrow is making a package of mitigations available to councils which agree to make such statements. A meeting was held in April 2016 between representatives of HAL and Elmbridge Borough Council in which possible mitigations which could be considered were discussed but no conclusions were reached. HAL have indicated they would be happy to reopen these discussions with Elmbridge Borough Council. At the time of writing this report, it is believed that the Government will make a decision on airport expansion on 18 October 2016. Such statements may have lost value if EBC’s decision is made after this event. This state of affairs notwithstanding, Elmbridge should aim to create a strategic partnership with HAL irrespective of the Government’s decision or EBC’s position statement in order to address the existing and future economic and environmental impacts of the airport on the Borough.
RECOMMENDED: THAT

(A) THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE CONSIDER THE FINDINGS OF THE WORKING GROUP BY REVIEWING THE IMPACT OF HEATHROW EXPANSION ON ELMBRIDGE.

(B) THE COMMITTEE CONSIDERS WHETHER THE COUNCIL SHOULD MAKE A PUBLIC STATEMENT ON THE EXPANSION OF HEATHROW AIRPORT BASED ON THE EVIDENCE GATHERED.

(C) IF THE COMMITTEE AGREE TO MAKING A PUBLIC STATEMENT ON HEATHROW THEN THE GATHERED EVIDENCE IS TAKEN TO CABINET AND COUNCIL FOR A VOTE ON THE POSITION OF ELMBRIDGE IN RELATION TO THE PROPOSED EXPANSION AT HEATHROW AIRPORT BASED ON THE TWO RESPECTIVE CONCLUSIONS IN THIS REPORT.

(D) IRRESPECTIVE OF THE DECISION BY GOVERNMENT AS TO WHETHER OR NOT TO EXPAND HEATHROW AIRPORT OR THE POSITION TAKEN BY ELMBRIDGE, THE COUNCIL WORK IN PARTNERSHIP WITH HEATHROW AND THE COMMUNITY FORUMS TO ADDRESS THE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE AIRPORT ON THE BOROUGH.

BACKGROUND

1.1. On July 1 2015, the Airports Commission published its final report which sets out its recommendations to Government for expanding aviation capacity in the UK. The Commission’s analysis argues that expanded airport capacity is crucial for the UK’s long-term prosperity. While each of the three schemes shortlisted were considered a credible option for expansion, the Commission has unanimously concluded that the proposal for a new northwest runway at Heathrow Airport, combined with a significant package of measures to address its environmental and community impacts, presents the strongest case and offers the greatest strategic and economic benefits by 2050.

1.2. Expansion at Heathrow involves building a new 3,500m runway about two miles north of the two existing runways Heathrow at an estimated cost of £18.6bn. This would allow for 250,000 additional flights and a passenger capacity of 130 million.

1.3. The decision on airport expansion was delayed by Government for a further six months in December 2015, in the meantime Heathrow accepted eleven further conditions from the Airports Commission in May 2016 in regards to the proposal (See Annex C). Due to the European Referendum, a change in Prime Minister and the summer recess, a decision on airport expansion has been further delayed. At the time of writing this report, the Task Group are aware that a decision from Government on airport expansion is due on October 18 2016.
1.4. Notably, although Elmbridge is in close proximity to Heathrow Airport, it was not considered in the Davies Report as one of the ‘impacted’ areas unlike Spelthorne, West Berks and Richmond, amongst others with the latter two areas being further away from the airport than Elmbridge.

1.5. The Task Group have gathered evidence from the following organisations, action groups and individuals in relation to the proposed expansion at Heathrow:

- Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL)
- Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC)
- Gatwick Ltd
- Residents Action Group Elmbridge (RAGE)
- Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer at Elmbridge Borough Council
- Economic Development Officer at Elmbridge Borough Council
- Private sector feedback from large and strategically important companies
- Air Products based at Hersham Technology Park.

