

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| PROPOSAL TITLE: | London Britannia Airport | Short Term | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SUBMITTED BY: | TESTRAD | Medium/Long Term | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

PROPOSAL

New five (expandable to six) runway airport on a purpose-built island off the north Kent coast. On opening of the new airport Heathrow would be closed and its site redeveloped, with the realised value offsetting the cost of construction of the new airport. Constructed on 15 km by 6 km reclaimed land platform with option to expand to 6 runways. Runways, of unspecified length, aligned E/W. Triple independent approaches with dual independent departures or vice-versa.

High speed rail link to an Origin and Destination (O&D) Terminal located at Ebbsfleet. O&D Terminal connected to the M2, HS1, HS2 and Crossrail. Requires all supporting infrastructure (road and rail links, utilities, etc), plus settlements (with their supporting infrastructure) to accommodate direct and indirect employees to be constructed.



INITIAL ASSESSMENT COMMENT

Developed submission setting out in limited detail proposals for delivery of the scheme. Although novel, the runway configuration appears deliverable. However operation of the shore based central terminal concept appears more complex.

The reclaimed land platform location implies substantial development costs in addition to surface transport investment (including long connections from shore-based passenger terminals to island airside terminal).

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| PROPOSAL TITLE: | London Britannia Airport | Short Term | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SUBMITTED BY: | TESTRAD | Medium/Long Term | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

OVERVIEW

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Proposal | <u>New 5 runway hub airport on a purpose built island off the north Kent coast, 50 miles from central London. Heathrow closed on opening and redeveloped, offsetting funding requirement.</u> | | |
| Approach | <u>Enabling legislation to be provided 2015-2020 with construction commencing in 2022; new airport opened and Heathrow closed by 2029.</u> Aside from enabling legislation, the mechanism by which Heathrow would be closed and the new airport developed is not clear. | Stated Capital Cost | <u>£47 bn</u> |
| Potential Benefits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Greater capacity than Heathrow, with the potential for further expansion (to a claimed 200+ mppa).</u> ▪ Unstated economic benefit, but references Frontier Economics' study for Heathrow, which claims £12.8bn NPV benefit in avoiding lost productivity and £20bn NPV in wider economic benefits ▪ <u>Promotes regeneration in Thames Gateway National Priority Area for Regeneration.</u> ▪ Away from current significant centres of population, therefore not creating a significant noise nuisance, whilst relieving those affected by Heathrow. ▪ Larger, more efficient configuration than Heathrow offers potential for a more resilient operation than Heathrow, able to operate over 24 hours, offering increased frequencies and/or destinations served. | Additional Capacity (mppa) Phase 1 : nil | Additional Capacity (ATM) Phase 1: nil |
| Key Issues & Risks | | | |
| Strategic Fit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although the first phase does not add to overall system capacity, the scheme establishes the basis for longer term expansion, providing additional capacity and specifically replacement hub capacity. Therefore the proposal appears to be broadly in line with the Commission's remit. | | |
| Economy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Given its distance from Heathrow existing businesses and workforce at Heathrow would be adversely impacted unless they are able to adjust to the new opportunities presented at the redeveloped site, or to relocate to the new location. ▪ Estimated redevelopment benefit of Heathrow (<u>£45bn</u>) is high by comparison with other submissions. | | |
| Surface Transport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Substantial investment required for new surface transport to serve location. <u>Promoter assumes a third Thames crossing is provided before opening.</u> ▪ Uncertain whether proposed rail and road enhancements can cater for the predicted level of demand and what measures will be implemented to achieve the 65% rail mode share target. | | |
| Environment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Significantly impacts on major sites of environmental designation. ▪ Would require appropriate assessment and demonstration of no alternative and overriding public interest plus large scale compensatory habitat creation. ▪ Risks to coastal and estuary processes: change to erosion/sedimentation and flooding. | | |
| People | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although health benefits likely to be occasioned for residents around Heathrow, removal of major employer could generate adverse impacts. | | |
| Cost | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unknown contingency allocation. ▪ Cost estimate excludes land acquisition, relocation of wind farm off-site and a number of consequential costs. £13bn included for surface transport, which appears to underestimate the potential cost. Including relocation of the wind farm, cost estimate may increase by £5-10 bn. | | |
| Operations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long airside transfers from shore-based passenger terminals to island terminal. ▪ Unproven and potentially challenging means of aircraft access from central terminal. ▪ Risk of bird strikes and Fog/low visibility conditions currently unknown. ▪ Impacts existing airspace with international cooperation required to resolve. | | |
| Delivery | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nature of reclaimed land platform poses increased risk of differential settlement. ▪ Relocation or removal of Kentish Flats Wind Farm required. ▪ The proposed first phase of development, providing a capacity of 90 mppa, only replaces Heathrow's lost capacity and would not itself add to system capacity. Later phases would increase capacity. ▪ Overall funding and financing strategy unclear but requirement for government funding / underwriting appears certain. Raises affordability and value for money questions. | | |
| Mitigations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Major compensatory habitat provision – some measures suggested locally or remotely but may be difficult to achieve. | | |