

# London Southend Airport Joint Area Action Plan

## Gap Analysis and Project Scoping

14 August 2009

### Notice

This report was produced by Atkins Limited for Southend on Sea Borough Council and Rochford District Council for the specific purpose of a gap analysis and project scoping for preparing a sound JAAP.

This report may not be used by any person other than Southend on Sea Borough Council and Rochford District Council without Southend on Sea Borough Council and Rochford District Council's express permission. In any event, Atkins accepts no liability for any costs, liabilities or losses arising as a result of the use of or reliance upon the contents of this report by any person other than Southend on Sea Borough Council and Rochford District Council.

### Document History

JOB NUMBER: 5085732			DOCUMENT REF: Gap analysis and project scoping JCB edit 090818			
1	Final	JCB	RS	RS	PW	19/08/09
Revision	Purpose Description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date

# Contents

Section	Page
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Initial review of JAAP process and outputs</b>	<b>4</b>
Planning	4
Transport	7
Economics	10
<b>3. Strategy for completion of JAAP</b>	<b>11</b>
Strategy background	11
Evidence base	11
Preferred Options Report	12
Sustainability Appraisal	12
Other reports	12
Further information required	12
<b>4. Programme for preparation of submission documents</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5. Study Team</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6. Fee estimate</b>	<b>16</b>
Assumptions	16
Payment Terms	16

## List of Tables

Table 4.1 – Indicative Programme	14
----------------------------------	----

## List of Figures

Error! No table of figures entries found.

## Appendices

Error! No table of contents entries found.

### List of Tables

Error! No table of figures entries found.

### List of Figures

Error! No table of figures entries found.

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1 A Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP) is being prepared by Southend on Sea Borough Council and Rochford District Council. The JAAP is considered necessary to develop a policy response to the challenges and opportunities presented by the potential to enhance the services at London Southend Airport and the potential to develop an airport related employment cluster in the area.
- 1.2 It is the intention of the local planning authorities to adopt the JAAP as a development plan document. As such it will be subjected to the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) and Planning Policy Statement 12 (Local Spatial Planning). Preparation of the JAAP has commenced and the following elements of work have been produced and published as part of the statutory procedures:
- London Southend Airport and Environs Study: JAAP Evidence Report (June 2008);
  - London Southend Airport and Environs Study: Draft Sustainability Appraisal (June 2008);
  - London Southend Airport and Environs JAAP: Issues and Options Report (June 2008); and,
  - London Southend Airport and Environs JAAP: Preferred Options (February 2009).
- 1.3 The local planning authorities have asked Atkins to provide support in completing the JAAP, taking it forward from Preferred Options through to Submission stage. The LPAs have indicated that the JAAP should be submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2010.
- 1.4 The purpose of this report is to provide an independent and realistic response to the LPAs. It reviews the processes and outputs of the JAAP paying particular attention to evidence base and the planning policy framework in the context of the tests of soundness that will need to be met. Having considered this and identified potential gaps the report recommends the scope for further work necessary to progress the preparation to Submission.

## 2. Initial review of JAAP process and outputs

- 2.1 Atkins has reviewed the published documentation to critically examine the processes followed in the preparation of the JAAP. This review has examined existing documents and evidence base by looking at three key themes that drive the JAAP (planning, transportation and economics).

### Planning

#### General Issues of Presentation and Content

- 2.2 We consider that the presentation of the Preferred Option JAAP needs to be improved. This is key to explaining and justifying the message the JAAP tries to impart. In its present state the document does not help guide the reader through the processes undertaken or the information gathered in support of the strategy. Of particular note is the lack of a readable master plan or context plans for the area meaning:

- There are no images to help the reader understand the surrounding land uses and context;
- There is no spatial portrait of the area, summarising the key issues that face the area (access, airport expansion, employment hub, local communities);
- There is no justification for why the boundary has been chosen, including land to the north where no proposals are envisaged and excluding land to the west where new employment development has occurred/is occurring;
- There is no single image to identify location, land uses, road names, Green Belt boundary and other key features; and,
- There are no images to help the reader understand surrounding linkages in terms of all forms of transport and desire lines.