1.6. An independent survey was carried out by Populus in Elmbridge and paid for by HAL. Populus interviewed 1,000 adult residents (18+) in Elmbridge by telephone between 19 and 28 January 2016. Demographic (age, gender, working status and ethnicity) and geographic (ward populations) quotas and weights were used in order to ensure that results were representative of all adults in the borough (Annex A).

1.7. Elmbridge Borough Council undertook an additional public survey using SNAP survey software on its website. The survey ran between September 5 and 30 2016. The survey received 836 of responses (Annex B).

1.8. A press release was published on the Councils website w/c September 5 2016 to promote the work of the Task Group and to advertise the survey to residents and businesses. Both were further promoted in a follow up press release w/c September 19 2016 that informed the public of the ‘scrutiny in a day’ exercise that was undertaken. Both press releases were picked up by local papers and The Chair of the Task and Finish Group was on BBC Surrey to further promote the survey and the evidence gathering approach to inform a decision on airport expansion.

1.9. The Task Group first met in January 2016 and has since received evidence both in favour and opposed to expansion of Heathrow Airport and on how such expansion would affect Elmbridge residents, its environment and the local economy. The Task Group have met a total of eight times since January 2016 (Jan, Feb, March, April, August, Sept x3).

2. **FULL REPORT**

2.1. A summary of the main arguments in relation to the proposed expansion at LHR obtained by the Task Group is set out below in relation to the respective impacts:
Economic:

2.2. The Elmbridge Business Leaders Board meets twice a year and it includes companies such as Proctor & Gamble, Dairy Crest, Keltbray Engineering, PRP architects and Sandown Park. There is strong support for new enabling infrastructure and expansion at LHR. Connectivity and access to the airport is key for most businesses such as Air Products at Hersham Technology Park.

2.3. The proposed LHR expansion was also discussed at the September Elmbridge Business Network meeting. It was noted that there is support from a business perspective subject to the right infrastructure but as local residents there is concern about the environmental concerns and need for appropriate mitigation against noise issues, air pollution and congestion.

2.4. The Surrey County Council Infrastructure study highlighted a £161m infrastructure funding gap to 2030. However, this figure is believed by some to be far higher. The right business infrastructure is vital to support the existing business base across road, rail, air and colleges such as Brooklands and Hersham Place Technology Park.

2.5. The current location of many Surrey based firms is undoubtedly a result of their relative proximity to LHR. Overall LHR and LGW facilitate 3.4% (19,000) of jobs for the economically active in Surrey (550,000). This increases to some 15% (75-80,000 jobs) once the Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) impacts are taken into account. Notably, 1100 (1.1%) directly/indirectly induced jobs in Elmbridge is from LHR and LGW.

2.6. Notably, there could be 16000 jobs lost with a potential mid to long term risk of relocation once LHR and LGW reach capacity. Conversely, it is predicted that there could be 19000 additional jobs across Surrey by 2030 with a third Heathrow runway. Furthermore, the FDI impact of LGW is less pronounced compared with LHR.

2.7. There is a clear link between large internationally owned and linked firms to proximity to LHR as 80% of foreign direct investment comes from existing firms. A Surrey County Council study estimates a ratio of 3.0 to 3.5 jobs per direct/indirect airport job so (1100 jobs linked to LHR/LGW) potential medium/long term risk to 3,300-3,850 jobs linked to firms located in the Borough because of access to LHR and LGW.

2.8. There is already uncertainty caused by Brexit undermining confidence in future in UK PLC (Feedback from international firms at the Elmbridge Business Leaders Board that overseas owners have asked for a rolling re-evaluation of business sites every 12-18 months to assess any impact of Brexit). New businesses not linked to the airport will emerge in the longer term but they may not have the scale or value of current business base.

2.9. There is no doubt of the critical role that LGW and LHR play in Surrey’s economic success. However, there is concern around issues such as noise, traffic, road/rail investment and air quality. Expansion at either airport would require the environmental and surface access issues to be addressed.
2.10. RAGE made the Task Group aware of a letter sent from the HM Treasury Chair to the Chancellor (See further information). It raises questions regarding the wider impact on the economy of the proposed expansion and the lack of robustness underlying the economic analysis in the Davies report.

