



# WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

A Meeting of an **INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION** will be held in SF1 - Civic Offices on **MONDAY 26 MARCH 2018 AT 3.30 PM**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Manjeet Gill'.

Manjeet Gill  
Interim Chief Executive  
Published on 16 March 2018

This meeting may be filmed for inclusion on the Council's website.

Please note that other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting. The use of these images or recordings is not under the Council's control.



# **WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **Our Vision**

A great place to live, an even better place to do business

## **Our Priorities**

Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential

Invest in regenerating towns and villages, support social and economic prosperity, whilst encouraging business growth

Ensure strong sustainable communities that are vibrant and supported by well designed development

Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough

Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services

## **The Underpinning Principles**

Offer excellent value for your Council Tax

Provide affordable homes

Look after the vulnerable

Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life

Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency

Deliver quality in all that we do

**For consideration by**

**David Lee, Executive Members for Strategic Highways and Planning**

**Officers Present**

**Tom Beck, Senior Planner**

**Luciane Bowker, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist**

<b>IMD NO.</b>	<b>WARD</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>	
IMD 2018/15	None Specific	<b>HEATHROW EXPANSION AND AIRSPACE CONSULTATION</b>	<b>5 - 20</b>

**CONTACT OFFICER**

**Luciane Bowker**

**Tel**

**Email**

**Postal Address**

Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

0118 974 6091

Luciane.bowker@wokingham.gov.uk

Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item IMD18

## INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION

REFERENCE IMD: 2018/15

<b>TITLE</b>	Heathrow Expansion and Airspace consultation
<b>DECISION TO BE MADE BY</b>	Executive Member of Strategic Highways and Planning - David Lee
<b>DATE, MEETING ROOM and TIME</b>	15:30 hours 26th March Shute End SF1
<b>WARD</b>	None Specific;
<b>DIRECTOR</b>	Interim Director of Environment - Josie Wragg

### **OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY**

Heathrow is a major employer within the Thames Valley and the economy and residents of Wokingham Borough currently benefit from being in proximity to this major driver of economic activity. Expansion of the airport will provide new economic opportunities for our residents. The expansion is likely to have a modest impact on residents living in Wokingham Borough.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Executive Member for Highways and Transport

Notes the contents of the contents of the report on Noise and Expansion:

- Approves the response to the HAL (Heathrow Airport Limited) consultation as detailed in this report (appendix 1) and
- Authorises officers to return the response to HAL on behalf of Wokingham Borough Council

### **SUMMARY OF REPORT**

The two consultations are being undertaken by Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL), the airports owners, not government, in preparation for the application for the Development Consent Order (DCO) needed to deliver the 3rd runway.

The first consultation asks questions around the purposed reorganisation of the 'space' around the airport and considers sustainability and surface access. The second consultation is shorter and discusses of the principles of airspace, navigation and the impacts of noise.

The impact of both on Wokingham Borough appear to be relatively minor, but we are overflowed by aircraft using Heathrow and we have a direct interest in surface access. Therefore, the council's response will reflect the nature of questions asked.

## **Background & Analysis of Issues**

In July 2015, Sir Howard Davies produced a report concluding that expansion of Heathrow Airport would create a greater economic benefit to the UK economy rather than at Gatwick or the development of new airport in the Thames estuary. Last year Government published its Aviation National Policy Statement giving an unequivocal view that additional runway capacity in the south east of England should be provided at Heathrow. Since then Heathrow Airports Limited (HAL) have been working with partners to develop plans to promote a new runway and the Development Consent Order (DCO) needed to achieve this.

The proposed development of Heathrow will include a new runway to the north west the existing airport, which will require the compulsory purchase of approximately 750 homes and significant re-modelling of the highways network. This include bridging the M25 while keeping the motorway operational.