- 2.3 The culmination of these issues for the Preferred Option Document is that the end Proposals Map is not supported by a robust process of masterplanning, considering issues such as access (in and outside the JAAP area), densities, key building locations, strategic views, specific constraints etc. In addition to following a credible masterplanning approach the Proposals Map needs to be supported by robust evidence.

#### Consistency with National Policy and the Development Plan

- 2.4 The following policy areas may not accord with national or regional policies:
- It is proposed to amend the boundary of the Green Belt. This will require a policy shift and consideration needs to be taken of PPG2. It is not considered that the JAAP provides sufficient justification for amending the Green Belt given the requirement to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. This should also include the consideration of alternative locations. This is a significant failing in the JAAP.
  - Need to cross reference against the East of England Plan (RSS) and demonstrate conformity.
  - The Environment Agency has indicated that no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposals will pass the PPS25 Sequential Test. Little or no mention of flood risk and potential increased flood risk from the proposed development. This would bring into question how effective the JAAP is and is an area that would raise further questions regarding the soundness of the document.

- There is no demonstration of robust sustainable or renewable energy policies to guide the JAAP. If the JAAP is to rely on Core Strategy policies this needs to be made explicit. At the present time it may be argued the JAAP has no sustainable community policy or renewable targets making the document ineffective and potentially failing the test of soundness.
- No reference has been made to the respective Statements of Community Involvement and no demonstration of conformity.
- Conformity with Local Development Scheme needs to be demonstrated. There is no reference to the JAAP in either the Rochford or Southend LDS. As the JAAP will be a DPD and an integral part of the LDF this is a major omission.

### **Robustness of evidence, research and fact finding**

- 2.5 The justification for the JAAP is based on the growth of the airport and surrounding employment uses. Both the Rochford and Southend-on-Sea emerging and adopted Core Strategies support this approach. However there are concerns whether this is supported in the evidence base. There are two clear issues that need addressing:
- a) A Sustainability Appraisal has been prepared and was published with the Issues and Option Report. However, SA is an iterative process and further appraisal work has not been prepared in support of the Preferred Options, as required by government guidance.
  - b) Parts of the evidence base and the tone of much of the Issues and Options document seem to suggest the 'High Growth' scenario has always been the preferred option. This makes the identification of alternative options superfluous and potentially misleading. Reference needs to be clearly made to national and regional policy, correspondence from bodies consulted or technical papers that provide the basis for assumptions. Furthermore the options fail to address the location and form of development within the JAAP.
  - c) Insufficient scrutiny is given to some key constraints and acceptance of proposed layout. This issue stems from the lack of any master planning for the area where key issues such as flooding, visual links, traffic and sustainable transport could have all been addressed. Instead the Evidence Base does not question the need for the development but merely tries to justify its requirement. The JAAP does not clearly demonstrate how the evidence points towards the selected strategy, policies and proposals.
- 2.6 These two issues open the document to the accusation of failing the tests of soundness by failing to set out assumptions made in its preparation, and that these assumptions are reasonable and clearly justified.
- 2.7 Areas that also need further consideration to ensure a robust evidence base for the JAAP include:
- Infrastructure and services. There is no reference to utility capacity or balance of services to accommodate new employment growth (sustainable community);
  - Flood risk and sequential test;
  - PPG17 assessment of loss of playing fields;
  - Documented reasoned review of the green belt boundary;
  - An analysis of the loss of agricultural land;
  - Review of water issues including sustainable drainage, particularly in relation to the development of industrial land and park and ride facilities on current recreational or agricultural land;

### **Consideration of alternatives**

- 2.8 There are two fundamental questions that the Preferred Option JAAP fails to address:

- How alternatives were developed and evaluated.
  - Why alternatives were rejected in favour of the preferred strategy
- 2.9 The Preferred Option JAAP needs to show that the chosen approach is the most appropriate and that realistic alternatives have been considered with a clear audit trail showing how and why the preferred strategy was arrived at. This is not clearly done and leaves the document open to failing the tests of soundness in terms of it being justified and effective.

