

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

PROPOSAL

New four runway airport on the Hoo Peninsular on the north Kent coast, predicated upon the closure of Heathrow.

No details on the design of the airport infrastructure or the scale of the development are provided.

No operational concept for the airport is provided, other than the use of the two northern runways during night hours to provide respite to residents in Cliffe and other nearby populated areas.

The scheme would be dependent upon significant investment in surface transport infrastructure, including an airport branch of the High Speed 1 line connecting the airport terminal with St Pancras and intermediate stations (Ebbsfleet and Stratford International).

LMA EXPRESS.

INITIAL ASSESSMENT COMMENT

A high-level proposal with limited information on the configuration of the airport infrastructure itself or the specific location of the planned development.

Considerable additional detail would be required in order for this to be considered a practical scheme for full evaluation against the sift criteria.

In the context of other Hoo Peninsula schemes, the London Medway Airport scheme offers only a slight variation in location and limited other information for evaluation purposes.

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

OVERVIEW

Proposal	<u>Proposal for a new 4-runway, 24/7 hub at Cliffe on the Hoo peninsula</u>		
Approach	<u>Develop a 4-runway, 24/7 passenger and cargo airport on unoccupied land north of Cliffe in Medway, Kent as a direct replacement for Heathrow.</u>		Assumed Capital Cost £50 bn
	<u>Gatwick, Luton, Stansted, City and Southend Airports would remain operational and competitive.</u>		
Potential Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Larger, more efficient configuration than Heathrow offers potential for a more resilient operation than Heathrow, able to operate over 24 hours. ▪ Increased economic activity due to unconstrained capacity of new hub airport, allowing for increased international and domestic connectivity enhanced by extensive rail connections in the UK and to northeast Europe. ▪ User benefits from more direct flights, increased frequencies, increased choice of airlines and more competition. ▪ Airline benefits from opportunities to pursue profitable traffic, reduced direct operating costs due to airport design and significantly improved resilience. ▪ Promotion of regeneration in North Kent, Thames Gateway and east of England. ▪ Away from current significant centres of population, reducing net impacts in comparison to Heathrow. 		Additional Capacity (mppa) 50 Additional Capacity (ATM) 300,000
Issues & Risks			
Strategic Fit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Providing additional capacity and specifically replacement hub capacity, the proposal is broadly in line with the Commission's terms of reference. 		
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Given its distance from Heathrow, existing businesses and workforce would be adversely impacted unless they are able to adjust to the new opportunities presented by the redeveloped site or to relocate to the new location. 		
Surface Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Substantial investment required for new surface transport to serve location. 		
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Greenfield site with impacts on designated sites. ▪ Would require appropriate assessment and demonstration of no alternative and overriding public interest plus large scale compensatory habitat creation. 		
Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although the stated cost includes a £5 bn allowance for surface access costs, this would appear to under estimate the total cost to provide all required surface access connections. Total cost likely to be c £50 bn. 		
Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts existing airspace with international cooperation probably required to resolve. ▪ Risk of bird strikes and fog/low visibility conditions currently unknown. ▪ All other airports remaining fully open may be uncertain. 		
Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nature of reclaimed land platform poses increased risk of differential settlement. ▪ No substantive commercial proposal presented, but viability likely to depend upon a range of support measures, including government support / commitment and supportive regulatory framework and planning environment and wider package of measures to reduce the cost of finance. ▪ The required government support also raises fundamental value for money and government accounting questions. 		