

PROPOSAL TITLE:	East London Airport	Short Term	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUBMITTED BY:	Private individual	Medium/Long Term	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

OVERVIEW

Proposal	To develop a two runway airport at the confluence of the M20, M25 and M26 as part of a four airport strategy to serve London. Flights would be distributed across London's airports to make better use of existing capacity at Heathrow, Stansted and Gatwick and the new East London Airport.		
Approach	No details provided. It is assumed that following enabling legislation an appropriate special purpose vehicle would be established to construct and operate the new airport, with unspecified regulatory/legislative mechanisms established to distribute flights between the airports.	Assumed Capital Cost	£50 bn+
Potential Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although not quantified, it would be assumed to deliver national and local economic benefits. Potential for a larger, more efficiently configured site offers the potential for a resilient operation. Additional capacity could allow for growth in range of flight destinations, frequencies and airlines. Low additional population affected by noise compared with Heathrow. 	Additional Capacity (mppa)	80
		Additional Capacity (ATM)	550,000
Key Issues & Risks			
Strategic Fit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal increases the capacity of the London system. However, the proposed distribution of flights disregards passenger and airline preferences and would not enable the London system to operate as a hub. It is not clear therefore that the proposal is aligned strongly with the Commission's terms of reference. 		
Surface Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the airport is located close to major motorways, its catchment areas may be lower than other locations. The distribution of all flights to/from London to the four airports would require all O/D passengers to travel across/around London to access the airport serving their particular flight. This is likely to require significant upgrades to road and rail networks across London. 		
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be expected to impact a number of environmental designated sites and lies wholly within the Kent Downs AONB. The increase in surface travel is likely to negatively impact carbon and air quality objectives. 		
Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No details provided. Large construction costs can be assumed given the scale of the development. However, the significant road and rail infrastructure requirements across the London system are likely to add substantially to the total cost. The site lies within the North Downs causing a significant cost to render the site compliant with gradients required by an airport. 		
Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passengers hubbing over London would be required to transfer landside between airports. Impacts existing airspace. International cooperation may be required to resolve. May necessitate the closure of Biggin Hill. 		
Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scheme would only be achievable with cooperation from all London airports and airlines. The scheme would need to be driven centrally by government, but within an "open skies" market place is likely to be contrary to UK and European legislation. If airlines do not subscribe to this arrangement they could base operations at other European hub airports. Should private finance be required, it is probable that a range of support measures would be required including government support / commitment and supportive regulatory framework and planning environment. The scale of private financing involved is large and deliverability is not certain despite significant government funding and underwriting of risk. The required government support also raises fundamental value for money and government accounting questions. The non-closure of Heathrow may raise certain risks (e.g. re level of demand) that could render the scheme commercially unviable. 		