

# Meeting of West Berkshire District Council

**Thursday 12 September 2019**

***Summons and Agenda***

---



WestBerkshire  
C O U N C I L

To: All Members of the Council

*You are requested to attend a meeting of*  
**WEST BERKSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
*to be held in the*  
**COUNCIL OFFICES, MARKET STREET,  
NEWBURY**

on

**Thursday 12 September 2019**  
**at 7.00pm**



Sarah Clarke  
Head of Legal and Strategic Support  
West Berkshire District Council

Date of despatch of Agenda: Wednesday 4 September 2019

---

## **AGENDA**

---

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To receive apologies for inability to attend the meeting (if any).

2. **CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS**

The Chairman to report on functions attended since the last meeting and other matters of interest to Members.

3. **MINUTES**

The Chairman to sign as a correct record the Minutes of the Council meeting held on 2 July 2019. **(Pages 9 - 16)**



**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

To remind Members of the need to record the existence and nature of any personal, disclosable pecuniary or other registrable interests in items on the agenda, in accordance with the Members' [Code of Conduct](#).

**5. PETITIONS**

Councillors may present any petition which they have received. These will normally be referred to the appropriate body without discussion.

**6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Members of the Executive to answer the following question submitted by a member of the public in accordance with the Council's Constitution:

**(a) Question to be answered by the Executive Member for Economic Development and Planning submitted by Mr Lee McDougall:**

*“Who will foot the bill for the Councils own estimates of costs of £1m (excluding land) to build a replacement step 5 facility to replace the community football ground in Faraday Road (should the Council eventually obtain planning permission to build flats on the site of the community football ground)?”*

**7. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES**

The Council to agree any changes to the membership of Committees.

**8. LICENSING COMMITTEE**

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of the Council, the Licensing Committee has not met.

**9. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of the Council, the Personnel Committee has not met.

**10. GOVERNANCE AND ETHICS COMMITTEE**

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of Council, the Governance and Ethics Committee met on 29 July 2019. Copies of the Minutes of this meeting can be obtained from Strategic Support or via the [Council's website](#).

**11. DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of the Council, the District Planning Committee met on 21 August 2019. Copies of the Minutes of this meeting can be obtained from Strategic Support or via the [Council's website](#).

**12. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION**

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of the Council, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission met on 9 July 2019. Copies of the Minutes of this meeting can be obtained from Strategic Support or via the [Council's website](#).

**13. JOINT PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE**

The Council is asked to note that since the last meeting of the Council, the Joint Public Protection Committee has not met.

**14. RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION AND MOTION ON HEATHROW EXPANSION (C3804)**

The purpose of the report is to:

- (i) respond to the motion submitted to the Council meeting on 2nd July 2019 relating to the expansion of Heathrow Airport, and
- (ii) set out a draft response to the current consultation on Heathrow expansion which is open from 18th June to 13th September 2019. **(Pages 17 - 52)**

**15. NOTICES OF MOTION**

- (a) **The following Motion has been submitted in the name of Councillor Lynne Doherty:**

**“This Council notes that 96% of councils across England do not have a formal Parental Leave Policy in place for elected members and considers that the lack of such a Policy may deter new or prospective parents, and particularly women, in standing for election in the first place and, if they are elected, could be a barrier to their fulfilling their role.**

Local Government is the cornerstone of our democracy; delivering services that people rely on and serving our communities. There is at present no right to parental leave for those in elected public office, but we should do all we can to encourage as wide as possible a range of candidates to stand for election. Improved provision for new parents should contribute towards increasing the diversity of experience, age and background of local authority councillors. It should also assist with retaining experienced councillors – particularly women – and making public office more accessible to individuals who might otherwise feel excluded from it.

An issue with introducing a Parental Leave Policy for Members is that a Member taking parental leave in accordance with the policy could find themselves in breach of s85(1), Local Government Act 1972 (“if a member of a Local Authority fails, throughout a period of six consecutive months from the date of their last attendance, to attend any meeting of the Authority they will, unless the failure was due to some good reason approved by the Authority before the expiry of

## Agenda - Council to be held on Thursday, 12 September 2019 (continued)

that period, cease to be a member of the Authority”).

It is therefore proposed that this Council agrees the following resolution with the intention of (a) introducing a Parental Leave Policy for Members in due course, (b) delegating to the Personnel Committee the ownership of the new policy, and (c) suspending the effect of s85(1) whilst a Member is taking parental leave.

**This Council resolves that** (a) the Personnel Committee shall be delegated with (i) the agreement and adoption of a Parental Leave Policy for Members and (ii) any subsequent amendments to it, (b) if a Member takes parental leave in accordance with the Policy once adopted the period of such parental leave (“the Period”) shall be treated as a good reason for the Member failing to attend any meeting or meetings during the Period for the purposes of section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972, and (c) the Monitoring Officer is authorised to approve such absences during the Period and to make any consequent amendments to the Council’s Constitution necessary.”

(b) **The following Motion has been submitted in the name of Councillor Lee Dillon:**

**“This Council notes:**

- The majority of West Berkshire Residents voted to remain in the referendum in 2016.
- That West Berkshire is projected to see a drop in GVA (Gross Value Added) of -2.3% in the event of a no deal Brexit\*
- That additional resources from Central Government to plan for a no deal Brexit locally have not been made available
- That a shrinking economy leads to lower tax revenues putting more strain on already underfunded public services.
- That on 12<sup>th</sup> August 2019 our local MP, Richard Benyon, put his name to a letter to the Prime Minister urging him to avoid a no deal Brexit.

**This Council therefore:**

- (1) Wishes to formally add its voice to those calling for a confirmatory referendum on the final Brexit outcome to be held while we remain members of the EU. The options in this referendum should be to leave the EU with whatever the Government’s specific plan is, or to remain in the EU on our current terms.
- (2) Will write to our 3 local MPs:
  - (a) note that we share Richard Benton MP’s alarm at the ‘Red Lines the Prime Minister has drawn’ which appear to make no deal the most

## Agenda - Council to be held on Thursday, 12 September 2019 (continued)

- likely Brexit outcome
  - (b) to express our concern about the expected negative economic impact of a no deal Brexit on West Berkshire
  - (c) urge them to do all they can to prevent a no deal Brexit
  - (d) urge them to join West Berkshire Council in supporting a confirmatory referendum to ensure explicit public support for the final course of action.
- (3) Will write to the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (No Deal Planning) to request additional resources to enable us to carry out a detailed impact study on our local economy in order to:
- (a) understand the full impact of a no deal Brexit on services run solely by West Berkshire Council.
  - (b) prepare a plan to mitigate/deal with the identified impacts”.

- (c) **The following Motion has been submitted in the name of Councillor Alan Macro:**

### **“Selection of Development Sites for the New Local Plan**

This council notes that sites to be allocated for development in past local plan documents have been selected by a task group meeting in private and, although the local plan documents were approved for submission and adoption by full Council, it proved not possible to change which sites were included. The decisions on which sites should be included in the local plan documents were therefore effectively taken behind closed doors.

Council therefore resolves that, in the interests of transparency and democracy, development sites to be included in the submitted new Local Plan should be selected in public. Local members, parish councils, the public and site promoters should have speaking rights similar to those at planning committees.”

- (d) **The following Motion has been submitted in the name of Councillor Alan Macro:**

### **“CO2 Emissions and Water Usage**

This council notes that it has declared a climate emergency and adopted a policy of achieving carbon neutrality by 2030. Given that private dwellings account for around 20% of carbon dioxide emissions, it is essential for measures to be urgently taken to reduce the emissions from new dwellings and extensions to be reduced by the maximum possible. This council also notes concerns by the Environment Agency and others about the effect of water abstraction on our watercourses and, particularly, on our chalk streams. Thames Water is classified as being under serious stress.

This council therefore resolves to draw up and adopt a Supplementary Planning



## Agenda - Council to be held on Thursday, 12 September 2019 (continued)

Document within six months requiring new dwellings and extensions to be built to standards requiring carbon dioxide emissions and water consumption to be minimised to the maximum extent consistent with government guidance.”

(e) **The following Motion has been submitted in the name of Councillor Lee Dillon:**

**“Re-open the Faraday Road Football Club Ground to its previous condition**

This Council notes:

- It served an eviction notice on the tenants of the Faraday Road Football site resulting in the site being vacant since June 2017
- That the Council was obligated to secure the site in its Development Agreement with St Modwen Developments Limited relating to the planned redevelopment of London Road Estate (LRE)
- That the Chief Executive of West Berkshire Council confirmed at a Newbury Vision meeting on that it would be 3 years before any works would be carried out on the site
- That the Council has foregone an income stream in rent since it evicted the tenants of the football club
- That the Executive of West Berkshire Council agreed on in December to allocate £88,000 secure the site following the eviction.
- That the Council allowed the removal of the football stand despite it being part of an Asset of Community Value (reg. number) and part of a protected local Sports Facility Cultural Facility registered by the Council in the Core Strategy
- That according to the Councils own planning policies Area Delivery Plan Policy 2 (ADPP2) and Core Strategy Policy 18 (CS18) the Ground is protected as a facility for organised football. In regard ADPP2 the Ground is identified on the CS proposals map as a cultural facility “sports stadium” and labelled on the Map as “Football Ground”. *“Existing community facilities will be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced. These include leisure and cultural facilities, which contribute to the attraction of the town for both residents and visitors. In regard CS18 (with added emphasis) “The District’s green infrastructure will be protected and enhanced ..... **Developments resulting in the loss of green infrastructure or harm to its use or enjoyment by the public will not be permitted. Where exceptionally it is agreed that an area of green infrastructure can be lost a new one of equal or greater size and standard will be required to be provided in an accessible location close by.**”* And supporting text para 5.124: *“For the purposes of this Core Strategy, green infrastructure is defined as: **Outdoor sports facilities (with natural or artificial surfaces, either publicly or privately owned) – including ..... sports pitches,.....**”* and para 5.129 *“Sporting provision ranges from established sports clubs with good facilities such as ..... **Newbury Town, Thatcham Town and Hungerford Town Football Clubs.....**”*



## Agenda - Council to be held on Thursday, 12 September 2019 (continued)

- That following the Court of Appeal declaring in November 2018 the Development Agreement with St Modwen “ineffective” the Council it has decided to reappraise LRE and is currently creating a development brief for the Estate.
- That the Councils Overview and Scrutiny Commission is currently undertaking a review of events that led to the decision by the Court of Appeal.

