


PROPOSAL TITLE:	A 3 rd and 4 th Heathrow Runway at the UK Hub airport	Short Term	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUBMITTED BY:	Aras Global	Medium/Long Term	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>


PROPOSAL

Heathrow to be developed as the UK’s hub airport. The scheme comprises the following elements:


1. The introduction of mixed mode on the existing runways for the peak hours as soon as possible.
2. The construction of a 3rd runway, 390m to the south of the existing southern runway. This close parallel runway would be located partly within the existing boundary of Heathrow Airport and then extending further to the west.
3. The construction of a 4th runway in the longer term: a close parallel runway, about 390m to the north of the existing northern runway, located on or near to the current A4 road.



3rd runway – Option 1



3rd runway - Option 2



4th runway

INITIAL ASSESSMENT COMMENT

The proposal sets out a strategy for the short, medium and long term expansion of Heathrow. The submission does not provide specific evidence that close parallel runways are the optimal operational solution and a thorough assessment of noise, air quality and other environmental impacts has not been conducted. However, a number of potential environmental mitigations are set out.

PROPOSAL TITLE:	A 3rd and 4th Heathrow Runway at the UK Hub airport	Short Term	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUBMITTED BY:	Aras Global	Medium/Long Term	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

OVERVIEW

Proposal	Phased expansion of Heathrow. In the short term by the introduction of mixed mode operations and subsequently with a 3 rd close-spaced runway to the south and then to the north.		
Approach	Proposes that the scheme would be undertaken through the established regulatory mechanisms by the airport owners, immediately following government approval. Mixed mode is proposed to be adopted on the existing runways in the short term with the 3 rd runway operational by the early 2020's and the 4 th by the late 2020's.	Stated Capital Cost MM £0.5bn 3rd Rwy: £2-3 bn 4th Rwy: 5 bn	
Benefits	Potential benefits could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Phased expansion building upon existing airport and transport infrastructure.Increased economic activity due to additional capacity of new hub airport, allowing for increased international and domestic connectivity.Possible reduction in night flight nuisance with additional capacity/flexibility.Lower construction carbon footprint compared to new hub locations with use of existing infrastructure.Potential for increased resilience over current Heathrow operations.	Additional Capacity (mppa) MM: 10 3 rd Rwy: 30 4 th Rwy: 50 Additional Capacity (ATM) MM: 50,000 3 rd Rwy: 160,000 4 th Rwy: 270,000	
Key Issues & Risks			
Strategic Fit	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Aligned with the Commission's objectives and sets out to create hub airport capacity while mitigating negative impacts on communities and the environment.		
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Some services could transfer from Gatwick, because of enhanced opportunities to take advantage of hub connectivity, which could free capacity at Gatwick.		
Surface Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Uncertain whether the local road network would cope with the projected increase in demand.Although road upgrades are discussed, the proposal does not consider any rail upgrades that may be required and appears to assume that existing plans would be adequate.		
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Risks to air quality continuing in medium term.Little change for arriving flights over central London as closed spaced runways would require Runway 25L&R arrivals to continue to use existing runways., although noted operational changes could help alleviate somewhat.Environmentally designated sites affected within 2km.Additional impacts from M25 diversion likely.Flood risk area likely to be affected with compensatory storage required.		
Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Only a high level cost assessment has been provided. Stated costs appear to underestimate probable scale of investment required, including all off-site and additional costs attached to the replacement of displaced/replaced existing infrastructure.Stated cost includes elements of surface access works, but likely that further investment required and that public support maybe necessary.		
Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Uncertain that sufficient area is available for all necessary taxiways, etc to make effective and efficient use of the additional, close-spaced runway capacity.The 3rd runway would require the removal (and replacement) of Terminal 4, plus supporting infrastructure south of the existing southern runway. The 4th runway would impact the business and infrastructure north of the existing northern runway.The stated operating modes do not comply with current requirements for close-spaced runways.		
Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Appears to assume that the works would be delivered through the established regulatory mechanisms, but unclear whether government/regulatory support required to achieve financeability/viability and/or specifically for surface transport upgrades.Government support requirement raises issue re affordability and value for money.		