**First Meeting of the HCEB Transport, Environment and Noise Advisory Group (TENAG)**

**Institute of Civil Engineers, One George Street, London SW1, 10th April 2019, 6-8 pm**

**Attendance**

Kris Beuret Chair, Paul Le Blond, Peter Bradley, Rob Buick,Mark Frost,Tim Henderson, Martyn Hurst, Guido Liguori, Arthur Leathley,

Susan Parsons, John Stewart,Christine Taylor.

**Apologies**

Lynda Addison, Bob McLellan

**Summary**

* + The background note explaining the rationale and structure for setting up and HCEB TENAG was discussed and approved.

The key role was to ‘scrutinise and challenge’.

* + The plan for membership of the Core Advisory Group and Specialist supporting group was agreed.
	+ Membership of the specialist support group was in draft and confidential but further suggestions for membership were invited.
	+ There was a need to add someone with environmental (especially air quality) expertise.

The main points discussed as well as associated requests and suggestions for actions are shown below along with subsequent

feedback from Heathrow.

**Next Steps**

* Future meetings and themes

Thursday June 27th, 6-8 pm: Noise envelopes

Thursday September 19th, 6-8 pm: Masterplan .

**Main Discussion – Surface Access with feedback from Heathrow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Comments/Actions** | **Actions/Requests** | **Heathrow feedback** |
| **A regional approach**  | There is a danger of incrementalism with Heathrow developing separate strategies without a fundamentallook about what is happening in the surrounding areas. Some transport and planning policies which might seem not to have a direct effect on HAL could still be highly relevant in the overall impact, and there could be cumulative gains in a joined-up approach.  | TENAG believes that HAL should work with stakeholders to set up such a structure. | Setting the boundary is difficult since Heathrow have no control of hotels, freight and cargo providers outside the airport perimeter. Whilst some stakeholders want to see it widened, others believe it could already be too restrictive. As the boundary supports the Heathrow’s no more traffic pledge, it is important that whichever boundary is chosen, it represents an accurate reflection of airport related traffic which can be measured. There needs to be a happy medium with outcomes which can be easily measured – defined as the ‘limit of the airport road network’However the ANPS notes that Heathrow is committed to meet the target of no more traffic on roads than there is today and this would need an area wide approach the structure for which did not yet exist.  |
| **Mobility as a Service (MaaS)** | Regional authorities such as Transport for the West Midlands are adopting such a policy with a key aim of influencing modal choice. HAL could consider a similar scheme in liaison with TfL. | Heathrow should consider the business case for introducing a Mobility as a Service Provider (MaaS) scheme for both colleagues, passengers and the wider public.  | Although a full scale MaaS scheme is not envisaged there are elements both current and planned which could be built up towards the concept. Examples were work with ‘colleagues’, the free travel zone, Heathrow Express accepting Oyster the one stop shop travel wallet, , development of an App to encourage booking backfilling for taxis and linking air payments with ongoing travel bookings. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Comments/Actions** | **Actions/Requests** | **Heathrow feedbak** |
| **Surface Access** A background note was tabled. The reason for choosing surface access as a subject for the first meeting was to feed into Heathrow’s drafting process prior to their publication of the draft surface transport strategy in June. The record over time was not good for air passengers and meeters/greeters. Since 1990 car use had stayed the same (c 28%) and public transport only increased slightly (33% to 39%). Taxi use had grown to 32%. The strategy includes targets to increase public transport use by air passengers to 51% by 2030 and 57% by 2040. Today 53% of the workforce use cars and 39% public transport compared to 82% and 14% respectively in 1991. The strategy includes targets to reduce car use by staff to 40% by 2030 and 26% by 2040. | The discussion focused on the need to increase the proportion of access to the airport by sustainable transport. The point was made that the mode share targets should include all airport functions in the DCO such as traffic resulting from re-siting.It was accepted that reducing car use would be challenging even with the proposed Western and Southern rail and especially without. Areas west and south-west of Heathrow are badly served by public transport. Nor does public transport operate on a 24-hour basis. Was the planned reduction a target or a pledge and how accountable or enforceable?What about traffic generated by others such as airlines and hotels. Will the airport boundary exclude certain roads? It is not clear how through (non-airport) traffic within the airport boundary is accounted for. | It was accepted that both HAL and HCEB support this aim. TENAG are keen to work with Heathrow to achieve this.TENAG supports the case for the reduction in motor vehicle use and considers that this is more likely to be achieved by new rail routes. More clarity required in the definition of targets and pledges which should be compatible with the ANPS. How will these targets be monitored and what action will be taken if they are not met?Role of DfT?TENAG challenges the boundary assumptions, to ensure that all airport as well as non- airport related traffic is included. The master plan should show details