### Therefore Council resolves:

- To commission a report into the costs associated with re-opening the existing football ground to include the reinstatement of the stand.
- To proceed with formal agreement on a development brief for LIRE only after the conclusion of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission investigation into the previous actions relating to the project so that any recommendations and required changes to process and authorisations can be taken into consideration and actioned.”

## 16. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Members of the Executive to answer the following questions submitted by Councillors in accordance with the [Council's Constitution](#):

- (a) **Question to be answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside submitted by Councillor Phil Barnett:**

*“Now the new bus station in Newbury is fully operational what incentives are being offered by West Berkshire Council to the charter coach companies to break their journey and stop off in the town?”*

- (b) **Question to be answered by the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside submitted by Councillor Phil Barnett:**

*“Whilst welcoming the pot hole repair programme taking place at present, is the Executive Member for Highways expecting all recognised pot holes on classified roads to be filled in before the winter sets in?”*

If you require this information in a different format or translation, please contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045.



# Agenda Item 3.

## DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

## COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON

**TUESDAY, 2 JULY 2019**

**Councillors Present:** Adrian Abbs, Steve Ardagh-Walter, Peter Argyle, Phil Barnett, Jeff Beck, Dennis Benneyworth, Dominic Boeck, Graham Bridgman, Jeff Brooks, Jeff Cant, Hilary Cole, James Cole, Jeremy Cottam, Carolyn Culver, Lee Dillon, Lynne Doherty, Billy Drummond, Clive Hooker (Vice-Chairman), Gareth Hurley, Owen Jeffery, Rick Jones, Alan Law, Tony Linden, Royce Longton, Ross Mackinnon, Alan Macro, Thomas Marino, David Marsh, Steve Masters, Geoff Mayes, Andy Moore, Graham Pask (Chairman), Erik Pattenden, Claire Rowles, Garth Simpson, Richard Somner, Joanne Stewart, Martha Vickers, Tony Vickers, Andrew Williamson and Keith Woodhams

**Also Present:** John Ashworth (Corporate Director - Environment), Nick Carter (Chief Executive), Sarah Clarke (Head of Legal and Strategic Support), Martin Dunscombe (Communications Manager), Tess Ethelston (Group Executive (Cons)), Olivia Lewis (Group Executive (Lib Dem)), Ian Pearson (Head of Education Service), Shiraz Sheikh (Principal Solicitor), Stephen Chard (Principal Policy Officer) and Jo Watt (Member Services Officer)

**Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:** Councillor Nassar Kessell and Councillor Howard Woollaston

## PART I

### 25. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman reported that he and the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Clive Hooker, had attended a number of events since the last Council meeting. Highlights included the Roc10K race in Newbury, a Citizenship Ceremony, the RAF Welford D-Day 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Commemoration and the Lord Lieutenant 'at home'. The Chairman thanked the Vice-Chairman for his assistance.

### 26. Minutes

The Minutes of the meetings held on 5 March 2019, 21 May 2019, the Special meeting on the 21 May 2019 and the Special meeting on the 30 May 2019 were approved as true and correct records and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman drew Members' attention to a correction which should be noted in respect of a typographical error which appeared on page 174 of the full agenda pack of the 5 March 2019 Council meeting. The private hire operator fee (for 5-9 vehicles) should have read £892 and not £298 as shown in the papers.

### 27. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Keith Woodhams declared an interest in Agenda Item 15a (by virtue of the fact that his wife worked for the Regency Park Hotel, Thatcham) and reported that, as his interest was a personal interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Gareth Hurley declared an interest in Agenda Item 15d (by virtue of the fact that he worked for Network Rail) and reported that, as his interest was a personal interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

## COUNCIL - 2 JULY 2019 - MINUTES

### 28. **Petitions**

There were no petitions presented to the meeting.

### 29. **Public Questions**

There were no public questions received.

### 30. **Membership of Committees**

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor Lee Dillon and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks:

That the Council:

“agrees that Councillor Dillon would replace Councillor Nassar Kessell as a substitute on the Governance and Ethics Committee.”

The Motion was put to the meeting and duly **RESOLVED**.

### 31. **Licensing Committee**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Licensing Committee had met on 24 June 2019.

### 32. **Personnel Committee**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Personnel Committee had met on 28 June 2019.

### 33. **Governance and Ethics Committee**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Governance and Ethics Committee had met on 17 June 2019.

### 34. **District Planning Committee**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the District Planning Committee had not met.

### 35. **Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission had not met.

### 36. **Joint Public Protection Committee**

The Council noted that, since the last meeting, the Joint Public Protection Committee had met on 11 June 2019.

### 37. **Revised Statement of Community Involvement for the Local Plan (C3750)**

The Council considered a report (Agenda Item 14) which sought approval of the draft updated Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) for public consultation.

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor Hilary Cole and seconded by Councillor Alan Law:

That the Council resolves:

“to approve the draft updated SCI for public consultation”.

Councillor Hilary Cole outlined the report and stated that the SCI set out the policy for involving the community in the plan making process and the consideration of planning applications within the district. Councillor Hilary Cole explained that in accordance with

## COUNCIL - 2 JULY 2019 - MINUTES

the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2017, the SCI must be reviewed every five years. As the current SCI was published in September 2014, a review was now required.

Council noted that the current SCI worked well. Therefore, only minor changes would be necessary as a result of the review, mainly to take into account changes in legislation and national planning policies, and some other factual updates. A revised draft SCI (June 2019) was attached at Appendix D to the report.

Councillor Hilary Cole reported that the Council's approach to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) had not changed; it was now set out in the Council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. In addition, as the Council now offered a pre-application advice service for all planning applications, it was no longer necessary to have a separate section in the SCI on significant applications.

The consultation period for the review would take place over six weeks from 12<sup>th</sup> July to 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2019. The revised SCI, post taking account of consultation responses, would then be considered by Council in December 2019.

Councillor Tony Linden reported that the revised draft SCI (Appendix D) referred to Wokingham District Council rather than the correct title of Wokingham Borough Council. Councillor Alan Macro highlighted other inaccuracies and a proof read was necessary prior to the commencement of consultation.

Councillor Macro said that given that not all residents had access to the internet, planning documents should be available in libraries in hard copy for the public. Councillor Graham Bridgman made the point that internet access was available to members of the public in libraries rather than needing hard copies.

Councillor Tony Vickers said that he was happy to support the consultation. However, Councillor Vickers said he regretted some of the changes that had taken place since the last review which meant that not all documentation relevant to planning applications was available on the website.

*(Councillor Billy Drummond joined the meeting at 7.15pm).*

Councillor Vickers asked Sarah Clarke, Monitoring Officer, to comment on the changes that had taken place. Sarah Clarke stated that whilst she did not have the necessary information to hand, her understanding was that the Council was fully compliant with its duties to publish planning application information. Sarah Clarke offered to follow this up outside of the meeting if needed.

Councillor Alan Law said that he fully supported the proposal to approve the draft updated SCI for public consultation. Councillor Law went on to suggest that the valid points raised by his fellow Councillors should be fed into the consultation process. On the matter of documentation published or not on the website, he felt that specific examples should be provided to Officers to investigate further.

Councillor Hilary Cole gave thanks for the comments received. She concluded by saying that the decision to not include planning documents in libraries, provide hard copies to parishes and other similar changes had been taken as part of a saving presented to and agreed by Council in 2017.

The Motion was put to the meeting and duly **RESOLVED**.

38. **Notice of Motions**

(a) **Notice of Motion - Motion on Road & Pedestrian Safety Issues Bowling Green Road Thatcham**

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 15a refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Keith Woodhams relating to road and pedestrian safety issues on Bowling Green Road in Thatcham.

The Chairman informed the Council that the Motion would not be debated at the meeting. In accordance with Procedure Rule 4.9.8. it would be referred to the Executive for consideration as this motion was an Executive function.

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor Keith Woodhams and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks.

“The Council is aware that the stretch of road known as Bowling Green Road from Northfield Road to the start of Tull Way acts as a significant part of the northern road system in Thatcham, linking Floral Way with Tull Way. As such, the road is used by people to get to and from Newbury and other parts of Thatcham from both east and west as well as from Ashmore Green and Cold Ash.

Along this stretch of road, three housing areas are accessed via Mersey Way, Conway Drive and Thames Road.

Among a wide range of issues are the following:

- The 30 mph speed limit is exceeded daily by numerous drivers.
- Drivers exiting junctions from the three housing areas encounter vehicles coming towards them at high speed.
- A 30 mph sign on the western approach is normally covered in foliage rendering the speed limit along the road unenforceable.
- Foliage extends towards the road at various points contributing to poor sight lines at junctions.
- Foliage narrows the footway at various points forcing pedestrians to walk closer to the edge of the pavement and thus closer to fast moving vehicles including HGVs.
- Regency Park Hotel staff & visitors cross the road to get to the facilities between fast moving vehicles, including HGVs.
- Pupils disembarking from the school bus and crossing the road between fast moving vehicles including HGVs.

Given these significant issues:

This Council agrees to carry out an urgent and comprehensive review of Road and Pedestrian safety issues along this stretch of Bowling Green Road.”

(b) **Notice of Motion - Motion on Governance Issues**

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 15b refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Lee Dillon relating to governance issues.

The Chairman informed the Council that the Motion would not be debated at the meeting. In accordance with Procedure Rule 4.9.8. it would be referred to the task group, set up by the Governance and Ethics Committee, considering amendments to the Constitution.

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor Lee Dillon and seconded by Councillor Jeff Brooks

“This Council notes:

## COUNCIL - 2 JULY 2019 - MINUTES

1. That more public questions are being asked at both Executive and Full Council meetings.
2. That the current time limit of 30 minutes results in some questions not being answered during the meeting they are tabled for.
3. Public participation is important to a healthy local democracy and the Council should welcome public questions.
4. That petitions are an important tool for local campaigners to highlight issues.
5. That some petitions have requests for multiple actions but current rules only allow for full acceptance, rejection, or investigation by Full Council and the Executive rather than being able to accept certain actions within the petition.