2.11. In conclusion, the proximity of Heathrow to Elmbridge has a beneficial effect on the local economy through job creation, business location and expansion. The evidence received appeared to show that it is a key factor in driving new developments and deals in the Borough; for example, at Hersham Technology Park and Brooklands Business Park.

2.12. The economic benefit of LHR expansion to Elmbridge presents the strongest argument in favour of Elmbridge supporting expansion.

Surface transport Infrastructure:

2.13. Heathrow proposes significant investment in surface transport infrastructure if expansion is approved, although it should be recognised that the cost of some of these developments and who funds them along with the timeframe for their implementation are not clear.

2.14. Improvements in rail connectivity to LHR and for the South West Quadrant of the M25 could help to ease traffic flow in parts of Elmbridge whilst also providing convenient and environmentally friendly links to the airport for those who live, work or visit Elmbridge.

2.15. Notably, there are 66% more cars than the national average on Surrey A-roads which resulted in £550 million per annum in congestion costs across Surrey. Areas that suffer congestion at peak times are Brooklands and Seven Hills Road. LHR argue that there will be no more airport related traffic on the roads with expansion than there is today. However, this is hard to believe with an increase of 250,000 extra flights predicted for passengers and staff and a 50% increase in freight.

2.16. A recent FOI request from LAANC to the DfT revealed an increase in 2 million private car and taxi/minicab journeys alone from 2013 to 2014 rising to 27 million (an increase of nearly 10%).

2.17. As part of the infrastructure improvements, HAL informed the Task Group that they would improve rail links to Heathrow at Clapham Junction, Woking, Weybridge and Guildford. The aim of HAL is to put Heathrow at the heart of the rail network.

2.18. HAL informed the Task Group about their proposals to work in partnership with transport providers to create efficient modes of transport for employees commuting to the airport and for passengers. Ideas such as electric taxis and guaranteed full return trips. Other proposals such as subsidised travel for employees are currently being discussed but such schemes have not been public.
2.19. A tunnel is due to be built between junctions 12 and 13 of the M25 as part of the proposed airport expansion. Heathrow say this will not affect traffic flow during the construction phase. The Task Group felt that this may be different in reality and therefore have knock on effects on the areas of Esher and Weybridge, amongst others.

2.20. In conclusion, further growth of LHR is conditional upon substantial investment in local and regional access and the provision of major rail investment, linking the airport with the Midlands, the West and the South, in addition to London. Greater clarity on the surface transport infrastructure proposals are required in order to see how it all fits together with the expansion.

**Air quality:**

2.21. Notably, there is no official or clear modelling of air quality when operating three runways at LHR. The Task Group were asked by LAANC to note that spending £24m and 3 years of technical reports and assessments, the Government were left in the position of not being able to have any confidence that LHR could be expanded and air quality compliance would not be at risk.

2.22. It is not clear who will be responsible for monitoring air quality should expansion be approved.

2.23. It is acknowledged that tackling air quality is not the sole responsibility of the airport operator. It is the belief of HAL and other consultations that better traffic management and vehicle improvements will improve air quality around the airport rather than the airport itself. It is not clear if Heathrow is the main contributor to air quality issues in the surrounding area.

2.24. It should be noted that meeting the EU limits for NO2 at LHR will be challenging, even without the addition of a third runway at the airport. This was noted in a report by the South East Region Air Services Consultation in 2002.

2.25. In the Air Quality Report, Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee, April 2016, the Task Group noted that “UK air pollution is a ‘public health emergency’. This should be considered when approving a third runway at LHR.

2.26. It is LAANC and RAGEs belief that before the Government makes its decision, it should make its own assessment of the likely costs of preventing an adverse impact on health from expansion at LHR and publish it.

2.27. Notably, LAANC made the Task Group aware of the first prospective case against the Government on the basis of a death caused by air pollution (See further information).

