



<b>PROPOSAL TITLE:</b>	<b>London Heathrow Airport –7 Runways</b>	<b>Short Term</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>SUBMITTED BY:</b>	<b>Private Individual</b>	<b>Medium/Long Term</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## OVERVIEW

<b>Proposal</b>	High level scheme setting out the potential for seven runways, with third and fourth runways that appear to be proposed to the south of the existing airport and three cross-wind runways between these additional runways. Terminal and support facilities are provided between the new runways		
<b>Approach</b>	Although no detail is provided, it is assumed that the submitter is looking for Heathrow Airport Limited and/or the Government to develop the scheme.	<b>Assumed Capital Cost</b>	>£100 bn
<b>Potential Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unstated, but would be expected to deliver local and wider economic benefit.</li> <li>Unstated, but would be expected to provide increased resilience over current Heathrow operations.</li> </ul>	<b>Additional Capacity (mppa)</b>	90
		<b>Additional Capacity (ATM)</b>	530,000
<b>Key Issues &amp; Risks</b>			
<b>Strategic Fit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the objective to create additional capacity and enhance the UK's hub status, but with very significant impacts on the communities located to the south of Heathrow.</li> </ul>		
<b>Economy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal would provide a significant increase in capacity at the UK's main hub airport. This could have valuable connectivity benefits, but could also affect competition in the London airport system.</li> </ul>		
<b>Surface Transport</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant upgrades required to support growth.</li> </ul>		
<b>Environment</b>	<p>Though not quantified, the proposal could be expected to have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of areas of designated land and of listed buildings.</li> <li>Large number of residential demolitions required.</li> <li>Large and increased population affected by noise and air quality.</li> <li>Mitigation and/or compensation required to ensure Water Framework Directive and flood risk storage requirements are met.</li> <li>Impacts on the reservoirs southwest of the airport, which given their environmental designation, would require appropriate assessment and demonstration of no alternative and overriding public interest plus compensatory habitat creation. However, this may be more deliverable than for other schemes affecting similar, but perhaps more unique habitats in the Thames Estuary.</li> </ul>		
<b>People</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant loss of communities.</li> <li>Increased pressure on local housing and services.</li> </ul>		
<b>Cost</b>	<p>Not quantified by the proposal however, it is likely that the scheme could have costs as a result of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of proposal.</li> <li>Displacement of affected communities.</li> <li>Need for relocation of infrastructure.</li> <li>High surface access costs.</li> <li>Complexity of construction.</li> </ul>		
<b>Operations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although presenting seven runways, only four could be used concurrently</li> </ul>		
<b>Delivery</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regulatory modifications likely to be required.</li> <li>Government support funding plus potential debt underwriting needed to support financeability / viability.</li> <li>Government support requirement raises issue re affordability and value for money.</li> <li>Effects on aero charges etc may render the airport uncompetitive in a European market.</li> </ul>		