Therefore Council resolves to:

1. Increase public question time at Full Council and Executive meetings to 45 minutes.
2. Increase time for petitions to be debated as follows:  
300- 500 signatures – 10 minute debate  
500 – 1000 signatures – 30 minute debate  
Over 1000 signatures – minimum of 45 minutes but final debate time to be agreed by all group leaders.
3. Allow Council or Executive to accept individual items within a petition without needing to accept all points, so that where we can take action we do.”

### (c) **Notice of Motions - Motion to Declare a Climate Emergency**

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 15c refers) submitted in the name of Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter relating to the declaration of a climate emergency.

The Chairman informed the Council that the Motion would be debated at the meeting.

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter and seconded by Councillor Adrian Abbs:

“This Council notes that:

1. All levels of government (national, regional and local) have a responsibility to limit the negative impacts of Climate Breakdown. It is important for the residents of West Berkshire and the UK that we commit to working towards carbon neutrality as quickly as possible.
2. The consequences of global temperature rising above 1.5°C are so severe that preventing this from happening must be of the utmost urgency.
3. Bold climate action can deliver economic benefits in terms of new jobs, economic savings and market opportunities (as well as improved health and wellbeing) but will also require changes in individuals’ lifestyles and have a cost implication to both the individual and the state.

West Berkshire Council therefore:

1. Declares a Climate Emergency.
2. Will create a strategic plan for West Berkshire, that aims to deliver carbon neutral by 2030.
3. Calls on HM Government to provide the Council with the powers and resources to make the 2030 target possible.
4. Will work with other authorities to determine and implement where practicable best practice methods to limit Global Warming to less than 1.5°C.

## COUNCIL - 2 JULY 2019 - MINUTES

5. Will continue to work with businesses, residents and other stakeholders across the district to deliver this new goal via all relevant strategies and plans.
6. The newly formed Environment Board will provide an interim report to the Executive in September 2019 with the progress made to date.

The Motion was put to the meeting and duly **RESOLVED**.

### (d) **Notice of Motion - Motion on Heathrow Airport Expansion**

The Council considered the under-mentioned Motion (Agenda item 15d refers) submitted in the name of Councillor David Marsh relating to Heathrow Airport Expansion.

The Chairman informed the Council that the Motion would not be debated at the meeting. In accordance with Procedure Rule 4.9.8, it would be referred to Transport Advisory Group for consideration. It would then return to Council at its meeting on the 12th September 2019 for further consideration.

**MOTION:** Proposed by Councillor David Marsh and seconded by Councillor Carlyne Culver:

“This Council notes:

The Heathrow Airport Expansion Consultation opened on 18th June and closes on 13th September 2019. The next full Council meeting is not until the evening before the consultation closes. In July 2018, Full Council voted to support Heathrow expansion. In July 2018, the former Council Leader wrote to Richard Benyon MP outlining the Council’s support for Heathrow expansion.

This Council believes:

Support for Heathrow expansion is incompatible with tackling the climate emergency and the UK becoming carbon neutral by 2030.

The Heathrow Western Rail Link is welcome because it will take more cars off the road, thereby reducing congestion and air pollution.

This Council resolves:

To oppose Heathrow expansion.

To make a submission to the Heathrow Airport Expansion Consultation to express its opposition to Heathrow expansion.

To write to Richard Benyon MP to express its opposition to Heathrow expansion.

To maintain its support for the Heathrow Western Rail Link.

## 39. **Members' Questions**

- (a) A question standing in the name of Councillor Steve Masters on the subject of investment in rural bus services would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside.
- (b) A question standing in the name of Councillor Steve Masters on the subject of investment in cycling infrastructure would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Transport and Countryside.
- (c) A question standing in the name of Councillor Steve Masters on the subject of redevelopment of Newbury Town Centre would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Economic Development and Planning.

**COUNCIL - 2 JULY 2019 - MINUTES**

- (d) A question standing in the name of Councillor Steve Masters on the subject of collection of CIL levies on non-commercial developments would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Economic Development and Planning.
- (e) A question standing in the name of Councillor Steve Masters on the subject of the Council's response to a consultation on CIL processes would receive a written response from the Executive Member for Economic Development and Planning.

*(The meeting commenced at 7.00pm and closed at 8.35pm)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature** .....

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## Response to the Consultation and Motion on Heathrow Expansion

---

|   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| <b>Committee considering report:</b>        | Council                            |
| <b>Date of Committee:</b>                   | 12 September 2019                  |
| <b>Portfolio Member:</b>                    | Councillor Richard Somner          |
| <b>Date Portfolio Member agreed report:</b> | 15 August 2019                     |
| <b>Report Author:</b>                       | Jenny Graham and Gabrielle Mancini |
| <b>Forward Plan Ref:</b>                    | C3804                              |

---

### 1. Purpose of the Report

1.1 The purpose of the report is to:

- (i) respond to the motion submitted to the Council meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2019 relating to the expansion of Heathrow Airport, and
- (ii) set out a draft response to the current consultation on Heathrow expansion which is open from 18<sup>th</sup> June to 13<sup>th</sup> September 2019

### 2. Recommendations

2.1 It is recommended that the Council:

- (i) rejects the motion submitted to the Council meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2019 relating to the expansion of Heathrow Airport,
- (ii) updates its position statement as set out in section 4.1 of Appendix C to reflect relevant local and national changes that have occurred and new information now available since 2014 (when the Executive agreed the previous position statement).
- (iii) considers the questions posed in the Heathrow expansion consultation and agrees the set of responses as detailed in Appendix D for submission by the 13<sup>th</sup> September consultation deadline.

### 3. Implications

- 3.1 **Financial:** No implications
- 3.2 **Policy:** No impact although this paper pre-dates the publication of an intended Environment Strategy
- 3.3 **Personnel:** No impact
- 3.4 **Legal:** No implications

- 3.5 **Risk Management:** No impact
- 3.6 **Property:** No impact
- 3.7 **Other:** Not applicable

#### 4. Other options considered

4.1 The options considered are:

- (i) Members oppose Heathrow expansion
- (ii) Members support the proposals for an expanded Heathrow unconditionally
- (iii) Members maintain the current Council position on Heathrow – conditional support for expansion
- (iv) Members update the current Council position on Heathrow of conditional support for expansion with amended conditions to reflect relevant local and national changes that have occurred and new information now available since 2014 (when the Executive agreed the previous position statement).

4.2 Option (iv) is the recommended option and takes on board the increased significance that West Berkshire places on reducing carbon emissions as well as new information now available that affects West Berkshire. It is also the opportunity to remove previous conditions that are no longer relevant due to the national debate on increased airport capacity progressing.

4.3 The reasons why options (i), (ii) and (iii) are not favoured are set out in the supporting information at Appendix C.

## Executive Summary

### 5. Introduction / Background

- 5.1 A motion was tabled at Full Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2019 (see Appendix E) calling for the Council to oppose Heathrow expansion stating that it is incompatible with tackling the climate emergency and the UK becoming carbon neutral by 2030.
- 5.2 This motion was triggered by the launch of a consultation on Heathrow expansion on 18<sup>th</sup> June which is open until 13<sup>th</sup> September. The consultation seeks feedback on: the preferred masterplan for expansion; plans to operate the future airport; a preliminary assessment of the effects of the airport's growth; and plans to manage the effects of expansion. It follows previous related consultations on the principle and strategy for airport expansion in the UK.
- 5.3 It is a statutory consultation being carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008. It follows the Government's endorsement of the independent Airports Commission's recommendation for a new north-west runway at Heathrow. The Airports National Policy Statement (NPS) sets out the primary policy framework for expansion at Heathrow and was designated by the SoS for Transport in June 2018 following approval by Parliament.
- 5.4 The Council first set out its position on Heathrow expansion in 2014. In summary, it expressed support for expansion at Heathrow on the conditions that the public transport access improvements were made without delay and the various impacts were appropriately mitigated especially for the local communities. This has remained the position of the Council since 2014.

### 6. Proposal

- 6.1 Whilst the current consultation does not ask the question about the principle of support, or otherwise, for Heathrow expansion, a motion has been tabled which provides an opportunity to reflect on any changes that may impact on the Council's position. The declaring of a climate emergency and the increased importance the Council is placing on reducing carbon emissions sets a different scene to that of 2014. It is not considered that it is in the interests of West Berkshire to now oppose expansion at Heathrow but it would be appropriate to update the Council's position and add conditions relating to the importance of Heathrow expansion becoming a zero carbon development.
- 6.2 It is proposed that the Council's updated position is reflected in its response to the consultation which focuses on the impact to West Berkshire (see Appendix D).

### 7. Conclusion

- 7.1 The expansion of Heathrow airport brings with it a range of economic benefits for West Berkshire and the Thames Valley region. Due to the distance that West Berkshire is from Heathrow, the negative environmental impacts on air quality and noise, for example, do not directly adversely affect our communities. It is considered that the overall support for expansion should remain this Council's position and its conditions for this support updated to include, for example, the importance of reducing carbon emissions. This should be reflected in the Council's consultation response.

## 8. Appendices

- 8.1 Appendix A – Data Protection Impact Assessment
- 8.2 Appendix B – Equalities Impact Assessment
- 8.3 Appendix C – Supporting Information
- 8.4 Appendix D – Proposed response to the consultation on Heathrow Expansion
- 8.5 Appendix E – Motion to Full Council 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2019

## Appendix A

### Data Protection Impact Assessment – Stage One

The General Data Protection Regulations require a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) for certain projects that have a significant impact on the rights of data subjects.

