

HSPG Masterplan Principles v2.4

This document updates the first version of the HSPG Masterplan Principles (31/7/18), modifying to reflect the HSPG’s consideration of the Updated Assembly Options (AOBs) and the ‘deep dive’ sessions held during September.

This is intended as a relatively ‘timeless’ statement of the HSPG’s expectations and principles to be applied to the airport expansion masterplanning. Specific ‘at a point in time’ comments will be made separately at each iteration of the masterplanning. For the HSPG’s full position this statement should be read alongside:

- HSPG Outcome Statements (Oct 2017) and HSPG Vision and Development Principles document (July 2016)
- HSPG Position Statements: Low Emissions Zone, Local Transport and Environment (Oct 2017)
- The specific responses made to each iteration of the masterplan assembly options – (See responses and questions to the Initial Assembly Options (AO1-4A July 2018) and Updated Assembly Options – (AO1-4B Sept 2018)

HSPG has three overarching concerns about the assembly options:

- **Background information and analysis is needed to explain how the assembly options currently being considered were derived and what they are focused on achieving.**
- **In the view of HSPG, master planning should seek full achievement of the HSPG Vision and Development Principles and the requirements of the HSPG Outcomes Statement, and should ultimately be fully integrated with an HSPG Joint Spatial Planning Framework;**
- **‘Whole’ alternative assembly options (AOs) beyond those currently being tested should be produced which would show how these wider vision and outcomes could be supported with alternative approaches.**

All comments are made in response to the information available on a restricted basis only and entirely without prejudice to the future positions of the HSPG or any member of the Group.

HSPG Masterplanning Principles v2.3

<p>A. Coherent assembly options and testing true alternatives, thematic based strategies and phasing. Challenge accepted wisdom, engagement to test truly alternative options</p>	<p>It is fundamental that coherent alternative assembly options (AOs) are produced to enable meaningful public consideration of alternatives. Truly alternative masterplan options should be produced to test all ‘reasonable alternatives’ on key components and the broader strategies for the scale of development on or off-airport and for wider dispersal.</p> <p>‘Accepted wisdom’ and assumptions should be challenged and other ‘best practice’ considered; however, meaningful engagement should focus on what can be changed.</p> <p>Clear explanations and justification of the overarching thematic strategies for a range of key themes are required. e.g. construction sequence; strategic and</p>
--	---

	<p>local movement around the airport to airport access ‘control points’ and off-airport ASF and ARD sites; airport passenger movement / experience; cargo and logistics processing; G&B Infrastructure strategy etc. The thematic strategies should be expressed spatially as well as in words whenever possible. The masterplanning should address all delivery phases: through site assembly and enabling works; construction of the DCO main works and parallel work outside of the DCO; future development post DCO to enable full utilization of the increased ATM. Schemes of mitigation/enhancement should be detailed throughout all phases.</p>
<p>B. Integration of the DCO with other National Infrastructure projects, planning processes and the Joint Strategic Planning Framework</p>	<p>The professional judgments and working assumptions, evidence and background information behind the the masterplanning needs more emphasis to explain how the options were derived, and should detail the timing, floorspace capacity, employment and precise land uses proposed with more specificity to allow the proper consideration of impacts on the immediate area surrounding the masterplan and the wider HSPG area.</p> <p>Evidence should be agreed (e.g. JEBIS) as far as possible and meaningful collaboration and joint planning maximised to address the area outside of the DCO for a joint spatial planning framework and other planning processes .</p> <p>Successful airport expansion is dependant of substantial floorspace and ‘critical’ enabling development to proceed through separate DCOs and planning applications, HAL should proactively engage in and coordination and collaborative work with the HSPG Group and individual members, and others to manage cumulative and combined impacts and maximise benefits.</p> <p>Coordinated approach with other major infrastructure projects is required when formulating the masterplan particularly around connectivity – both surface access incl. green/blue infrastructure.</p>
<p>C. Unique opportunity, planning for greater integration, not in isolation</p>	<p>As a key principle, the design of all interfaces and connections between the airport and surroundings network and land uses should aim to improve integration and enhance all interfaces. While airport expansion cannot resolve all the problems in the surrounding areas and networks, a more successful future relationship is necessary and this is a unique opportunity for substantial enhancement.</p> <p>Masterplanning should seek full achievement of the HSPG Vision and Development Principles and requirements of the HSPG Outcomes Statement (as amended). Full integration with a HSPG Joint Spatial Planning Framework.</p> <p>See HSPG Position Paper on the Low Emission Zone</p>
<p>C. Catalyst for regeneration – planning and investment to</p>	<p>All opportunities to maximise positive change at local and wider scales should always be sought; this is a unique opportunity to invest wisely and</p>

