

## **Summary of Surrey County Council Resolutions in response to proposals for airport expansion**

### **The Future Development of Air Transport in the United Kingdom: South East (SERAS) Surrey County Council's consultation response (November 2002)**

The report sets out Surrey County Council's response to the original government consultation which excluded options for any further runway development at Gatwick Airport.

With specific regard to Heathrow the following resolutions were agreed:

That the Executive, on behalf of the County Council

- wishes to safeguard the role of Heathrow and Gatwick as major international airports given their importance to Surrey and the South East generally and will support appropriate investment there to secure this;
- considers that the surface access infrastructure package agreed for Terminal 5 at Heathrow is inadequate and should be improved;
- if further growth at Heathrow is to be considered then it should be conditional on substantial investment in local and regional surface access and the provision of a major rail investment linking Heathrow with the Midlands, the West and the South, in addition to London;

### **The Future Development of Air Transport in the United Kingdom: South East (SERAS) - Second Edition**

The revised Government consultation which incorporated options for additional runway provision at Gatwick Airport. The recommendations were not included in the actual report to committee, and instead, were agreed at the meeting, and recorded in the minutes as follows:

#### **Recommendations**

The Executive agrees that the County Council should:

- Restate its concern to safeguard the role of Heathrow and Gatwick as major international airports given their importance to Surrey and the South East generally.
- Restate the stance in its previous submission in relation to Heathrow that if further growth at Heathrow is to be considered then it should be conditional on substantial investment in local and regional surface access and the provision of major rail investment linking Heathrow with the Midlands, the West and the South, in addition to London.

In addition the Executive notes that Members of the Council had requested an opportunity to consider the second SERAS consultation before the Executive determined its final response.

The Executive is minded also to agree further resolutions in the following terms:

#### **Item 7, Annex 2**

- Confirms its support for the 2019 Gatwick legal agreement and opposes further expansion at Gatwick on regional planning, operational, surface access and environmental grounds set out in the report.
- Considers that expansion at Stansted could be a flexible response to uncertainty about whether an additional or alternative hub is required in the south east and

would also accord strongly with regional planning and the New Communities Paper objectives.

Mindful that its report will be discussed at the Council meeting on 17 June, the Executive also agrees that the Executive Director for Sustainable Development, in consultation with the Leader and the Executive Member for the Environment, be authorised to agree its final response to the consultation.

### **Additional comments arising at the full Council meeting on 17 June 2003**

At the meeting of County Council, it was requested that the following comments were also submitted to the Department for Transport to accompany the committee report and the recommendations that were subsequently agreed.

- The current and planned capacity at Heathrow requires significant improvements in surface access and infrastructure , especially rail, before further growth is considered. Inadequate surface access and infrastructure is having a detrimental effect on the Surrey economy and environment. The investment required in surface access and infrastructure to meet the needs of current and planned capacity would not on its own be sufficient to meet the demand created by a third runway. Only with additional investment in surface access and infrastructure could the County Council give consideration to proposals for a third runway at Heathrow.
- Because of uncertainty about whether the long term forecasts for traffic growth will be realised, the Government should adopt a flexible approach.
- Should the Government be minded to take forward proposals at other airports or variations on existing proposals that did not form part of the 2002 or Second Edition consultation, we would expect the fullest public consultation to allow an assessment of the local and regional impacts.
- The Government should publish its decision on further runway, terminal and infrastructure provision as soon as possible to reduce uncertainty and relieve blight.
- Any proposals for expansion at Redhill Aerodrome would be contrary to the Surrey Structure Plan which resists any intensification of flying or related activities at Redhill.

Item 7, Annex 2

### **County Council Meeting 4 March 2008**

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE C CONSULTATION ON PROPOSALS TO EXPAND HEATHROW AIRPORT**

The following motion referred to the Executive by the Council on 22 January 2008 was considered by the Executive:

‘This Council agrees that, given the negative environmental impact on Surrey, this Council opposes any further expansion of Heathrow.’

At its meeting on 26 February 2008, the Executive took account of the comments and views expressed by Local Committees, the Environment and Economy and Transportation Select Committees and by Members generally. A revised response to the consultation was tabled by the Executive Members for Transport and Environment and agreed by the Executive.

**'This Council agrees that, given the negative environmental impact on Surrey, this Council opposes any further expansion of Heathrow Airport unless and until comprehensive and credible investment which satisfactorily addresses the environmental and surface access issues. has been agreed and put in place.'**

The above response was agreed on 4 March 2008 by the County Council and forms the "existing policy" referred to in the resolution below.

### **County Council meeting – 16 October 2012**

**Amendment to motion standing in the name of Ian Beardsmore, proposed by David Hodge**

**(additional words underlined)**

This council opposes any proposals **out of line with existing county council policy** to build additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick airports or increase air traffic at other **local** airports. ~~in and around Surrey, such as Farnborough and Biggin Hill, due to the damage this would cause to Surrey's environment and the adverse impact on Surrey's residents.~~

Council agrees to write to the Secretary of State for Transport to express its view that while being pro economic growth the Surrey environment must be protected ~~and alternatives to airport expansion in the South East must be found~~ **and to express support for the Government's approach in requesting Sir Howard Davies to assess options for managing airport capacity in the UK.**

### **County Council Meeting 16 July 2013**

Item 9(ii)

Mr Peter Martin (Godalming South, Milford and Witley) to move under Standing Order 11 as follows:

'This Council recognises the crucial role of the airports at Heathrow and Gatwick in supporting employment for Surrey residents, generating investment in the Surrey economy and in attracting and retaining major businesses to locate in the county.

Given the vital importance of these airports for the continued success of the Surrey economy, this Council opposes any proposals that would serve to reduce their capacity or the role of Heathrow as a hub airport.

This Council remains of the view that expansion at either airport would require the environmental and surface access issues involved to be satisfactorily addressed.

This Council calls on Government and the aviation industry to prioritise investment in road and rail connections to the airports to reduce congestion and overcrowding.'

(59 Yes, 3 No and 3 abstentions)

## **County Council Meeting 15 October 2013**

### **ITEM 8(iii)**

“That this Council recognises the concerns of the residents of Stanwell Moor about proposals for the expansion of Heathrow and calls on the Davies Commission to end the uncertainty for them as soon as possible.”

43 Members voting for and 19 Members voting against it. There were 2 abstentions.