Should you require additional guidance in completing this assessment, please refer to the Information Management Officer via [dp@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:dp@westberks.gov.uk)

|                          |                                 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Directorate:             | Economy and Environment         |
| Service:                 | Development and Planning        |
| Team:                    | Planning and Transport Policy   |
| Lead Officer:            | Jenny Graham/ Gabrielle Mancini |
| Title of Project/System: | Heathrow Consultation Response  |
| Date of Assessment:      | 17/07/2019                      |

**Do you need to do a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)?**

|  | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| <p><b>Will you be processing SENSITIVE or “special category” personal data?</b></p> <p>Note – sensitive personal data is described as “<i>data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person’s sex life or sexual orientation</i>”</p> |     | X  |
| <p><b>Will you be processing data on a large scale?</b></p> <p>Note – Large scale might apply to the number of individuals affected OR the volume of data you are processing OR both</p>   |     | X  |
| <p><b>Will your project or system have a “social media” dimension?</b></p> <p>Note – will it have an interactive element which allows users to communicate directly with one another?</p>  |     | X  |
| <p><b>Will any decisions be automated?</b></p> <p>Note – does your system or process involve circumstances where an individual’s input is “scored” or assessed without intervention/review/checking by a human being? Will there be any “profiling” of data subjects?</p>  |     | X  |
| <p><b>Will your project/system involve CCTV or monitoring of an area accessible to the public?</b></p>   |     | X  |
| <p><b>Will you be using the data you collect to match or cross-reference against another existing set of data?</b></p>   |     | X  |
| <p><b>Will you be using any novel, or technologically advanced systems or processes?</b></p> <p>Note – this could include biometrics, “internet of things” connectivity or anything that is currently not widely utilised</p>  |     | X  |

**If you answer “Yes” to any of the above, you will probably need to complete [Data Protection Impact Assessment - Stage Two](#). If you are unsure, please consult with the Information Management Officer before proceeding.**

## Appendix B

### Equality Impact Assessment - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act), which states:

- “(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:**
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;**
  - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; this includes the need to:**
    - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;**
    - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;**
  - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.**
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.**
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.”**

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality:

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- (The relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected but on the significance of the impact on them)
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy, or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Executive to make:</b>               | To respond to the consultation on the manner in which Heathrow Airport will be expanded  |
| <b>Summary of relevant legislation:</b>   | The consultation on the delivery method of Heathrow expansion was published earlier this year and will run until 13 <sup>th</sup> September 2019. HM Government's National Airport Policy Statement, published in June 2018, indicated that expansion at Heathrow was the preferred option for increasing UK airport capacity. |
| <b>Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities?</b> | No   |
| <b>Name of assessor:</b>  | Gabrielle Mancini  |
| <b>Date of assessment:</b>  | 17/07/2019   |

| <b>Is this a:</b> |           | <b>Is this:</b>                             |            |
|-------------------|-----------|---|------------|
| <b>Policy</b>     | <b>No</b> | <b>New or proposed</b>                      | <b>No</b>  |
| <b>Strategy</b>   | <b>No</b> | <b>Already exists and is being reviewed</b> | <b>Yes</b> |
| <b>Function</b>   | <b>No</b> | <b>Is changing</b>                          | <b>No</b>  |
| <b>Service</b>    | <b>No</b> |   |            |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>1 What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?</b> |  |
| <b>Aims:</b>   | To outline the council's position on Heathrow expansion and its views on the manner in which this expansion will be delivered  |
| <b>Objectives:</b>   | To establish the council's response to the consultation on Heathrow expansion and to publicly assert the council's position on the overall principle of Heathrow expansion |
| <b>Outcomes:</b>   | The council's position will have been established and a consultation response will be submitted  |
| <b>Benefits:</b>   | The council, its partners and West Berkshire's residents and businesses will be made aware of the council's stance on the principle of Heathrow expansion                  |

**2 Note which groups may be affected by the proposed decision. Consider how**

| <p><b>they may be affected, whether it is positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this.</b></p> <p>(Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation.)</p> |                                  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Group Affected</b>  | <b>What might be the effect?</b> | <b>Information to support this</b>   |
| Age  | None                             | The impact of Heathrow expansion would be unlikely to have any more impact on a person with a protected characteristic than on anyone else |
| Disability   | None                             | The impact of Heathrow expansion would be unlikely to have any more impact on a person with a protected characteristic than on anyone else |
| Gender Reassignment  | None                             | The impact of Heathrow expansion would be unlikely to have any more impact on a person with a protected characteristic than on anyone else |
| Marriage and Civil Partnership   | None                             | The impact of Heathrow expansion would be unlikely to have any more impact on a person with a protected characteristic than on anyone else |
| Pregnancy and Maternity  | None                             | The impact of Heathrow expansion would be unlikely to have any more impact on a person with a protected characteristic than on anyone else |
| Race   | None                             | The impact of Heathrow expansion would be unlikely to have any more impact on a person with a protected characteristic than on anyone else |
| Religion or Belief   | None                             | The impact of Heathrow expansion would be unlikely to have any more impact on a person with a protected characteristic than on anyone      |

|   |      |  |
|---|------|--|
|   |      | else   |
| Sex   | None | The impact of Heathrow expansion would be unlikely to have any more impact on a person with a protected characteristic than on anyone else |
| Sexual Orientation                            | None | The impact of Heathrow expansion would be unlikely to have any more impact on a person with a protected characteristic than on anyone else |
| <b>Further Comments relating to the item:</b> |      |  |
| None  |      |  |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>3 Result</b>  |           |
| <b>Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?</b> | <b>No</b> |
| <b>Please provide an explanation for your answer:</b>  |           |
| <b>Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?</b>              | <b>No</b> |
| <b>Please provide an explanation for your answer:</b>  |           |

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered 'yes' to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment.

If a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the [Equality Impact Assessment guidance and Stage Two template](#).

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>4 Identify next steps as appropriate:</b> |    |
| <b>Stage Two required</b>                    | No |
| <b>Owner of Stage Two assessment:</b>        |    |
| <b>Timescale for Stage Two assessment:</b>   |    |

Name: Gabrielle Mancini

Date: 17/07/2019

Please now forward this completed form to Rachel Craggs, Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity) ([rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk)), for publication on the WBC website.

This page is intentionally left blank

---

# Response to the Consultation and Motion on Heathrow Expansion – Supporting Information

---

## 1. Introduction/Background

- 1.1 A motion was tabled at Full Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2019 (see Appendix E) calling for the Council to oppose Heathrow expansion stating that it is incompatible with tackling the climate emergency and the UK becoming carbon neutral by 2030.
- 1.2 At a meeting of the Executive in 2014, the following statement was agreed as the Council's position on Heathrow and a response to the Airports Commission Interim Report:

*West Berkshire Council acknowledges the Airports Commission's conclusion of the need for additional runway capacity for London and the south east and supports this growth in capacity being provided at Heathrow.*

*There should be no further investigation of the Isle of Grain option as the economic impacts of the closure of Heathrow would be devastating to the Thames Valley and West Berkshire economies.*

*Measures to improve public transport access arrangements to Heathrow are critical and the Council supports the Airports Commission's call for these improvements to be made without delay.*

*The Council recognises the various impacts that will result in the expansion of Heathrow, especially for the local communities, and would expect to see appropriate mitigation measures included in the plans for additional runway capacity.*

- 1.3 In terms of the background relating to the steps that have brought about the current consultation on Heathrow expansion, these are explained below:
- 1.4 In July 2015, the independent Airports Commission reported the conclusions of its three-year study examining the need for additional capacity to maintain the UK's position as Europe's most important aviation hub. It found that there is a need for additional runway capacity in the South East of England, and unanimously concluded that a new north-west runway at Heathrow, combined with a package of measures to address environmental and community effects, presented the strongest case for meeting that need and offered the greatest strategic and economic benefits.
- 1.5 In October 2016, following further review, the Government announced that it endorsed the Airports Commission's recommendation, and backed a new north-west runway at Heathrow. It also announced that an Airports National Policy Statement (Airports NPS) would be brought forward to provide policy for the preferred scheme, and that a draft Airports NPS would be subject to public consultation and scrutiny by Parliament. National Policy Statements are put in place

by Government to provide the policy framework for nationally significant infrastructure projects, such as the expansion of Heathrow.

- 1.6 In February 2017 the Government published and consulted on a draft Airports NPS. A revised draft of the Airports NPS was published for a second round of consultation later that year.
- 1.7 In June 2018, following approval by Parliament, the Secretary of State for Transport designated the Airports NPS. The Airports NPS confirms policy support for a north-west runway at Heathrow, and establishes the primary policy framework for deciding whether the proposals to expand Heathrow should be granted development consent. It also recognises the important role that the expansion of Heathrow has to play in supporting the wider UK economy.
- 1.8 Heathrow have now launched a consultation on their expansion plans within the context of the designated Airports NPS. It is a statutory consultation being carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008. The consultation seeks feedback on:
  - (i) the preferred masterplan for expansion;
  - (ii) plans to operate the future airport;
  - (iii) a preliminary assessment of the effects of the airport's growth;
  - (iv) plans to manage the effects of expansion.
- 1.9 The full details of the consultation can be found at [www.heathrowconsultation.com](http://www.heathrowconsultation.com) There are 8 main topic headings under which there are a number of sub-topic areas some with supporting papers. The consultation poses a number of questions highlighting the areas that Heathrow is seeking views on in order to inform the next step of the process which is preparing for a Development Consent Order (DCO) application. They propose to submit their application in 2020.
- 1.10 A number of topics are covered in the following supporting information section of this report. Consideration is given to the impact of Heathrow expansion on West Berkshire and its communities – residents, those who work in or visit the District and those who base their business in West Berkshire. The report is not aiming to address national debates regarding the principle of airport expansion that have happened in previous years or to comment on the impacts of the proposals on other communities outside of West Berkshire.

## 2. Supporting Information

- 2.1 The key topic areas that will be most closely linked to the proposal at Heathrow airport are considered to be: air quality, noise, health, transport, economy and carbon emissions. Each of these is briefly considered below with the addition of a comment on waste which is relevant due to the impact on a facility currently used to deal with waste generated in West Berkshire.
- 2.2 **Air Quality** - The influence of Heathrow on air quality falls sharply with distance from the airport. The communities of West Berkshire do not currently and will not in the future suffer adversely with regards to a direct impact on air quality as a result of Heathrow. Outside of the airport boundary, the main source of pollution that affects

air quality is road traffic. Transport impacts are addressed below but, at this point it is worth commenting that it cannot be over stated that the western rail access to Heathrow project is an absolute must in support of reducing pollution from road travel.