Although Wokingham Borough has no comment on how the work will be undertaken or on the new highways layout feeding the airport, we are concerned about surface access. An aspiration of the HAL is to make up to 50% of journeys to the airport sustainable by 2030. At present people travelling to the airport from London have a choice of rail, tube or bus. Travellers to the west of the airport do not have many options other than using cars. This could significantly change with the delivery of Western Rail Link to Heathrow and, in the long-term, a southern rail access via Staines serving parts of Surrey. Wokingham Borough Council has made comments supporting the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership's (LEP's) position of the North Western runway option and the need to deliver Western Rail Link to Heathrow by 2024.

The issues of noise and flight paths are a more complex and the necessary documents are attached to this briefing paper as web links, this contains Guide to WebTAG Noise Appraisal for non-expert. The issue of aircraft noise is perceived by a number of residents to affect Wokingham Borough even though our closest point is 23km from the airport and aircraft using Heathrow over they are over 3000ft high registering less noise than the prescribed 56db limit contour where noise mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

Plans to change the way that air space is used or modernisation of air space is considered in this consultation process but only the basic principles that may be followed such as overflying settlements rather than open spaces. Our response to the HAL consultation reflects this.

A full copy of the recommended response can be found in Appendix 1 to this report.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION**

***The Council faces severe financial challenges over the coming years as a result of the austerity measures implemented by the Government and subsequent reductions***

**to public sector funding. It is estimated that Wokingham Borough Council will be required to make budget reductions in excess of £20m over the next three years and all Executive decisions should be made in this context.**

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	nil	nil	nil
Next Financial Year (Year 2)	nil	nil	nil
Following Financial Year (Year 3)	nil	nil	nil

<b>Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision</b>
N/A

<b>Cross-Council Implications</b>
N/A

<b>SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES</b>	
<b>Director – Corporate Services</b>	None received
<b>Monitoring Officer</b>	None received
<b>Leader of the Council</b>	None received

<b>List of Background Papers</b>
<p>Full details of the consultation can be found at the following location:  <a href="https://www.heathrowconsultation.com/">https://www.heathrowconsultation.com/</a></p> <p>Expansion consultation booklet:  <a href="https://www.heathrowconsultation.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Expansion-Consultation-Document.pdf">https://www.heathrowconsultation.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Expansion-Consultation-Document.pdf</a></p> <p>Expansions consultation questions:  <a href="https://surveys.ipsosinteractive.com/mrlWeb/mrlWeb.dll">https://surveys.ipsosinteractive.com/mrlWeb/mrlWeb.dll</a></p> <p>Airspace consultation booklet:  <a href="https://www.heathrowconsultation.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/2755-HRW-3R-AIR-Principles-booklet-WEB.pdf">https://www.heathrowconsultation.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/2755-HRW-3R-AIR-Principles-booklet-WEB.pdf</a></p> <p>Airspace consultation questions:  <a href="https://surveys.ipsosinteractive.com/mrlWeb/mrlWeb.dll">https://surveys.ipsosinteractive.com/mrlWeb/mrlWeb.dll</a></p> <p>Guide to WebTAG Noise Appraisal for non-experts  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/669423/webtag-for-non-experts.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/669423/webtag-for-non-experts.pdf</a></p> <p>WBC Response to Expansion Consultation</p> <p>WBC Response to Airspace Consultation</p>

--

<b>Contact</b> Tom Beck	<b>Service</b> Place
<b>Telephone No</b> Tel: 0118 974 6300	<b>E-mail:</b> tom.beck@wokingham.gov.uk



**1a. Please tell us what you think about Heathrow's plans to expand the airport.**

Wokingham Borough Council acknowledges that the proximity of Heathrow Airport is an essential factor in driving economic growth in the Thames Valley. Consequently we endorse the view of the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership that expansion at Heathrow is essential to maintain economic activity in the Thames Valley cluster. We acknowledge the recommendation of the Airports Commission in its unequivocal view that Heathrow should be expanded supported by the Government's National Aviation Policy Statement of 2017 again recommending expansion at Heathrow using the NW runway option. As Heathrow expands consideration will be required with respect to the pressure for Housing and associated infrastructure required in the Borough and the importance of good surface access (see response to 5g.).