2.28. The Task Group are not currently aware of a plan which demonstrates that Heathrow can be expanded and remain within the EU air quality limits. However, it is argued by HAL that they are compliant now which is an observation based upon specific monitoring sites but LAANC and RAGE argue that this is not how compliance is assessed.
2.29. LAANC stated that the Government must establish clearly delineated responsibilities for meeting air quality limits before deciding to go ahead with the scheme.

2.30. The Task Group note that without the adequate infrastructure investment and technological improvements there is a substantial risk that air quality limits will be compromised.

2.31. As the Air Quality Plan to the EU demonstrates, air quality limits, even with the operation of the current two runway airport are not expected to be met until 2025; Had the previous 2009 decision been allowed to go ahead the runway would have been built and not able to be used.

2.32. The link between air quality and health impacts is a serious and important concern for local people and reassurance on the projections will be required if expansion is approved.

2.33. Heathrow evidence suggested that air quality projections were optimistic but they depend on technological progress and to a large extent on how the aircraft fleet will evolve.

2.34. In conclusion, there is a notable conflict between LAANC and Heathrow on the proposed expansion in regards to the current impact and future impact on air quality.

2.35. LAANC said that before the Government decides to go ahead with Heathrow expansion it should set out its assessment of what would be required in terms of infrastructure improvements, agreed responsibilities for funding and milestones for completion. The Government must make a binding commitment that Heathrow will fund the infrastructure improvements necessary to accommodate an expanded Heathrow.

Noise:

2.36. Discussions with Heathrow, LAANC and RAGE at the Task Group meetings have noise from aircraft from Heathrow above Molesey and Weybridge in particular as the current most serious and contentious issue in the Borough.

2.37. Expansion at LHR would allow up to 250,000 more aircraft movements a year. Due to unknown flight paths it is not possible to determine if complaints will increase. Future flight paths across Elmbridge could be re-considered if Elmbridge write to the Secretary of State in advance of the Aviation Policy Framework being agreed.

2.38. The validity of the assumption that noise only becomes a problem at values over 55 decibels should be considered as community sensitivity to noise may be lower than this. The Task Group note that from evidence provided by LAANC that tone, frequency and intensity of noise can be factors in community annoyance.
2.39. Although aircraft noise is a concern mainly to the East of the Borough, Heathrow and LAANC both stated that aircraft are becoming less noisy in their certification mode and that take-off gradients can reduce the impact of noise. It is further recognised that improved aircraft design and technology could further potentially reduce the impact of noise.

2.40. Furthermore, it is recognised that an impact of airport expansion will result in more aircraft movements across different flight paths within permitted limits. As a result, this will mean that the noise is spread across the East of the Borough, meaning lower ‘doses’ of noise for more people.

2.41. Taking the above into account, as Heathrow do not yet know the flight paths, it is not clear as to who in the Borough could be affected by noise. Moreover, there is no policy approach for precision navigation at Government or the Department of Transport which is technology likely to be used in the near future.

2.42. Notably, Heathrow airport self-regulate the noise from aircraft using the noise monitors on the ground. The collected information is public knowledge. It was agreed that should expansion be approved, both Heathrow, LAANC and the Task Group believe that noise should be independently monitored.

2.43. Should expansion go ahead, the impact of noise on the well-being of residents should be mitigated by an agreement with LHR to ensure noise performance targets are met and that restrictions on night-flights remain in place.

2.44. In addition, it is recognised that there are causal links between noise, sleep disturbance and ill health which require further study.

2.45. In conclusion, the impact of additional noise, as a result of LHR expansion, on Elmbridge presents the strongest case opposing the third runway proposal. Noise from aircraft currently affects residents and further noise from 250,000 additional flights with unknown flight paths that could be more concentrated with technology that looks at efficiency modelling is likely to increase the noise for more residents and those already affected. Notably, Heathrow airport self-regulate the noise from aircraft using the noise monitors on the ground. The collected information is public knowledge. It was agreed that should expansion be approved, both Heathrow, LAANC and the Task Group believe that noise should be independently monitored.