- 2.3 **Noise** - Noise effects of the airport today are primarily caused by the flights arriving and departing. Despite an increase in the number of flights over the past few decades, the noise contour footprint has shrunk considerably and it is currently smaller than it has ever been. Noise is clearly one of the biggest concerns for communities living close to Heathrow and the proposals include new and improved ways to manage the noise associated with an expanded Heathrow. These include a 6.5 hour scheduled night flight ban and utilising runway alternation. This represents a significant change from the current position where there is currently no ban on night flights but the type of aircraft and number of movements are restricted during the night period (still some of the strongest restrictions on night flights of any hub airport in Europe). The noise impacts from flights are not considered to adversely impact on the communities of West Berkshire given the distance away from the airport and the height at which aircraft are travelling in the vicinity of our District.
- 2.4 **Health** – the consultation on Heathrow adopts a wide definition of health. This is: ‘Health is ‘a state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.’ Any of the adverse impacts on health that the scheme is likely to cause and which Heathrow is working to address, minimise and mitigate against will not affect the communities of West Berkshire due to our distance from the airport.
- 2.5 It is considered that the only knock-on health impact that is relevant to West Berkshire is in the area of a change to the economic environment. This impact is considered positive for the health and wellbeing of residents and workers in West Berkshire who are linked to any businesses associated with Heathrow or who benefit from the presence of Heathrow in our region either now or in the future.
- 2.6 **Transport** – the access to Heathrow is of particular interest to West Berkshire and the Council has been working with neighbouring authorities and the TVB LEP for many years to improve access to Heathrow via rail. It should be made clear that the Western Rail Access to Heathrow scheme is required and is progressing regardless of the plans for airport expansion. The same can be said for the proposals to improve southern rail access to Heathrow.
- 2.7 The surface access proposals for the expansion of Heathrow seek to increase bus and coach travel, support existing proposals for rail improvements, reduce the proportion of car travel through charging, increase the uptake of active travel for workers at Heathrow, consolidate parking, manage freight movements in efficient and smart ways and underpin passenger and worker travel choices with an Intelligent Mobility Strategy.
- 2.8 All of the above need to be delivered and at the highest quality if the proposals are to be successful in meeting the targets set out in the Airports NPS. These key targets (when compared to a 2013 base) are:
- (i) for 50% of the journeys to and from the airport to be made by public transport by 2030 increasing to 55% by 2040, and

- (ii) to reduce the number of car trips made by workers by at least 25% by 2030 and 50% by 2040

- 2.9 It is considered that rail is the most important element for West Berkshire. Whilst the proposals by Heathrow support the improved access by rail and safeguard any land required to deliver rail projects, it is considered that more of an emphasis is needed on rail in the overall transport plans for Heathrow's access strategy. Comments are made in relation to this in the proposed response to the consultation. More details are included in Appendix D and particularly in response to Question 2.2
- 2.10 **Economy** - In preparation for this section of the report, the Economic Development Officer consulted Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership and a number of local businesses from a wide range of industries and sought data from HMRC and ONS.
- 2.11 The economic benefits of geographic proximity to Heathrow are clear as it is estimated that 70% of international businesses looking to locate themselves within the UK will do so within an hour's drive of Heathrow.

*International trade:*

- 2.12 International trade is worth around £7bn to the Thames Valley LEP economy. International trade figures are calculated by parliamentary constituency. Of the businesses registered in the Newbury constituency, which falls entirely within West Berkshire, 128 are exporters and 173 are importers outside of the European Union. This figure represents a higher figure than any other constituency in Berkshire and is likely to be still higher when considering the parts of West Berkshire within the Wokingham and Reading West parliamentary constituencies.
- 2.13 Although figures including the European Union are not available, it is likely that this figure would be significantly higher, reflecting the importance of international trade to the local economy.
- 2.14 Berkshire has the highest proportion of foreign owned companies of all LEP areas in the UK, with strong direct foreign investment resulting in over 1000 companies choosing the area for its UK headquarters. Whilst this only represented 2% of all local businesses as of 2017, 30% of local employment and 47% of local turnover was generated by foreign owned companies.

*Logistics and freight:*

- 2.15 As Heathrow's ambition is that following expansion, cargo capacity would double, data was sought from HMRC and ONS in relation to the number of businesses within West Berkshire which are heavily reliant on international trade.
- 2.16 Within West Berkshire, between 90 and 100 firms identify themselves as being part of the logistics and freight industry. It is not unreasonable to suggest that many if not all of these businesses would require access to freight forwarding facilities at Heathrow, as its closest airport, and that growth in the number of available flights would facilitate growth where applicable.

- 2.17 The largest two logistics firms are two of the largest business rate payers within West Berkshire, Kuene & Nagal and Harrods, cumulatively contributing over £2.5 million pounds annually.

*Motor Racing:*

- 2.18 Exporting is vital to the motor racing cluster based in Thatcham, with 77% of Xtrac's c.£50m sales resulting from direct exports. During the Formula 1 season, Xtrac is involved closely in Grand Prix races in locations across the world. As such, accessibility to reliable air travel and freight is integral to its business operations.

*Transportation of racehorses:*

- 2.19 A recent report showed that Lambourn's horseracing industry is worth in the region of £30m per annum to West Berkshire's economy. By virtue of the nature of the horseracing, transporting horses to race meets around the world is necessary. Consequently, there are 12 horse transportation businesses based in and around Lambourn, all of which are or have been reliant on Heathrow for overseas transport. Heathrow is one of only two airports in the UK that can be used to transport horses, the other being Prestwick.

*Hydrogen fuelling:*

- 2.20 Hungerford-based Fuel Cell Systems Ltd's second largest customer is directly linked to Heathrow expansion as it supplies hydrogen fuel cells for noise monitoring equipment which, in turn, is used to influence flight paths and patterns to mitigate the noise impact of Heathrow.
- 2.21 **Carbon Emissions** – The aspects of the expansion proposals that could cause effects and create carbon emissions are construction activity, air transport, surface transport, airport buildings and ground operations. 'Carbon' is used in the current consultation to refer to carbon dioxide and other Greenhouse Gas emissions.
- 2.22 Whilst the carbon aspects of the proposed development at Heathrow are not considered to have a direct impact on West Berkshire and its ability to meet its carbon neutral targets, it is clear that there is significant interest in this aspect of the proposals. Therefore information is provided below relating to carbon emissions and proposed comments are included in the draft consultation answers (Appendix D) promoting the planning of carbon neutral development at Heathrow.
- 2.23 It is Heathrow's long term aspiration to make growth from its new runway carbon neutral. They have also made a commitment to operate zero carbon infrastructure, including buildings and other fixed assets by 2050.
- 2.24 International flights are by far the largest source of emissions. To address these, the international aviation industry has put in place a scheme known as CORSIA (Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation). CORSIA has been set up by the United Nations to deliver "carbon neutral growth" from 2020 by offsetting the growth in emissions from international aviation.
- 2.25 Growth in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from additional flights after expansion will be largely offset through CORSIA but Heathrow are exploring options to offset all the growth in emissions from flights.

2.26 The Airports NPS requires Heathrow to ‘report’ their carbon emissions to Government so that they can consider whether they would materially affect the ability of the UK to meet its overall reduction targets, including carbon budgets.

2.27 The opportunities that exist for the Heathrow expansion project to reduce carbon emissions are as follows:

*Construction design:*

- Use of rail access, to allow more materials and waste to be transported by rail rather than road.
- A reduction of the volume of construction materials and the use of materials with lower embodied carbon.

*Air Transport:*

- The airfield will be designed for efficient operations, including reduced taxiing distances for aircraft.
- New technology will be installed at aircraft stands to reduce the need for aircraft to use their own power. Fuelling infrastructure will be capable of distributing sustainable aviation fuels.
- Heathrow are looking at ways to speed up the uptake of more carbon-efficient aircraft through aircraft operator charges.
- Much of the growth in air transport emissions from the Project will be offset by airlines (through international agreements). Heathrow are engaging with airlines and governments to encourage sustainable operations.

*Surface Access:*

- New employment is located close to public transport hubs, such as the Central Terminal Area and Hatton Cross rail station which makes it easier for people to use public transport.
- The road design will meet future traffic requirements, reducing the risk of congestion; something that leads to increased carbon emissions.
- Vehicle charging points are included in the design to encourage the use of low emission electric and hybrid vehicles.

*Airport buildings and ground operations:*

- The design includes energy efficiency features, low carbon energy generation and a range of measures to improve the management of waste, materials and water.

2.28 Heathrow’s assessment of carbon emissions will continue to be updated to take account of the latest airport footprint, any design or operational changes and UK Government policy on carbon emissions.

2.29 **Waste** - Currently approximately 10,000 tonnes of waste per year from West Berkshire is handled at the Lakeside Energy from Waste facility. This is private commercial and industrial waste, not municipal waste from West Berkshire. It is not connected to the Council’s waste contract.

- 2.30 The Lakeside Energy from Waste facility will be affected by the proposed expansion project. It is proposed that the facility is re-provided and land is shown as being safeguarded for the new site on the ‘Proposed displacements – key land uses’ plan contained in the consultation information.
- 2.31 The permission for the new facility is likely to be dealt with by a separate planning application outside of the Development Consent Order application for the main expansion project. Comments are proposed to be made in relation to this within the responses to the current consultation (see response to Question 1.2 in Appendix D) and assurances are sought that there will be no interruption to the provision of waste management services.