<p>maximise positive ‘legacy’ benefits at the local and wider scales</p>	<p>reinvent relationships with the wider area and for a ‘better and bigger’ airport with a focus on genuine ‘legacy’ benefits and not just scheme mitigation.</p> <p>At the wider scale, options should explore investing in key infrastructure and dispersing economic growth and employment (Direct, Indirect, Induced and Catalytic) in ways to best achieve mutual aims. Specifically, dispersal of certain Airport Related Development (ARD) such as hotels, support services, offices, and logistics to the future network of well-connected town centres, commercial centres and regeneration areas.</p>
<p>D. Minimise loss of Green Belt and open space near the airport</p>	<p>At the local scale, the loss of Metropolitan Green Belt and open space near the airport can be minimised by the maximum dispersal of hotels and offices to accessible town centres, and the use ‘scarce’ local airport sites proximity priority ASF, parking and cargo driven ARD.</p> <p>There needs to be a more ‘strategic approach to Green Belt impact, assessing wider strategic-scale function of key areas of surrounding Green Belt, address cross-boundary impacts of GB sites to be lost, and ensuring the remaining GB boundaries are made permanent and compensatory ‘betterment’ is best targeted to what remains (NPPF and ANPS refer).</p>
<p>E. Design principles and objectives</p>	<p>Design should where possible offer: a positive outward facing design towards local communities; include finer grain blocks, highly mixed uses and a ‘human scale’ throughout the masterplan; accessible location of publicly available uses and operational access at airport access ‘control points’; and creating an improved local movement network and reducing severance and isolation (including use of Southern Access Tunnel and multifunctional network of green and blue infrastructure).</p> <p>Proper consideration of the need and role of perimeter roads. Where appropriate, suitable screening / buffers / design to shield communities, and protecting access to local businesses.</p>
<p>F. Sustainable surface access should drive masterplanning the</p>	<p>Sustainable surface access strategy should drive the masterplanning and sustainable transport options maximised.</p> <p>The AOs should maximise opportunity for / use of rail, buses & rapid transit vehicles, including measures for the ‘last part of the journey’ (to encourage mode shift); utilise Southern Access Tunnel to the CTA for public transport; and encourage patterns of staff travel and access to the Airport to deliver ‘no more traffic’ pledge, modal and Air Quality targets.</p> <p>Major development site options (such as the proposed Parkways) should be accompanied with outlines of proposed management strategies to maximise benefits (such as new focus for coaches and local buses) and prevent / avoid and manage the undesirable impacts (such as the management and physical</p>

	<p>measures to restrict ‘rat running’ and create controlled parking zones to restrict inappropriate car parking in local areas etc).</p> <p>Transformative measures are required to increase use of ‘sustainable modes of transport’(public transport with buses / rapid transit vehicles, cycling and walking) to improve access for airport workers to move into and around the airport / ARD ‘campus’, and to access from the surrounding communities. This requires both new physical provisions and services, and ‘soft’ advantage measures including: extension of free bus travel zones, extension of Zone 6 / Oyster for Spelthorne , greater integration of cross-boundary bus services and ticketing regimes, for faster more convenient and affordable sustainable travel to complement and the required additional rail lines / capacity / ticketing improvements (e.g. to serve the airport (Western and southern rail access). Including use of multifunctional green/blue routes for ‘commuter’ and leisure movement that are safe and attractive for users.</p> <p>The inclusion of the Southern Access Tunnel to Central Terminal Area (CTA) in all options is strongly supported. This will enable buses to traverse the airport north to south and places the CTA at the very heart of the transport network. Further information required on how the tunnel could be used and configured into the local road network, what purpose of vehicles will be able to use it etc? <u>(The HSPG is of the view that the management of congestion on the approach routes is the key issue and therefore that the use of the tunnel by ‘clean’ electric private cars is unlikely to be supported).</u></p> <p>The strategy for movement around and across the airport for ASF and ARD traffic needs to be clearer, including the airport perimeter roads – options effectively remove the airport perimeter road on the northern and western sides. The future strategy to access the main cargo areas and Terminal 4 in the south need to be clearer.</p> <p>Integrated surface access strategy is required, around the airport campus and beyond, addressing wider displacement effects beyond boundaries of Low Emissions Zone and traffic management areas. The local impacts of displaced and realigned roads (inc. A4 and A3044) should be carefully considered.</p> <p>All masterplanning must make provision for all planned enhancements to existing and proposed new rail links and service development options. It should demonstrate that both a range of Southern Rail Access options and the Western Rail Access (including station locations) are integrated into the HAL masterplanning, including service options for terminating and through-running rail services.</p>
--	---