**2a. Please tell us what you think about the options for the new runway.**

No direct effect on this Council but a runway of 3,500m would permit maximum flexibility and respite

**2b. What factors do you think should be important in fixing the precise location and length of the runway?**

No direct effect on this Council.

**2c. What factors do you think should be important in locating new terminal and apron space?**

We agree that apron space needs to be primarily between the runways together with any required satellite terminal facilities. We consider that any new terminal should be co-located with Terminal 5 as far as is practical and further use made of Terminal 2, perhaps with another satellite to maximise their accessibility from the existing rail facilities under these main terminals.

**2d. What factors do you think should be important in deciding the location of new taxiways?**

This is an operational matter on which we do not feel competent to comment apart from observing that aircraft taxiing should be minimised as far as is practical to reduce aircraft noise and emissions

**3a. Please tell us what you think about the re-positioning of the M25.**

We support the proposal to re-locate the M25 about 150m to the west for the reasons given in the consultation document together with bridging the motorway for runway construction. It is essential to minimise the impact on traffic flow on the M25 during these works.

**3b. Please tell us which family of options you prefer for the alterations to Junctions 14 and 14a and the reasons why.**

This council expresses no view

**3c. Please tell us which option you prefer for the diversion of the A4 and the reasons why.**

This council expresses no view

**3d. Please tell us which option you prefer for the diversion of the A3044 and the reasons why.**

This council expresses no view

**3e. Please tell us which option you prefer for the Stanwell Moor junction and the reasons why.**

This council expresses no view

**3f. Please tell us what you think about the options to improve access to the Central Terminal Area.**

We favour Option S6 as the design would be optimised as a passenger road link

**3g. Please tell us what you think about the options for the diversion of rivers and the approaches to replacement flood storage.**

This council expresses no view

**4a. Please tell us what you think about the locations and sites that we have identified as being potentially suitable for airport supporting facilities.**

This council expresses no view

**4b. Please tell us what you think about our approach to providing car parking and the potential site options we have identified.**

We consider that Heathrow's current thinking on this is the correct approach

**4c. Do you have any comments on the land uses that will be affected by Heathrow's expansion.**

This council expresses no view

**4d. Please tell us what you think about the sites identified for the relocation of the Immigration Removal Centres, if you have a preference please tell us why.**

This council expresses no view

**4e. Please tell us what you think about the locations and sites that we have identified as being potentially suitable for airport related development.**

This council expresses no view

**4f. Do you have any views on how the demand for additional airport related development such as hotels and offices might best be delivered?**

This council expresses no view

**4g. Please tell us how you think we should best bring the various components together to build our masterplan for the expansion of the airport and what factors you think should be most important in our decision-making.**

This council expresses no view

**4h. Please tell us what you think about the sites we have identified as potential construction sites, and the approaches we are considering to manage the effects of construction.**

We consider that the principles outlined in the consultation document to be sound and will help to minimise additional construction traffic for the site

**5a. Please tell us what you think about our Property Policies.**

No views

**5b. A noise envelope is a package of measures that can be used to reduce noise. Please tell us your views on the objectives of the noise envelope and the timeline for its development.**

Wokingham Borough Council acknowledges that a number of its residents consider that they are affected by aircraft noise, mainly from aircraft inbound or outbound from Heathrow (even though they are at least 23km from Heathrow) although there is also noise from other aircraft travelling in uncontrolled airspace. We are aware that modern aircraft are less noisy than even their immediate predecessors and that this process should be further encouraged by differential pricing of landing charges for noisier aircraft. We are aware of the work being done by Heathrow to minimise noise intrusion such as steeper glide angles. We consider that the measures described in the consultation document form a reasonable approach in addressing this subject

**5c. Is there anything further we should be considering to reduce noise?**

No views

**5d. Please tell us what you think about our suggested approach to the provision of respite.**

The principle factor affecting aircraft noise is wind direction and the prevailing winds normally give westerly operations at Heathrow minimising aircraft noise in the Borough. Easterly operations rarely last for extended periods therefore we see no requirement for formal respite measures.