### 3. Options for Consideration

- 3.1 Since the statement agreed by the Executive in 2014 (set out in 1.2) there has been no change in the support that West Berkshire has shown for expansion at Heathrow.
- 3.2 The Council responded to the Government consultation on the Draft Airports National Policy Statement (May 2017) in which it maintained its support for the Heathrow north-west runway scheme. The consultation response was agreed at an Executive meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2017.
- 3.3 When considering what the options are with regards to the Council’s position on Heathrow expansion and how to respond to the current consultation, it is helpful to review what has changed for West Berkshire since the original position was agreed in 2014. Some recent changes to highlight are:
- (a) Local elections and the resultant change to the make-up of the Council
  - (b) The declaration of a Climate Emergency in West Berkshire and the commitment to work towards West Berkshire being carbon neutral by 2030
- 3.4 The options proposed are:
- (i) Members oppose Heathrow expansion
  - (ii) Members support the proposals for an expanded Heathrow unconditionally
  - (iii) Members maintain the current Council position on Heathrow – conditional support for expansion
  - (iv) Members update the current Council position on Heathrow of conditional support for expansion with additional conditions to reflect relevant local changes and new information that have occurred since 2014
- 3.5 Comments in relation to each of the options that are not recommended are provided in the following paragraphs.
- 3.6 **Members oppose Heathrow expansion** – It is considered that opposing expansion at Heathrow would:

- not recognise the important economic benefits that the airport brings to West Berkshire,
- have potential reputational and relational impacts that may affect joint working (by acting contrary to our neighbouring authorities and the TVB LEP and objecting to a nationally accepted principle of airport expansion when the evidence shows there are no adverse impacts on West Berkshire)
- not be appropriate in the context of what the current consultation is asking (the question as to whether there is support or not for Heathrow expansion is not being asked in the current consultation – it is purely about the detail of the proposals and not the overall principle which has already been established)

**3.7 Members support the proposals for an expanded Heathrow unconditionally –**

There are impacts that Heathrow expansion will bring and elements of the proposals that are critical for West Berkshire to see included in any future Development Consent Order for the project. It is not considered appropriate for West Berkshire to support the proposals for Heathrow without detailing some conditions because the Council will wish to influence elements of the proposals through its consultation responses especially around transport, carbon emissions, appropriate mitigation and re-provision of waste facilities.

**3.8 Members maintain the current Council position on Heathrow – conditional support for expansion –** This option does not provide the Council with the ability to reflect on changes since 2014 locally and nationally or to respond to new information not available at the time of setting out its original position. This option is therefore not recommended.

3.9 There are also options to be considered in relation to the current consultation. The options are to respond and reflect the Council’s position on Heathrow expansion or not to respond.

3.10 The Council is not obliged to respond to this consultation. However, given the importance of Heathrow to the Thames Valley and West Berkshire economies and due to the Council engaging in previous consultations, it is considered appropriate for the Council to respond and set out its views on the various elements of the proposed expansion plans. Responding to the consultation also provides a way of raising the important issues to West Berkshire relating to transport, skills and economic benefits, appropriate mitigation, re-provision of waste facilities and measures to reduce carbon urging Heathrow to focus on delivering a carbon neutral development overall.

## **4. Proposals**

4.1 It is proposed that option (iv) in 3.4 above is agreed by Members and that an updated position statement set out below is adopted by the Council:

***West Berkshire Council continues to support expansion of Heathrow airport subject to the following statements:***

*That Heathrow delivers on its plans to make the expansion of the airport a carbon neutral development and does not adversely impact the ability of the Government to meet its targets on reducing carbon emissions.*

*Measures to improve public transport access arrangements to Heathrow are critical and the Council agrees that these improvements should be made without delay with priority given to rail.*

*That West Berkshire's residents and businesses are given the opportunity to access the directly related employment, training and trading benefits that expansion of Heathrow would create.*

*The Council recognises the various impacts that will result in the expansion of Heathrow, especially for the local communities, and would expect to see appropriate mitigation measures included in the Development Consent Order application.*

*That the regionally significant Lakeside Energy from Waste facilities are re-provided and that the appropriate safeguards are put in place to ensure land is available for this purpose.*

- 4.2 It is also proposed that the Council responds to the consultation on Heathrow expansion (by the deadline of 13<sup>th</sup> September 2019) using the responses set out in Appendix D. These responses reflect the statements proposed above.

## **5. Conclusion**

- 5.1 Heathrow is the UK's only hub airport and the UK's biggest port by value for trade with countries outside the EU. Heathrow currently serves more than 200 destinations in more than 80 countries, connecting the UK to the world and the world to the UK.
- 5.2 It is not just passengers that travel through Heathrow; over £100bn worth of imports and exports with countries outside the EU were shipped through Heathrow in 2018, helping British businesses access customers in every corner of the globe.
- 5.3 Heathrow is clearly important nationally but is also important to West Berkshire and growing our economy to help facilitate a good quality of life for our communities.
- 5.4 It is recognised that there are impacts from such a significant development proposal and it is important not to ignore these impacts but to seek to ensure that they are addressed. The proposals contained in this report, therefore, seek to address these impacts as far as they are relevant to West Berkshire and to highlight the importance of Heathrow expansion to be a carbon neutral development.

## **6. Consultation and Engagement**

- 6.1 The following people and organisations have been consulted / engaged in the preparation of this report:

Thames Valley Berkshire LEP, a selection of local businesses and colleagues from Public Health and the Public Protection Partnership.

Transport Advisory Group – this Member group considered the report at their meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2019. Much of the discussion was around the principle of airport expansion rather than the details of the consultation. The draft consultation responses (Appendix D) did not get discussed in detail. There were a range of

views expressed by the Members on TAG and a consensus was not reached over the course of the debate.

---

**Background Papers:**

Heathrow Expansion Consultation material has been used in the preparation of this report. This can be found at [www.heathrowconsultation.com](http://www.heathrowconsultation.com)

Other papers relevant to this topic have been referred to in the main report:

- Airports National Policy Statement (published 5<sup>th</sup> June 2018)
- Papers from the West Berkshire Council Executive meetings held on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2014 and 4<sup>th</sup> May 2017.

---

**Subject to Call-In:**

Yes:  No:

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Item is Urgent Key Decision   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Report is to note only  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

---

**Wards affected:**

The report covers this topic from the point of view of impacts on the whole of West Berkshire. No impacts on individual wards are specified.

---

**Strategic Priorities Supported:**

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the Council Strategy priorities by supporting development that is considered will have a positive impact on the Thames Valley and West Berkshire economies whilst promoting a high standard of environmental mitigation and sustainable access proposals.

---

**Officer details:**

Name: Jenny Graham  
Job Title: Transport Policy Team Leader  
Tel No: 01635 519623  
E-mail Address: [Jenny.Graham@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:Jenny.Graham@westberks.gov.uk)

**Officer details:**

Name: Gabrielle Mancini  
Job Title: Economic Development Officer  
Tel No: 07771 387128  
E-mail Address: [Gabrielle.Mancini@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:Gabrielle.Mancini@westberks.gov.uk)

---

## Appendix D

# Proposed response to the Heathrow Airport Expansion Consultation

## Introduction

This appendix sets out a proposed response to the questions asked in the current consultation on expansion at Heathrow. The consultation information is structured under the following main headings:

- Our preferred masterplan
- Travelling to and from Heathrow – surface access
- Construction
- Future Operations
- Local Neighbourhoods
- Managing the Effects of Expansion
- Compensation
- General

Each of these headings above is then divided further into more specific topic areas. The consultation poses questions for some of these topic areas and provides an opportunity for any other comments. Consultation responses can be made online (closing date 13<sup>th</sup> September 2019). The full consultation information can be viewed at [www.heathrowconsultation.com](http://www.heathrowconsultation.com)

The paragraphs below provide the introductory or summary text for each section and set out any questions raised under each section. Answers to these questions have been drafted to help inform discussion.

## Section 1 – Our preferred masterplan

Heathrow's vision is to give passengers the best airport service in the world. The layout of an expanded Heathrow – and all the different parts or components within it – is crucial to achieving this vision. Our latest thinking on the layout of the future airport's physical infrastructure is called our Preferred Masterplan.

### Question 1.1

Expanding Heathrow is about more than building a new runway. To operate a three-runway airport, we also need to build passenger facilities, infrastructure and relocate or replace some existing buildings and land uses. Our Preferred Masterplan sets out our plans for the future expansion of Heathrow. It has been developed taking into account feedback from previous consultations, as well as community, consumer and stakeholder engagement events and our ongoing design and assessment work.

Please tell us what you think about any specific parts of our Preferred Masterplan or the components that make up the masterplan.

**Proposed Response**

*Although West Berkshire Council is supportive of a well-planned, enhanced Heathrow site; it is not placed to comment on the precise form this should take given the lack of direct immediate impact on West Berkshire due to its geographical location.*

*The one comment the Council would make is that it welcomes Heathrow Airport's commitment to delivering the site in the most carbon efficient manner possible and looks forward to seeing these assurances manifested in an improved and sustainable site.*

*The strategy for access to Heathrow is of interest to West Berkshire. Whilst the plans for significant improvements to western and southern rail access are not specifically linked with the expansion plans, it is good to see an acknowledgement that Heathrow supports these plans and is safeguarding the on airport development that will be required for each of these schemes. These are priorities for the region around Heathrow (including West Berkshire) as well as the local neighbouring communities.*

*The Council welcomes Heathrow taking the opportunity to move bulk construction materials by rail. It is essential that this happens to save thousands of HGV movements during construction and then to maintain the realigned branch line in order for it to provide a sustainable link for supplies into the future.*

*The Council wishes to highlight the need to ensure that the regionally significant Lakeside Energy from Waste facilities are re-provided and that the appropriate safeguards are put in place to safeguard land for this purpose. This is of importance to business in West Berkshire as currently approximately 10,000 tonnes per annum of commercial and industrial waste is exported to this facility.*

**Question 1.2**

The expansion of Heathrow will require a number of existing buildings and community facilities to be moved, such as the Immigration Removal Centres at Harmondsworth and Colnbrook.

Please tell us what you think about the sites we have identified for buildings and facilities we are proposing to move.

**Proposed Response**

*The facility proposed to be affected by the expansion project that is of importance to West Berkshire is the Lakeside Energy from Waste facility. Currently approximately 10,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste per year from West Berkshire is handled here. The consultation information sets out that the re-provided facility is likely to be dealt with by a separate planning application outside of the Development Consent Order application for the main expansion project.*

*When will this be confirmed? What assurances can be given that the timing of re-provision will be appropriate so as not to interrupt the provision that this service provides to the waste management strategies in the surrounding region? It is good to see that land is safeguarded for the new site on the 'Proposed displacements – key land uses' plan contained in the consultation information. The Council will be looking for the appropriate*

*assurances within the DCO that this new facility will be delivered especially if it ends up being a separate process of a planning application that is used to secure permission.*

### **Question 1.3**

The boundary of an expanded Heathrow will be carefully designed to improve the overall appearance of the airport and help it blend into the surrounding area.

