

<b>PROPOSAL TITLE:</b>	<b>London Thames Global Airport and Cruise Liner Terminal</b>	<b>Short Term</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>SUBMITTED BY:</b>	<b>Private individual</b>	<b>Medium/Long Term</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### PROPOSAL

A single runway airport proposed at the London Gateway Logistics Park, a brownfield site and deep water port being developed by DP World on the Thames estuary near Thurrock, south of Basildon. The adjacent port would be redeveloped as a cruise liner terminal. A London Thames Global Airport South Terminal would be located by Ebbsfleet International Station, connected by a high speed rail shuttle via the proposed Lower Thames Crossing.

The single runway airport is intended to complement the existing London system, with future runway capacity provided at Gatwick and beyond that Stansted if required.

#### INITIAL ASSESSMENT COMMENT

High level, brief proposal for a 'reliever' airport scheme that would add incremental capacity to the London system.

The proposed site would require investment in surface transport infrastructure to achieve acceptable journey times from London. The suggested synergies between aviation and a cruise ship terminal are not obviously relevant to the Commission's remit.

The submission does not address the impact of relocating DP World's new investment in the London Gateway. The cost of acquisition is not addressed, nor the impact on the UK port industry of the lost capacity. Both are likely to be significant.

Whilst, in theory, the airport proposal has the potential to add capacity to the London system, it is not clear that doing so, at the loss of the Thames Gateway development, is the most efficient option given other sites that could be developed with less impact.

PROPOSAL TITLE:	London Thames Global Airport and Cruise Liner Terminal	Short Term	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUBMITTED BY:	Private individual	Medium/Long Term	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## OVERVIEW

Proposal	A single runway airport proposed at the London Gateway Logistics Park, a brownfield site and deep water port being developed by DP World on the Thames estuary south of Basildon.		
Approach	No detail provided on whether DP World would lead the redevelopment of the existing site, a third party would acquire the site for redevelopment, or the scheme would be government led with enabling legislation forcing the closure of the port in its current form and its redevelopment.	Assumed Capital Cost	£30 bn+
Potential Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention of jobs and businesses at Heathrow and surrounding area.</li> <li>Could facilitate increased competition between London area airports.</li> <li>Brownfield site with surrounding relatively low population density.</li> <li>May be intended to be privately financed although public support likely for surface transport.</li> </ul>	Additional Capacity (mppa)	35
		Additional Capacity (ATM)	250,000
<b>Key Issues &amp; Risks</b>			
Strategic Fit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The high-level plan would provide additional capacity with reduced noise impact. In this regard it may be seen as being in line with the Commission's terms of reference. However, the scheme would have a significant impact upon the UK port industry and therefore it is not clear that this is the most strongly aligned proposal across all considerations.</li> </ul>		
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most additional demand is likely to be generated from short haul trips to Europe and the UK given long haul airlines would be likely to locate at Heathrow or Gatwick.</li> <li>Any benefit from increased aviation would need to be offset by the impacts on the London Gateway port.</li> </ul>		
Surface Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial investment required for new surface transport.</li> <li>Stated travel times appear unrealistic.</li> <li>The removal of the Thames Gateway port would be likely to adversely impact UK port capacity.</li> </ul>		
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although brownfield location with relatively low population density, which with carefully designed noise preferential routes could limit noise impacts, some previously un-impacted communities would be subject to noise and air quality nuisance.</li> </ul>		
Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No cost details provided, however total cost including compensation to DP World, plus required surface access is likely to be significant. Surface access may increase the cost by c £5bn (assuming the Lower Thames Cross was developed so that it could be used by the proposed airport). However, the redevelopment of the London Gateway port as a cruise facility would add significantly to the cost.</li> </ul>		
Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May impact existing airspace with international cooperation required to resolve.</li> <li>Would require the closure of Southend Airport.</li> </ul>		
Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>Indicates that the DP World development and the Aerotropolis are incompatible and that the DP World operation would have to be absorbed by other UK container ports.</u></b></li> <li>Unclear how a funding/financing strategy and ownership structure would work.</li> <li>Probable need for government underwriting of project risk for financeability.</li> </ul>		