	<p>It is noted that the location of the Immigration Removal Centre at Bedfont could impact some of the development opportunities that might be important to facilitating the Hounslow Southern Rail Access proposal</p> <p>HSPG also seek support from HAL for the Chiltern link to Old Oak Common, although noting that this is a scheme is also to be developed by another party.</p> <p>HAL must proactively engage with secondary processes for the delivery of Western Rail Access and the scheme selection and delivery of Southern Rail Access, to ensure total integration. The delivery of the schemes should be achieved in a timely and sensitive environmental manner, and subject to modelling, the proposed increases in ATM operations linked to the commencement of new rail access capacity. .</p>
<p>G. Resilient and appropriate access to the M25 – further design consideration required</p>	<p>The position of the HSPG is refined – rather than specifying preference for the retention of a two junction M25 (J14 & 14a) solution over an alternative simpler single junction access, the principle sought is to achieve maximum resilience of direct access to the airport and Poyle industrial area from the M25 with a design for minimum environmental impact. This might be provided by both a correctly designed one or two junction solution. None of the AOBs appear clear or satisfactory.</p> <p>The issues and drawings are very complex. The HSPG repeat the request for a ‘deep dive’ on the ‘strategic road issues’. (This should include the Agencies, and responsible authorities and key partners in the room). Further consideration should be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring maximum resilience of access to the airport and for commercial traffic to Poyle - direct to the M25 • Clarity about the design considerations and hierarchy of roads and purposes at the junction(s). e.g. which local roads have access to the motorway, which are local distributors, ‘airport perimeter road’ function, local access roads etc. • Retaining and enhancing connectivity across the M25 for buses/cycles/pedestrians to access the airport and surrounding areas (this requires ‘bridging’ the M25 not junctions) • Reducing inappropriate local road access routes from the M25, potentially resulting in a simpler design • Restricting all taxi/car access to the SW parkway / western terminal to be direct from the M25 only • Restricting all LGV/HGV access to air cargo area to be via M25 junction and preferred routes. Restricting use of local roads for access to the south of the airport – redirecting to the M25 • Consideration of the 3D design impacts of the junctions and bridging of the M25 and the significance of the environmental benefits to G&BI network that could follow from a simpler design solution. <p>See HSPG Transport Position Paper for further detail</p>

<p>H. The scale of airport parking</p>	<p>The total quantity of proposed car parking provision is fundamentally challenged, this needs to be justified or revised downward. HAL’s justification needs to be much more explicitly presented and evidenced. Noting that car parking is proposed to increase slightly (2.5%) in absolute terms but that this means a reduction in spaces per passenger and employee with the employee reduction significant. More information is needed to understand the assumptions behind car park usage in particular backfilling of taxis. Similarly, the relationship with management of ‘drop-offs’ and taxis should be robustly justified.</p> <p>HSPG want to engage with the determination of the number of car park places and future management control (see below) of other private parking and car use much more closely before any agreement to absolute numbers.</p> <p>See HSPG Transport Position Statement for further detail.</p>
<p>I. Parkway locations – principles of use allied with comprehensive management of the surrounding areas</p>	<p>The position of the HSPG is redefined to support the development of consolidated parking at two strategic parkways to the north and southwest (noting the objections and requirements of Spelthorne – this matter is addressed in greater detail in the Transport Position Paper). The two sites should provide almost all passenger and colleague airport parking. The parkways should be restricted to access from the motorway and strategic road network only, but include the connection of public transport and cycling, to provide a local public transport hub as well as a car park.</p> <p>The parkways should be linked to all terminals via high quality high frequency, reliable and quick transit system. This transit system needs to connect both car parks to all primary terminals and means the development of a connection across the airport (southwestern car park -> T5 -> CTA -> northern car park).</p> <p>The HSPG do not support a southern carpark (near the access point to the Southern Tunnel). It is likely to cause local road congestion. Rather it is preferable to strengthen the T4 transit connections to CTA and SW parkway.</p> <p>Dedicated rapid transit links from both parkways to access all airport terminals (and similar for colleagues to workplaces at terminals, ASF / ARD) are required. These systems should also act as important access points to the airport for taxis and hire cars.</p> <p>HSPG support for the concept is dependent on: a) comprehensive proposals to manage and enforce suitable parking controls in the surrounding areas designed to protect residential amenities and / local business requirements, and b) proposals for cooperative action to restrict private carparks and courtesy parking / storage in the wider area.</p> <p>See HSPG Transport Position Statement for further detail.</p>