Housing:

2.46. The Airport Commission believe that additional 78,000 jobs created by the proposed expansion would be of significant value to London’s growing population. It is noted that several local authority areas around Heathrow have relatively high levels of unemployment (8.5% across the five local authorities closest to the airport – Spelthorne, Slough, Hounslow, Hillingdon and Ealing), suggesting that any new jobs created would boost the local economy. The economically active population in these five local authority
areas is forecast to grow by 100,000 by 2030 and in a wider group of 14 local authorities in the surrounding area by 160,000, more than twice the number of new jobs forecast to be generated. As such, a high proportion of new jobs may be expected to be taken up by people living in the areas and the additional capacity is not expected to result in an insurmountable requirement for extra housing.

2.47. The Local Economy Impact Assessment for the Heathrow options encompassed fourteen local authorities, with a particular focus on the five aforementioned areas with the strongest connection to the airport in terms of employment and business. It is noted that the assessment area does not extend to Elmbridge and in housing terms, the justification for concentrating on these fourteen is that the greatest focus should be on those local authorities with a high proportion of direct and indirect airport employees currently.

2.48. In terms of Elmbridge, the “Heathrow: On-Airport Employment Survey, 2008/09”, reported that 807 Elmbridge residents were employed at Heathrow, equating to 1.1% of the overall Heathrow workforce of 73,436. Overall Elmbridge had the fifteenth highest number of residents employed there. This confirms that the relationship between Elmbridge as a place to live and Heathrow as a place to work is comparatively weak.

2.49. The range of forecasts put to the Airport Commission in the initial Local Economy Impacts: Assessment published in November 2014, coupled with the feedback generated from the subsequent consultation, led to the Commission undertaking further analysis, which was published alongside the final report. This suggested that the favoured scheme would generate a theoretical maximum additional demand for housing in 2030 of around 48,000 homes across the assessment area but that in reality, the level of additional demand would be much smaller due to the potential for new jobs to be taken up by people already living in the area. The final report does not suggest that this number of homes would need to be built to enable airport expansion, but demonstrates that this level of additional housing is deliverable. It is recognised that housing would be delivered over several years as the airport builds up its capacity. Demand for additional housing may be spread over a large number of local authorities and would only be a percentage of the overall demand for new housing in the region.

2.50. Both the final report and the supporting documentation refer to the ability to increase housing densities in local authorities close to the airport and also make the point that improvement to transport infrastructure, including Crossrail, should reduce commuting times and increase the catchment area from where the labour-force can commute from and bring parts of East London to within a journey time of 45 minutes from the airport. Neither point really applies to Elmbridge.

2.51. In reality, any expansion of Heathrow and the associated growth in employment would almost certainly lead to an increase in the number of Elmbridge residents employed at the airport (or in related sectors). However,
as described the relationship between the two areas are weak and the Elmbridge housing market is markedly different from those operating closer to Heathrow and the type and cost of housing that might be needed for those employed in or around the airport does not match well with the costs and types of housing here now and what is likely to be developed in the future.

2.52. Taking the above into account, coupled with relatively poor transport connections between the two areas, is likely to limit the direct impact of any expansion to Heathrow on Elmbridge, in terms of housing and infrastructure requirements. For the same reasons, it is suggested that it is unlikely that an expansion of Heathrow and the increased demand for housing that would result would directly lead to increases in the costs of buying or renting in Elmbridge.

2.53. All the options would necessitate the demolition of housing, to accommodate both the expanded airfield and the associated transport links. The housing loss associated with the Northwest Runway Scheme is estimated at 783 residential properties lost, compared to the 242 for the Extended Northern Runway Scheme and 167 for the Gatwick scheme. Whilst obviously hugely significant to the communities concerned, it would not directly affect Elmbridge residents.