of local road diversions. | The key to achieving targets is to build a strategy that maximes the utilisation of existing infrastructure, builds new where needed and drives behavioural change. The proposed Western and Southern rail route, the Piccadilly and Elizabeth Lines are crucial and Heathrow welcome support from TENAG for these developments.The Heathrow Surface Access Proposals document will be published on 18th June – this will be a c650 page document and includes six modal delivery plans and four policy documents. Heathrow welcome TENAG’s response to this which they hope will address some of the concerns already expressed and will be compatible with the ANPSThe document will set out in draft how Heathrow proposes to set and measure the targets that are laid out in the ANPSHeathrow also has a pledge **of** no more than current landside traffic within the expanded airport boundary.In terms of scrutiny within the consultation documents, Heathrow is including proposals for an independent scrutiny panel.  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Comments/Actions** | **Actions/Requests** | **Heathrow feedbak** |
| Parking | The impact of Heathrow generated traffic affects the wider area – examples of inappropriate parking in nearby villages especially PHVs (particularly Addison Lee and smaller companies but not UBER) and lack of enforcement; or where cars drive to an off-airport carpark, and up to 50 people are then picked up by coach, so the cars are not counted in reduction targets. | What plans are there for better control and enforcement of parking? (NB the current Hillingdon Public Spaces Protection Order expires in September 2019). | Heathrow is committed to working with local authorities to address the issues of parking in the local areas and have demonstrated our commitment by the introduction of an “Authorised Vehicle Area” for private hire vehicles. We however receive complaints which which we try to address but enforcement is often outside Heathrow’s remit but continue to work more pro-actively for local authorities.Heathrow have already agreed geofencing with UBER and plan to extend the dialogue with other private hire companies.  |
| Heavy and light goods vehicles | There seemed to be a relative lack of information about freight-related traffic or clarity about what makes up freight-related traffic. Around 75% of freight goes in the holds of passenger aircraft. | TENAG request more details of freight movements and planned strategies for expansion | The Surface Access Proposals published on 18 June will have provide further details on freight related traffic and the plans to mitigate the impacts of additional freight traffic on the roads.  |
| AffordabilityAffordability cont. | There are a lot of low wage workers who may not be able to afford public transport and find private cars cheaper.  | TENAG believe that HAL should consider the link between low wages and car use. | As part of its Colleague Travel Strategy, Heathrow is looking at measures to encourage more colleagues onto public transport including the extension of the free travel zone, additional early and late buses and a rewards scheme to encourage sustainable travel. |
| Cycling is a good alternative, but current piecemeal routes act as a deterrent. Some disagreement about the extent of the potential for cycling | TENAG believes that HAL needs to develop a ‘thought through’ cycle strategy taking into account the commitment of surrounding Local Authorities to increase cycling. | 20,000 aiport employees live within 5km of the airport. The Surface Access proposals will have a Active Travel strategy which includes new cycling provision and ideas such as electric scooters could be part of the mix. |
| Electric vehicles are discouraged by the cost of charging. | Charging should by cheaper | There are regulatory obstacles to cross subsidising which need Heathrow is currently looking into. |
| There is a danger that increasing the cost and other deterrents to driving by car could lead to public transport operators increasing their prices. | TENAG will consider how fare regulation and subsidy for public transport might be achieved, and this might be via a recommendation to both DfT/ TfL | Heathrow agreed this was a threat and welcomed working with TENAG to influence policy. |
| Charging | Some local authorities are concerned that a limited congestion charge zones within the airport would push vehicles out into the surrounding roads. | TENAG believes that a solution might be to extend the TfL low emission zone and this should be investigated by HAL and/or TfL. | Heathrow is publishing its draft road charging proposals as part of our Surface Access Proposals and we welcome feedback as part of our consultation. |
| Agile management | There could be better utilisation of HAL vehicles such as staff buses between shift times plus move to electric and later autonomous vehicles | TENAG believes that HAL should explore good examples of change achieved by others. TENAG can provide examples. | Agreed – examples welcomed |
| Bus and Coach policy | Agreement that the current bus and coach station is inadequate and gives a poor image.Transport Focus research showed potential to increase coach use. | TENAG believe that it is important to upgrade facilities. Need National Coach strategy to fit with the relocation of Victoria Coach Station | Improvements to our bus and coach provision is included within our Surface Access Proposals and support from TENAG welcomed. |
| Rail links | Noted that the Western Rail Link planning is progressing, but the Southern Link is awaiting DfT action. | TENAG supports both links. | Agreed – support from TENAG welcomed |