**5e. Please tell us what you think of our proposals for noise insulation and phasing of delivery.**

No views

**5f. A 6.5 hour night flight ban on scheduled flights is required between 11pm and 7am. Our current preferred option for this is from 11pm to 5.30am. Please tell us when you think the night-flight ban should be scheduled and why.**

We agree that the night flight ban should be from 11pm to 5.30am as that offers the best compromise for our residents

**5g. Please tell us what you think about the priorities and initiatives we propose to use to develop our surface access strategy.**

We consider that enhanced surface access is essential to help relieve congestion on approach roads and, in particular, the motorways and to help air quality. We are conscious that currently many single flights in and out of Heathrow involve a car journey to drop off the passenger or to collect them all contributing to congestion.

We welcome the pledge that at least 50% of passengers will use public transport by 2030 and at least 55% by 2040. However, this raises 3 questions:

- What is public transport? Easy with trains, London Transport buses and National Express coaches but where is the line to be drawn between small mini-buses and people carrier type taxis carrying, say, a single passenger?
- How and by whom are usage figures to be measured?
- What happens if the stated levels of 50% by 2030 and 55% by 2040 are not reached?

We support the Thames Valley Berkshire LEP's view that Western Rail Link to Heathrow is its Number 1 infrastructure project and welcome the promise by Heathrow to "Provide a fair and reasonable contribution to the costs". We understand that Government has promised funding for this link 'subject to contributions from the aviation industry'. We hope that this promise for additional funding will allow the DCO to be applied for the construction of the rail link and that an opening date in 2024 can still be achieved.

We note the easy interchange at the proposed Old Oak Common station on HS2 but in no way, do we consider that this obviates the need for Western Rail Link.

We also note that Twyford Station, in the Borough, will have an increasingly important role for access to Heathrow as it will be connected to Heathrow by both Elizabeth Line and Western Rail Link services. Consideration should be given to mitigating any infrastructure requirements arising from the proposals as Twyford is the only station on the crossrail route which has not been proposed for improvement.

Heathrow should continue their commuter programme to reduce the numbers from their own workforce travelling to work by car.

**5h. Please tell us what you think about the options to use road-user charging to reduce emissions and to manage vehicular access to the airport.**

The aim has to be to make public transport attractive to use, reliable and comprehensive to form the transport mode of choice. Road pricing and drop off charges will not have a significant effect on business travellers where the charges will be added to expenses. However, for leisure travellers these charges will form part of the decision on transport mode. We see it inevitable that some form of road charging will be introduced at Heathrow (following the example at Stansted) to encourage the use of public transport and to help in improving air quality.

**5i. Please tell us what you think about the measures proposed to manage emissions. Are there any other measures that we should consider?**

No views

**5j. Do you have any comments on our approach to limiting carbon emissions from the design, construction and operation of an expanded Heathrow?**

We support the strategy outlined in the consultation document.

**5k. Please tell us what you think about our approach to natural environment issues.**

No views

**5l. Are there any opportunities that the expansion of Heathrow could provide to enhance the natural environment?**

No views

5m. Please tell us what you think about our approach to historic environment issues.

No views

6. Having considered everything you have read, do you have any further comments in relation to our proposals for the expansion of Heathrow?

No further comments

7. Please tell us your views on this consultation (for example, the information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any maps or plans, the web site and feedback form etc.).

No views



### Q1. Principle 1: Flight Paths

Please read pages 12 and 13 of the Airspace Consultation Document before answering this question.

Please select one of the options a-c, and provide any comments in the box below. A trade-off exists between these three principles and we would like to understand which principle you prefer.

When designing airspace, Heathrow should:

- a) Minimise the total number of people overflown, with flight paths designed to impact as few people as possible
- b) Minimise the number of people newly overflown, keeping flight paths close to where they are today, where possible **X – Wokingham Borough Council select option B**
- c) Share flight paths over a wider area, which might increase the total number of people overflown but would reduce the number of people most affected by the flight paths as the noise will be shared more equally

Please provide any comments you have on flight paths:

As a Local Authority near Heathrow, we consider that there is a finite possible routes and that these should basically follow existing flight paths to minimise complaints from people who perceive that they are being newly overflown. For example, there is a very limited variety of route available on glide paths prior to landing and the main nuisance is on easterly operations. Aircraft taking off at are higher altitudes by the time they fly over the Borough and are less of a problem.