2.54. For the Northwest Runway Scheme, Heathrow Airport Limited has proposed to extend its 125% plus reasonable costs offer beyond the immediate CPO zone to assist those residents who may be prevented from selling their homes whilst the airport development is going through the planning and construction phases. It is understood that this would be extended to a number of communities covering up to 3750 households in the likes of Poyle and Sipson (and other settlements to the north and west of the airport). Under this voluntary scheme, residents accepting the offer would sell their home, which would then be fully noise insulated and then made available for resale. Again, this scheme would not be of relevance to Elmbridge or its residents.

2.55. Heathrow Airport Limited has proposed to invest £700m in noise insulation, with over 160,000 households potentially eligible for assistance, should the Northwest Runway Scheme be approved. The scheme would cover an area based on the 55 decibel noise contour. There would be two zones, with homes in the designated zone closest to the airport with higher levels of noise having the full costs of their noise insulation covered by the airport. In addition, up to £3,000 in noise insulation would be offered to homes further away from the airport. The package could include acoustic double glazing in windows; ceiling overboarding in bedrooms and loft insulation and ventilation. The press release in which the offer was outlined refers to households benefiting from Windsor in the west to Richmond in the east, but there is no explicit reference to settlements in Elmbridge benefiting. The release goes onto say that the final number and location of these homes would be dependent on the design of routes around an expanded Heathrow and actual level of noise measured. As such, it is not clear, whether Elmbridge residents would benefit from any noise insulation scheme.
2.56. In conclusion, based on a review of the key elements of the Airport Commission’s Final report and some of the supporting technical documents which it considered, along with selected other materials produced on or behalf of Heathrow Airport itself, it does appear that the housing impacts for Elmbridge and its residents are limited—particularly in terms of issues such as additional housing requirements and demand for related infrastructure.

2.57. Furthermore, with regard to airport expansion on housing in Elmbridge, from the research conducted and input from housing representatives, it is unlikely that the housing requirements at Heathrow will have a significant impact in the Borough.

Gatwick:

2.58. Having heard the case for Gatwick, it is recognised that traffic, pollution and noise from a second runway at Gatwick would likely have a minimal impact on Elmbridge. Although, Elmbridge residents and businesses may welcome increased connectivity, it was agreed that there are probably few significant benefits for Elmbridge to a second runway at Gatwick.

Residents' views:

2.59. Populus surveyed 1000 Elmbridge residents in January 2016 and found that 54% felt positively about LHR expansion, whereas 8% were negative. 45% supported expansion at LHR whereas 34% opposed. In comparing the same study conducted in other areas affected by expansion, Elmbridge is placed in the 'middle of the pack' in terms of feelings regarding expansion (Annex A).

2.60. Elmbridge Borough Council undertook an online survey on its website between the 5th and 30th of September 2016. At the time of submitting this report, there have been 836 respondents, of which 57% are opposed to the proposed expansion and 43% are in favour of the proposed expansion at LHR (Annex B).

Other:

2.61. The Lakeside Energy from Waste (EFW) facility at Colnbrook near Slough processes waste from local businesses and a number of local authorities including Surrey Waste Partnership. The facility is situated on the site of the proposed third runway at Heathrow Airport and therefore would have to be demolished in the event that the Government gives the green light to the Airport’s expansion. The company believes that were this to happen it is essential that a like-for-like replacement is built close to the existing site. Members may wish to look at this in further detail.

Should Elmbridge consider making a position statement?

2.62. Heathrow Airport Limited is keen for local authorities to make public statements in favour of expansion, in the hope that such statements will bolster its case with the Government. By way of encouragement, Heathrow is
making a package of mitigations available to councils which agree to make such statements. Spelthorne and Slough Borough Councils have already come to such an agreement with Heathrow (See further information). Whereas Surrey County Council has made a statement of the expansion (See further information).

2.63. Such statements are more valuable to Heathrow if they are made early in the Government’s consideration and would attract a better package of incentives. By contrast, a statement made close to the Government’s announcement would be unlikely to attract any incentives. A meeting was held in April 2016 between representatives of HAL and Elmbridge Borough Council in which possible mitigations which could be considered were discussed but no conclusions were reached. HAL have indicated they would be happy to reopen these discussions with Elmbridge Borough Council. At the time of writing this report, this option is unlikely to be on the table come a decision by Elmbridge. Nonetheless, Elmbridge should aim to create a strategic partnership with Heathrow in the future.