<p>J. Park and Ride</p>	<p>Off-site park and ride sites should be implemented for connections during construction phase. Potentially P&R may have a role in consolidated parking to serve employment locations and ARD sites in the longer term? Further consideration required of options</p>
<p>K. A4 and A3044 diversions and airport ‘perimeter road’</p>	<p>On the basis of information currently available HSPG do have an agreed position on the diversion of the A4 and A3044. (See response to the UAOB). This should be subject to a ‘deep dive’ on road issues. The ‘cartoons’ are not easily to resolve, but it appears that the northern and western perimeter roads will disappear, placing reliance on the diverted A4 A3044 west of the M25? The need and role of perimeter roads needs to be clarified.</p> <p>Also see HSPG Transport Position Paper and various responses to the AOBs.</p>
<p>L. DCO ‘red line’ boundary to ensure the delivery of necessary mitigation and compensation works</p>	<p>DCO ‘red line’ should extend well beyond the airport perimeter as necessary to enable full delivery of mitigations and compensatory measures and ensuring a wide area around the airport is comprehensively managed and maintained in the long term – a ‘legacy’ effect.</p> <p>A comprehensive planning statement should reference the relationship with Development Plans, including the role of Local Plans and Minerals & Waste Plans.</p>
<p>M. Airport operational requirements - taxi-ways, aprons, terminals, runway thresholds, public safety zones etc</p>	<p>On the basis of information supplied it <i>appears</i> to be the case that the extent of taxiways, aprons, runway thresholds etc are necessary for sound operational and safety reasons. However, this needs to be validated by the CAA and NATS before HSPG can endorse this.</p> <p>It <i>appears</i> that options for a western extension of the ‘starter extensions’ to the NW runway cannot not supported. This would significantly increase the impact of take-off engine noise, runway and alignment of taxi-ways in the Colnbrook area, for little / no useful benefit at the eastern end (because the relationship created between the realigned A4 with Sipson appears unacceptably harmful – AO3B)</p> <p>The full range of benefits of expansion at the northern or western terminal locations need to be fully evaluated including assessment of whether more or different sensitive receptors in adjacent areas are impacted by each.</p> <p>Further detail is needed on the nature of ASF, individual uses, requirements (e.g. travel time access to what destinations) and the scope for location on or off airport thoroughly evaluated.</p> <p>The indicative new Public Safety Zones associated with new operating procedures for all runway thresholds should be <i>identified now</i> to assist the consideration of areas around the airport.</p>

<p>N. Construction phase</p>	<p>The HSPG believe that a substantial provision of a range of construction worker accommodation is essential in order to avoid unacceptable impacts on local housing markets and open land /environment. The HSPG encourage the provision of properly planned temporary camps and worker / ‘legacy’ affordable housing and management of acquired housing stock. Different levels of provision will be required throughout the airport expansion period.</p> <p>Use of a railhead for bulk materials and building components should be maximised, subject to role of the rail-head in the full masterplan and further exploration of layout options and impact on river corridors. All construction vehicle fleets should comply with best environmental standards (e.g. Euro 6) and all routing be designed to minimize impacts off-site.</p> <p>Some temporary construction sites may be proposed within the Green Belt for lengthy temporary uses. Compensation, mitigation, remaking to ensure environmental betterment needed from the outset.</p> <p>Further information is required about the strategy of remote construction logistic centres and construction processes but advantages appear to be apparent.</p> <p>There is a need for a brief setting out the sourcing of minerals required to build the development and the disposal of waste arising from the development.</p> <p>The avoidance of use of borrow pits outside of ‘construction area’ and broad balance of excavation / demolition with land fill (20M m3) are welcomed. The interaction of this with existing and emerging Waste and Flood Risk alleviation Plans other National Infrastructure Projects needs to be clearly established. (Further information is sought of the proposed removal from site of a small element of contaminated waste is required).</p> <p>With the information currently available the HSPG does not at this time have a position on the precise location of the proposed rail transshipment site for construction purposes nor its potential wider / longer term roles.</p>
<p>O. Connected landscape (Green & Blue Infrastructure) with plans for positive management of Green Belt, water bodies and open space</p>	<p>The principle of establishing a firm requirement for a publicly walkable multi-functional ‘green loop’ is welcomed; this should be of ‘good size, usefulness, attractiveness, quality and accessibility¹’ feature that integrates with surrounding multi-functional connected networks of accessible and natural G&B infrastructure. The existing parts of networks to be interconnected should be similarly protected and strengthened.. This should provide an important basis for mitigation and compensatory enhancement provisions, supported by appropriate management, rights of way and maintenance agreements.</p>

