

THE IMPACT OF HEATHROW EXPANSION ON SURFACE ACCESS
Richmond Heathrow Campaign June 2018

1. London Background Traffic
 - a. Congestion from growing background traffic continues to increase the dis-benefit from delayed journeys and pollution,
 - b. There needs to be a shift to public transport but is there capacity?
 - c. The new Elizabeth line (2019) and an upgraded Piccadilly line (mid 2020s) will serve growth and modal shift but overcrowding still results,
 - d. This additional capacity is for background traffic and is not intended for passenger and staff growth at a two or three runway Heathrow.

2. Two runway Heathrow
 - a. Terminating passengers are expected to increase by 60% between 2016 and 2050,
 - b. The Western Rail Access Link (WRAL) and Southern Rail Access Link (SRAL) are not yet committed or funded by a sponsor,
 - c. The WRAL and SRAL are needed to serve the two runway passengers and staff growth and are not sufficient also to support 3rd runway growth.

3. Three runway Heathrow
 - a. Heathrow has pledged Heathrow related vehicle traffic should not increase,
 - b. The resultant public transport modal share would be around 70%, which is a very challenging shift from the current 40%. Daily trips would triple between today and 2050.
 - c. **Substantial new public transport capacity would be required and there appears to be no published scope, cost or timetable for such capacity - a major failing of the NPS.**

4. Failure to achieve 'no increase in vehicle trips'
 - a. The pledge of no increase in road vehicle trips related to Heathrow could easily fail because of failure of modal shift or failure to provide sufficient new public transport capacity,
 - b. **Failure would result in overcrowding on public transport and additional high levels of road traffic added to background traffic with still higher dis-benefits from delayed journeys and pollution - altogether potentially costing the nation up to £25bn (60 year NPV) ,**
 - c. In the event of failure, Heathrow should be required to take remedial action or curtail its flights and terminating passengers.

5. Heathrow's contribution to surface access costs
 - a. Ultimately the user of the surface access should pay,
 - b. To the extent fares to/from Heathrow are subsidised on the Elizabeth line, Piccadilly line, WRAL and SRAL then Heathrow and not the tax payer should pay for the subsidies,
 - c. Heathrow and its passengers and staff are already using surface access capacity they have not paid for and this should not continue with new capacity needed for a 3rd runway.
 - d. **Required road congestion charges of £33 per passenger or more (£20bn 60 year NPV) should be used to fund additional public transport capacity and not as additional return to Heathrow's shareholders,**
 - e. **The costs to passengers for surface access capacity needed for a doubling of Heathrow's terminating passengers from today are likely to be substantial and a major addition to the already high and potentially increasing airport costs born by passengers.**

Contact details:

Peter Willan BSc Eng(Hons), MBA, ARSM, FCMA, FEI, HonRCM

Chair, Richmond Heathrow Campaign

Email: willan829@btinternet.com

www.richmondheathrowcampaign.org