2.64. At the time of writing this report, Government are still considering their decision on airport expansion, Elmbridge should consider what the ‘ask’ could or should be. However, this may not be an option should a decision be made at the time of reviewing this report. Examples for Elmbridge could include:

- Apprenticeships for young people
- Subsidised bus services
- Business masterclasses
- Form a strategic partnership to address council objectives

2.65. If the Committee decides that the Council should make a statement in favour of expansion, we could then explore with HAL what mitigations they may be able to offer Elmbridge.

Conclusion:

Based on the evidence gathered, the Task and Finish Group offer two responses for the position statement: one in favour and one in opposition to the proposed expansion at LHR:

Position 1:

Elmbridge Borough Council recognises the economic importance of the proximity of the Airport to the Borough. Elmbridge supports the principle of expansion at LHR, on the provisos that;

i) environmental targets for noise and air quality, are met.
ii) a noise envelope is negotiated specifically for Elmbridge; and
iii) air quality and noise are respectively independently monitored.

Or:
Elmbridge opposes expansion of a LHR, as happened in 2002 and 2008, based on the following:

i) the impacts of aircraft noise on Elmbridge already affect the quality of life for residents and a third runway could aggravate this.

ii) air quality targets are breached currently and there is limited assurance that air quality limits can be met with the addition of a third runway.

iii) uncertainty of how many residents will be affected by unknown flight paths, frequencies, heights and stacking arrangements.

iv) it is not clear how the surface transport infrastructure proposals will mitigate the impact on the already congested road network in and around the Borough.

3. WAY FORWARD:

3.1. Members attend the available forums to hold LHR to account on the environmental impacts of aircraft overflying the Borough. This could be supported by the Council re-joining LAANC.

3.2. That the Council write to the Secretary of State to express involvement in the Community Engagement Board so that Elmbridge can be part of the collective when discussing the aviation policy framework. This will help to ensure that the Secretary of State is clear that Elmbridge wish to be involved when the framework is set out. This can also be copied to the Department of Transport.

3.3. That the Council Leader and Chief Executive hold regular meetings with LHR to form a strategic partnership to help achieve the Council objectives.

Further information:


Surrey County Council:
http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/q3236/Printed%20minutes%20Tuesday%202016-Jul-2013%20%30%20Council.pdf?T=1

11 London Borough Councils statement:
http://www.richmond.gov.uk/london uniting behind gatwick as 11 councils urge the prime minister to back expansion

Elmbridge BC Press Release w/c 5th September 2016:
http://www.elmbridge.gov.uk/news/proposed-heathrow-expansion/

Elmbridge BC Press Release w/c 19th September 2016:


Surrey Airports Commission Response airport:


Slough Borough Council: https://your.heathrow.com/takingbritainfurther/local-council-slough-announces-support-heathrow/

Air pollution case: http://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/jun/05/mother-inquiry-air-pollution-daughter-asthma-death

**Background papers:**
None

**Enclosures/Appendices:**
Annex A: Populus Survey Results
Annex B: Elmbridge SNAP Survey Results: 5-30 September.
Annex C: Airport Commission 11 conditions.
Annex D: Task and Finish Group Members

**Financial implications**
There are no financial implications at this time.

**Environmental implications**
Environmental implications are noted above.

**Legal implications**
There are no legal implications at this time.

**Equality implications**
There are no equality implications at this time.

**Risk management implications**
There are no risk management implications at this time.
Community Safety implications
There are no community safety implications at this time.

Contact details:
Nicholas Martin,
Policy Officer (Partnerships)
01372 474399
nmartin@elmbridge.gov.uk

Natalie Anderson
Head of Organisational Development
01372 474111
nanderson@elmbridge.gov.uk