### Q2. Principle 2: Urban and rural areas

Please read page 14 of the Airspace Consultation Document before answering this question.

Please select one of the options a-b, and provide any comments in the box below.

When designing airspace, Heathrow should:

- a) Prioritise routing aircraft over urban areas, recognising that urban areas have higher general noise levels
- b) Prioritise routing aircraft over rural areas where fewer people live **X – Wokingham Borough Council select option B**

Please provide any comments you have on overflight of urban or rural areas:

Where practical we suggest that aircraft should be routed over rural areas to minimise the number of residents affected by aircraft noise.

**Q3. Principle 3: Urban areas**

Please read page 15 of the Airspace Consultation Document before answering this question.  
Please select one of the options a-b, and provide any comments in the box below.

When designing airspace in urban areas, Heathrow should:

- a) Prioritise routing aircraft over parks and open spaces rather than residential areas
- b) Prioritise routing aircraft over residential areas, avoiding aircraft overflight of parks and open spaces **X – Wokingham Borough Council select option B**

Please provide any comments you have on parks and open spaces in urban areas:

Where practical we consider that aircraft should be routed over parks and open spaces to minimise noise nuisance in residential areas.

**Q4. Principle 4: Noise and emissions**

Please read page 16 of the Airspace Consultation Document before answering this question.  
Please select one of the options a-b, and provide any comments in the box below.

When designing airspace, Heathrow should:

- a) Design flight paths that prioritise the reduction of aircraft noise for local communities over those that reduce fuel burn and emissions\* **X – Wokingham Borough Council select option A**
- b) Design flight paths that prioritise a reduction in fuel burn and emissions\* over those that reduce noise for local communities

Please provide any comments you have on noise and emissions\*:

We consider that aircraft should minimise noise over local communities even if that entails a marginally longer route

**Q5. Principle 5: Technology and innovation**

Please read page 17 of the Airspace Consultation Document before providing any comments on the statement below.

In order to deliver any of these design principles, all aircraft will need to be equipped with the latest technology. We will not design flight paths to accommodate aircraft with older navigation technologies and there may be parts of the design where aircraft with the highest specification of navigation technology have an advantage.

Please provide any comments you have on technology and innovation:

We consider that Heathrow should be encouraging the use of the most modern aircraft at that airport, by differential landing charges if necessary, to ensure all aircraft using Heathrow are equipped with the latest navigational technology. In addition, such modern aircraft will be less noisy than even their immediate predecessors and more fuel efficient resulting in fewer emissions.

**Q6. Principle 6: Night flights**

Please read page 18 of the Airspace Consultation Document before providing your response to the question below.

Heathrow has made good progress over the last few years in reducing the number of late running flights that operate from the airport and, with expansion, we have committed to a six and a half hour ban on scheduled flights in the night period (sometime between 11pm and 7am).

However, some aircraft will need to use Heathrow late at night or early in the morning: what key principles should we apply to the design of flight paths for arrivals and departures during these times? (You may like to consider the design principle options set out in Questions 1-5).

We agree with Heathrow that the optimum 6 ½ hour period for a ban on scheduled flights should run from 11pm to 5.30am.

As far as principles are concerned, we consider the following:

- Insist on punctual operation. We accept that it may be a finely balanced argument as to whether a late running aircraft is allowed to depart after 11pm and the judgment may be that the least disruption will be caused by allowing that departure. But Heathrow will know which operators try to turn round aircraft on small margins and who are persistent offenders.

The same principles should apply to aircraft presenting themselves early for landing and early landings should only be allowed in extreme circumstance.

**Q7. Please provide any other comments you would like to make about our approach to airspace change, and let us know if there are any other design principles we should consider:**

No comment.

\*Note that emissions refer to those impacting climate change, not health.