Please tell us what you think of our boundary design proposals to manage noise and the effects on views around the boundary of the expanded airport.

### **Proposed Response**

*This is not relevant to the communities of West Berkshire. No comments are therefore made.*

## **Section 2 – Travelling to and from Heathrow – surface access**

The expansion of Heathrow is a unique opportunity to change the way that people and goods travel to, from and around the airport.

This section describes how we propose to improve and develop transport and travel for an expanded Heathrow to help us achieve our pledge to deliver expansion with no more airport-related traffic on the roads than there is today.

### **Question 2.1**

Do you have any other comments on our Surface Access Proposals?

### **Proposed Response**

*The surface access proposals seek to increase bus and coach travel, support existing proposals for rail improvements, reduce the proportion of car travel through charging, increase the uptake of active travel for workers at Heathrow, consolidate parking, manage freight movements in efficient and smart ways and underpin passenger and worker travel choices with an Intelligent Mobility Strategy.*

*The importance of these proposals and the challenge of making them successful should not be underestimated. The Airports National Policy Statement sets targets for the modal split of passenger and worker trips to the airport. Meeting these targets will take serious commitment and investment in providing travel choices of the highest quality and embracing and developing the latest in supporting technologies.*

*Whilst it represents only 4% of the total carbon emissions from Heathrow (based on 2016 figures), travel to and from the airport remains an important way in which carbon emissions need to be minimised and the impacts of congestion and air quality in the local areas around the airport need to be managed.*

*The Council would like to see Heathrow place greater importance on access by rail and for this mode to feature more in the proposals for public transport. This is expanded more in the following response about public transport access.*

### **Question 2.2**

Our proposals for public transport at an expanded Heathrow are based on: Making best use of existing public transport; Supporting committed improvements; and Developing new public transport routes.

Please tell us what you think of our proposals and how we could further encourage or improve public transport access to the airport.

### **Proposed Response**

*West Berkshire has an excellent strategic location given its links to London, Bristol and beyond via the M4 and A34. The Council is keen to see its position strengthened even more through the improvement of public transport links to Heathrow. The quality of these links need to be such that this becomes the first choice for travel to the airport from West Berkshire for its residents and businesses.*

*The Council does not consider that the proposed approach to public transport goes far enough. The first part of the strategy of making the best use of existing public transport is agreed.*

*The second part of supporting committed improvements relates to rail improvements that are being developed regardless of the expansion at Heathrow. The Council agrees that Heathrow should be supporting these projects but the consultation suggests that, as far as rail is concerned, Heathrow's involvement and interest stops there. The Council would expect to see more emphasis on rail travel to the airport and for Heathrow to have a Rail Strategy that sets out how it will maximise its current and future planned rail links to ensure that rail plays a significant part in transporting passengers to the airport. Heathrow should use their influence to ensure that as many rail services as possible from key stations in the region can link directly with Heathrow making the journey as simple as possible and therefore an attractive option.*

*Enhancing the proposals for and importance of rail for access to Heathrow is a priority for West Berkshire and the Council would hope to work with Heathrow, Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership and other partners to ensure rail is seen as the key mode of travel to the airport as well as continuing the support for delivery of a Western Rail Link. This link benefits not only Berkshire, but the counties of the South West region, too.*

*The consultation does mention a vision of putting Heathrow at the heart of the rail network – the Council looks forward to seeing more information as part of any Development Consent Order application (or before) on how this vision will be achieved.*

*The success of the public transport proposals including the new routes proposed will come down to the details of quality of provision, effective communication of choices, ease of use and overall cost to the passenger. The rail, bus and coach alternatives to the private car need to be priced attractively and be efficient in time for the target of half the journeys to and from the airport being made by public transport by 2030 to be reached.*

### **Question 2.3**

We are proposing to introduce a Heathrow Ultra-Low Emission Zone by 2022, which will help us to manage emissions and encourage passengers to consider other modes of transport or cleaner vehicles. We are also proposing to use charging to supplement improvements to public transport and encourage its use, this is known as the Heathrow Vehicle Access Charge. This would be introduced from the opening of the new runway.

Please tell us what you think about our proposals for the Heathrow Ultra Low Emission Zone and Heathrow Vehicle Access Charge as ways to manage congestion and air quality impacts.

### **Proposed Response**

*The Council agrees that some form of road user charging system is required in order to help establish public transport as the primary means of travel to Heathrow. We welcome the early introduction of Heathrow's Ultra-Low Emissions Zone (HULEZ) by 2022 and the more general Heathrow Vehicle Access Charge scheme (HVAC) which will replace the HULEZ when the third runway is due to open in 2026.*

## **Section 3 – Construction**

We recognise that the construction and operation of an expanded airport will affect the day to day lives of local people. There will be some negative effects but also some positive ones. We take seriously our responsibility to those around us to minimise the potential negative effects of expansion during and after construction.

### **Question 3.1**

The expansion of Heathrow will require careful planning to ensure that it is successfully delivered in a way that considers the effects of construction on local communities, the environment and the transport network.

Please tell us what you think of our construction proposals and the ways we are proposing to minimise effects on communities and the environment.

### **Proposed Response**

*West Berkshire does not wish to comment on the impacts of construction activity that will affect the communities local to Heathrow – this will be adequately covered by the local authorities closer to the airport and other organisations and local groups and individuals. It is, however, good to see that there is a well advanced and comprehensive Draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) as construction activity is just as essential to get right as the end result of the operation of an expanded airport.*

*The Council, through working with the TVB LEP, will be keen to see the Thames Valley Major Works Coordination Group and the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group used effectively to ensure the wider strategic impacts of the construction of an expanded Heathrow are well thought out and take into account other major projects happening in the area. It is acknowledged that there will be impacts on the transport networks as a result of the delivery of a scheme of this size. The Council hopes that joint working with these groups and cooperation between all parties will ensure that disruption is kept to a minimum so that the Thames Valley can continue to operate efficiently for the benefit of all.*

## **Section 4 – Future Operations**

This section explains how we propose to operate our runways at a three runway airport. This is summarised here and is set out in more detail in the [Future Runway Operations document](#).

### **Question 4.1**

In response to our previous consultation, we have developed a combined runway alternation and night flights scheme which prioritises respite for communities closest to the airport in the evening, night and early morning periods. As part of our plans for runway alternation, we are proposing four runway operating patterns. We would rotate between these patterns at either 2pm or 3pm and again at midnight each day. The sequence of these patterns will be repeated every four days.

Please tell us what you think of our runway alternation proposals, in particular we would like to know if you think we should alternate the runways at 2pm or 3pm.

**Proposed Response**

*It is good to see the comments of local communities from previous consultations shaping the plans for how the runways will be used. The choice between a 2pm or 3pm alternation of runways does not impact on the communities of West Berkshire and therefore we have no comment to make in relation to this.*

**Question 4.2**

Please tell us what you think of our preferred proposal for a ban on scheduled night flights and / or whether you would prefer an alternative proposal.

**Proposed Response**

*It is good to see the proposals responding to the Airports National Policy Statement's expectation of a 6.5 hour ban on scheduled night flights. Due to the lack of impact on the communities of West Berkshire, the Council does not wish to propose an alternative to the proposal to ban scheduled flights from 23:00 to 05:30 and to only use one runway for the early morning arrivals.*

**Question 4.3**

The Airports National Policy Statement (NPS) identifies the need for increased airport capacity at Heathrow and the important role that aviation has to play in the UK economy.

We plan to increase the number of arrivals and departures at Heathrow prior to the new runway opening, to respond to the urgent need for additional airport capacity.

Please tell us what you think about our proposals for managing early growth.

**Proposed Response**

*The Airports NPS makes clear that not increasing airport capacity in the south-east would be damaging to the UK economy and to the UK's hub status.*

*A number of West Berkshire's 9,000 businesses are heavily reliant on import and export activity, including almost 100 logistic firms, 128 exporters to outside of the EU, 173 importers from outside of the EU and two of West Berkshire's top ten business rate payers. As such, the district's local economy is heavily reliant on the international trade opportunities associated with Heathrow Expansion and welcomes the commitment to managing the rollout of additional capacity effectively.*

## Section 5 – Local Neighbourhoods

This section provides information relating to the impacts on local communities nearest to the airport. There are some overview sections covering the general impacts both positive and negative and there are specific sections covering details relating to 10 individual neighbourhoods.

The consultation includes questions about each of the 10 neighbourhoods. These are not relevant to the community of West Berkshire. Therefore no comments are made in this section.

## Section 6 – Managing the Effects of Expansion

We are carefully considering the effects expansion may have on the environment and local people. We have planned measures to avoid or reduce these effects, or to improve the current environment wherever possible.

### Question 6.1

Our Preliminary Environmental Information Report carefully considers the effects that expansion may have on the environment and provides measures to reduce them or improve the current environment wherever possible.

Please tell us what you think about our proposals to manage the environmental effects of expansion.

### Proposed Response

*The Council would urge Heathrow to aim for the highest possible standards in terms of environmental protection and mitigation throughout its proposals.*

*The reduction of carbon emissions is important to West Berkshire Council. Whilst the Council has a commitment to work to reduce our local carbon emissions and be carbon neutral by 2030, there is also a desire to influence and encourage carbon neutral development wherever there is opportunity.*

*In terms of carbon emissions, the largest contributor from the Heathrow expansion project is international air transport. The Council notes that the proposal is to use the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA) put in place by the international aviation industry to offset much of the growth in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from additional flights. The Council would urge the use of this scheme or other suitable measures to offset all emissions from all flights whether associated with expansion or not.*

### Question 6.2

Our surface access proposals will help us manage airport-related emissions and our Preferred Masterplan has been designed to reduce the impact of the airport on local air quality. Chapter 7 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, published as part of this consultation sets out in detail the work we have done to assess the effects on air quality from the construction and operation of an expanded Heathrow.