¹ ANPS para 5.120 refers

	<p>he design of the AOs options should clearly display how they are informed by the work on the scope for enhancement and importance of the green and blue corridors around the airport. A strong network of green/blue corridors, with long-term management regimes, should be a driver of design, and heritage and historic landscapes should be enhanced (informed by HSPG’s Heathrow Area Landscape Framework).</p> <p>Design should include a programme of enhancement within local villages / settlements and ‘Green Envelopes’ around them. (e.g. strategy offered by Slough for Colnbrook). Care should be taken that areas identified for public amenity space can genuinely contribute to environmental and recreational objectives.</p> <p>The adverse impacts on river corridors, green open space and Green Belt extend well beyond the expanded airport perimeter. e.g. in relation to water systems.</p> <p>The ANPS and NPPF carry a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and open space; alternative options should be must be exhausted to demonstrate ‘very special circumstances’ and any loss accompanied by a clear strategy for betterment. Open space, sports and recreation buildings should be replaced. (Development plans and NPPF apply together with the ANPS – revised NPPF introduces further Green Belt compensation considerations)</p>
<p>P. Freight Strategy and facilities</p>	<p>A comprehensive freight strategy and freight surface access network required. Thorough investigation of both widely dispersed and concentrated models of provisions is required. However, both consolidated and dispersed cargo deliveries involve moving freight around the perimeter of the airport and then reliance on ARD (potentially in excess 700,000sqm) away from the airport. Consolidated delivery points for cargo and other airport deliveries at both the North / West and South perimeters, together with a system to move this around the airport internally using sustainable means, would reduce traffic on perimeter roads.</p> <p>Deeper consideration needs to be given to achieving more logistics cargo space at the airport campus, and the key preferred locations of logistics ARD in the wider area, with preferred routing of LGV/HGV traffic to be established.</p> <p>Deeper consideration required on the potential benefits alternative layout arrangements and longer-term role of the construction railhead site for: a) other major construction projects in the area or b) the permanent role of air cargo / road freight / rail freight transshipment interface.</p> <p>See HSPG Position Paper on the Low Emission Zone</p>

<p>Q. Air Quality Zone and Noise (surface running and airborne)</p>	<p>There should be collaboration with the Low Emission Zones now being created and planned by the Mayor of London and surrounding local authorities in Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Surrey, and coordinated approaches to Air Quality approaches and Zones in conjunction with HSPG.</p> <p>Baselines should be agreed now and measures address throughout site assembly, construction and implementation to achieve full airport expansion.</p> <p>Visual annotations are required now to inform land use planning and to demonstrate of how the “Innovative Noise Envelope” mitigation proposed by the national airports and airspace policy would be applied. This will be beneficial to all parties.</p> <p>See HSPG Position Paper on the Low Emission Zone</p>
<p>R. Reducing flood risk</p>	<p>Spatial approach should reduce flood risk rather than maintain existing levels as mitigation (and to address potential increases from climate change).</p> <p>Heathrow’s Preferred Master Plan must include all land required to mitigate the impacts of development. The Masterplan must identify the locations for flood storage capacity (in view of HAL’s confirmation that all sites identified in Consultation One will be required). Flood modelling must be provided to all the Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFA) as part of the Preferred Masterplan consultation. Joint deep dives should then take place with the LLFA, the EA and HAL’</p>

v2.4 MT 19/10/18