Please tell us if there are any other initiatives or proposals that we should consider in order to address the emissions from airport related traffic or airport operations?

**Proposed Response**

*The Council welcomes the commitment of Heathrow to work closely with airlines to use modern aircraft which meet tighter emission standards.*

*As the consultation states, the influence of Heathrow on air quality falls sharply with distance from the airport. The communities of West Berkshire do not currently and will not in the future suffer adversely with regards to impact on air quality as a result of Heathrow.*

*Outside of the airport boundary, the main source of pollution that affects air quality is road traffic. Comments have been made in other responses to this consultation regarding measures that will help to reduce pollution from journeys being made to and from the airport. It cannot be over stated that the western rail access to Heathrow project is an absolute must in support of reducing pollution from road travel.*

**Question 6.3**

The health and well-being of our passengers, colleagues and neighbours is important to us and we have carefully considered the effects expansion may have on them.

Please tell us what you think about our proposals to help health and well-being. Are there any other proposals that you think we should consider to address the effects of the Project on the health and wellbeing of our colleagues, neighbours and passengers?

**Proposed Response**

*The Council welcomes the wide definition of health that Heathrow have adopted. This is: 'Health is 'a state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity'.'*

*The Council does not wish to comment on the proposals to help health and well-being as these are very much focused on the localised impacts and are not relevant to the communities of West Berkshire.*

**Question 6.4**

Noise is one of the biggest concerns for communities living close to airports. We are proposing to introduce new and improved ways to manage noise at an expanded Heathrow such as introducing a 6.5 hour scheduled night flight ban, utilising runway alternation and developing a noise envelope.

Please tell us what factors are most important as we develop our proposals for noise management, in particular our proposals for the design and implementation of a noise envelope.

**Proposed Response**

*The noise impacts from flights do not adversely impact on the communities of West Berkshire. The Council, therefore, does not wish to comment on this part of the consultation.*

### Question 6.5

We are proposing to introduce three noise insulation schemes for eligible local residents to address the effects of noise from an expanded airport. These will open in stages and prioritise properties in the highest noise areas.

Please tell us what you think about our noise insulation schemes.

### Proposed Response

*The noise impacts from flights do not adversely impact on the communities of West Berkshire. The Council, therefore, does not wish to comment on this part of the consultation.*

### Question 6.6

Heathrow is a cornerstone of the local economy and we are one of the largest single-site employers in the country. Expansion will provide a range of new employment and training opportunities.

Please tell us what you think of our proposals for maximising new jobs and training. Are there any other ways that we can maximise skills and training opportunities to benefit our local communities?

### Proposed Response

*West Berkshire Council is very supportive of Heathrow's drive to recruit, train and manage apprentices and is pleased to see apprenticeships well integrated within its future plans, from construction onwards.*

*Due to West Berkshire's proximity to Heathrow as well as the extensive works taking place to deliver expansion, the council would hope that linked apprenticeship opportunities and T-Level\* placements would be made available to young people across Berkshire.*

*\*For information: T Levels are a new two-year level 3 technical programmes that will sit alongside apprenticeships and A Levels within a reformed skills training system, primarily aimed at 16-18 learners. The first T Levels will be introduced in September 2020 with full roll-out intended by September 2024.*

*The 2018 Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership's Priority Skills Statement articulates clearly that there are a number of key sectors in the Berkshire economy that are experiencing training and recruitment issues. One of these sectors is the construction industry and, as such, the council believes that the opportunity to become involved with a major strategic project such as Heathrow, with all of the innovative construction techniques outlined in the consultation document, would serve as an incentive for potential apprentices.*

*The council is supportive of the principle of the proposed 'Skills Passport' as it would allow apprentices to broaden their experience across of range of infrastructure projects and would simplify monitoring for educational institutions and employers.*

*West Berkshire Council's draft Economic Development Strategy focusses on the importance of work experience and careers advice at all ages. The 10,000 work experience days mentioned in the consultation document would be a welcome part of this and the council would hope that some of these opportunities would be made available to West Berkshire residents.*

*The displacement of some businesses and commercial activity mentioned in the consultation document would be unlikely to have an impact on West Berkshire so the council has no comment on this.*

*The consultation makes reference to the impact of the enhancement of the transport network on Heathrow's employment catchment area which could have an impact on West Berkshire. The Western Rail Link, which the council strongly supports, would enhance this further and the linked opportunities would be welcomed by the district's residents and businesses.*

*West Berkshire Council has worked closely with developers of strategic housing and employment sites to deliver STEAM and construction workshops in primary and secondary schools and will also be delivering a STEAM fair in the next year (STEAM fields are science, technology, engineering, art, and mathematics). The council would welcome Heathrow's input into similar initiatives across Berkshire to encourage STEAM uptake among young people across the local area.*

*West Berkshire-based Fuel Cell Systems Ltd's second largest customer is directly linked to Heathrow expansion as it supplies hydrogen fuel cells for noise monitoring equipment which, in turn, is used to influence flight paths and patterns to mitigate the noise impact of Heathrow. The council would be keen to see local businesses such as this given further opportunities to apply their technical expertise to Heathrow's work on noise mitigation and other operational aspects in the future.*

#### **Question 6.7**

The expansion of Heathrow presents both challenges and opportunities for the historic environment and for the historic buildings and features which may be affected. We have set out in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report a series of historic environment principles that are informing the design and development of the expansion of Heathrow and have included a number of measures within the scheme design to minimise effects on the historic environment. We are proposing four historic environment strategies that will address effects on the historic environment.

Please tell us what you think about our approach to addressing effects on the historic environment, including any particular proposals you would like us to consider.

#### **Proposed Response**

*The Council is pleased to see that measures are being included in the scheme design to minimise the impact on the historic environment and that the consideration of the historic environment is being taken seriously. We do not wish to comment on the four proposed historic environment strategies and consider this is best left to the most affected local authorities, local interest groups and relevant national organisations.*

### **Section 7 – Compensation**

This section of the consultation provides details on the proposed Community Fund to help address the positive and negative effects of the Project and to improve the quality of life in the area around the airport. It also discusses the discretionary property compensation schemes that have been developed for owners or occupiers of land which may need to be acquired, or may be affected by expansion.

Neither of these topic areas relate directly to the communities of West Berkshire. Eligibility for the Community Fund focuses on areas which are close to construction sites, close to the airport itself, including key roads and public transport routes, and areas within a particular noise contour. The discretionary property compensation scheme is clearly not relevant either so no comments are proposed for this section of the consultation.

## Section 8 – General

This section talks about growing within environmental limits. Expansion at Heathrow is not a choice between the economy and the environment – it must deliver for both. The Development Consent Order process is also outlined.

### Question 8.1

We are proposing to operate an expanded Heathrow within a set of strict environmental limits which would be monitored and enforced by an independent body. Please tell us what you think of our proposed approach to manage the future growth of the airport within environmental limits. Is there anything else we should consider as we develop the framework and its potential limits?

### Proposed Response

*The setting of strict environmental limits and the independent monitoring of these is welcomed. The research into monitoring regimes at other international airports to ensure that the Heathrow proposals are robust adds to a sound approach to the monitoring proposals for this scheme. Heathrow should also take this opportunity to promote the ground breaking fuel cells used in its own noise monitoring to our global partners.*

*Surface access and carbon are the areas that the Council has most interest in and will maintain a watching brief on as the project progresses and annual monitoring reports are published. The Council will also be separately monitoring the progress of the delivery of the Western Rail Access to Heathrow scheme.*

### Question 8.2

To get permission for our expansion proposals we will need to apply for a specific type of permission called a Development Consent Order (DCO). The DCO will contain the legal powers we need to build and operate the expanded airport. It will also place certain constraints on us, including obligations to minimise and reduce the effects of expansion and to pay compensation for land that has to be compulsorily acquired.

Do you have any comments on what we think will need to be contained in our DCO and do you have any views on anything else the DCO should contain?

### Proposed Response

*The Council is confident that Heathrow will include all the relevant documents and information required as part of the DCO process. It will be particularly interested in detailed plans for access to Heathrow and the various plans to promote and incentivise sustainable travel. The detailed and final plans for delivering carbon neutral growth at Heathrow will also be of particular interest.*

### Question 8.3

Do you have any other comments in response to this consultation?

### **Proposed Response**

*The Council is keen to work with Heathrow alongside TVB LEP on maximising the positive economic benefits of expansion of Heathrow as already mentioned in our consultation responses. The development of skills, opportunities for apprenticeships and career development are all areas the Council is keen to be a part of as well as increasing the business and technology links to the benefit of residents and the local economy of West Berkshire.*

*In the same way, the Council is keen to support improvements to transport links to Heathrow, focusing on rail as a priority and then other public transport improvements.*

*West Berkshire Council considers the focus on Heathrow doing all it can to minimise the environmental impacts and offset carbon emissions from its expansion plans as a critical element to its development proposals.*

## Appendix E

### **Motion to Council for 2<sup>nd</sup> July Council meeting**

Motion 4 - Heathrow Airport Expansion proposed by David Marsh Seconded by Carolyne Culver

#### **This Council notes:**

The Heathrow Airport Expansion Consultation opened on 18th June and closes on 13th September 2019.

The next full Council meeting is not until the evening before the consultation closes.

In July 2018 Full Council voted to support Heathrow expansion.

In July 2018 the former Council Leader wrote to Richard Benyon MP outlining the Council's support for Heathrow expansion.

#### **This Council believes:**

Support for Heathrow expansion is incompatible with tackling the climate emergency and the UK becoming carbon neutral by 2030.

The Heathrow Western Rail Link is welcome because it will take more cars off the road, thereby reducing congestion and air pollution.

#### **This Council resolves:**

To oppose Heathrow expansion.

To make a submission to the Heathrow Airport Expansion Consultation to express its opposition to Heathrow expansion.

To write to Richard Benyon MP to express its opposition to Heathrow expansion.

To maintain its support for the Heathrow Western Rail Link.

This page is intentionally left blank