### **Soundness: Effective, deliverable and flexible**

- 2.10 The tests of soundness require the document to be effective, deliverable and flexible. The effectiveness of the document has been addressed above.
- 2.11 With regard to the deliverability of the JAAP and its flexibility, these are harder to assess. The following issues will warrant further consideration:
- The objectives set out in Section 2.2 of the Preferred Options need to be more area specific and related to the issues considered through the preferred option. It may be that the objectives should refer to employment growth related to existing employment sites and access issues to named roads and rail lines. Should the railway station be an objective of the JAAP?
  - Each policy should relate to an objective and conform to national and regional policies and have a reasoned justification. This relates the general wording of the policies and the number, content of the policies. The use of 'bold' policy text and distinguished from the supporting justification and commentary should be used.
- 2.12 The following issues will need to be addressed:
- There may need to be a list of priorities and clearer phasing of development to ensure community and environmental benefits are adequately addressed at each stage;
  - There are no timescales or clear phasing of the development to demonstrate deliverability in the life of the JAAP;
  - Make clear the infrastructure implications of the JAAP. Transport Policy goes some way in doing this but need to be clearer and other infrastructure issues needs to be addressed;
  - Make clear who will be delivering the infrastructure requirements;
  - Support of Regional Airports Ltd should be made clear;
  - The JAAP must be capable of being monitored. This a key test of soundness. The Preferred Options document makes reference to the Submission documents making arrangements for monitoring. This should ideally be included at this stage. There is a need for measurable targets against the policies and a programme for implementation. This should be a key focus of future work if we are to demonstrate deliverability; and,
  - There also needs to be an implementation and delivery plan for the JAAP set out in much more detail.
- 2.13 There is an overall need to tighten up the text and format of the JAAP Preferred Options before submitting to the Secretary of State. This should include, but may not be restricted to, setting out clearer objectives, re-wording policies and clearer references to the process and options considered.

### **Summary**

- 2.14 In order to ensure a robust evidence base is also put in place and for a clear process to emerge, the following actions are recommended:

**Links to national and regional policy**

- Demonstrate throughout the documents that the exceptional circumstances that require changes to the Green Belt Boundary to conform to PPG2 and RSS;
- Complete a robust flood risk assessment and complete as required a sequential test to conform to PPS25;
- Demonstrate conformity with Local Development Scheme; and,
- Prepare statement of engagement and consultation activities in conformity with Statement of Community Involvement.

**Evidence Base**

- Update and publish the Sustainability Appraisal and prepare Health Impact Assessment to accompany the Preferred Options Document.
- Complete a robust sustainable and renewable energy review to guide policy.
- Review infrastructure and services requirements.
- Review employment assumptions.
- Refine assumptions made regarding airport operations, particularly freight handling forecasts and impact of runway extension on noise, air quality, lighting and public safety zone.
- Update and extend ecology appraisal.
- Prepare full transport assessment.

**Masterplanning**

- Ensure the Preferred Option document is supported by a robust process of masterplanning, considering issues such as access (in and outside the JAAP area), densities, key building locations, strategic views, specific constraints etc.

**Transport****Background**

- 2.15 Atkins has carried out a strategic review of the transport information provided in support of the Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP) in relation to the Southend Airport expansion. The Transport Assessment dated September 2008 has been reviewed.
- 2.16 The supporting background planning information has also been consulted in relation to the wider aspirations and third party consultee comments already received.
- 2.17 To inform the strategic review the current Transport Assessment Guidance produced by the Department for Transport (DfT) has been used by Atkins as the main source of information. As a further source of information, in addition to the DfT guidance, consideration has also been to the Essex County Council Transport Assessments Guidelines.
- 2.18 These documents have been used to form the basis of our gap analysis response.

**Transport Assessment Review**

- 2.19 One of the first considerations given to this gap analysis relates to the content of the Halcrow report submitted being entitled as a Transport Assessment (TA). Based on the current DfT Transport Assessment Guidance the report that has been submitted would not be considered a TA, but a more focused Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA).
- 2.20 Since 2006, Government focus has changed from these focused Traffic Impact Assessments (TIA) towards Transport Assessments (TA). This is to ensure that all forms of travel are

considered not just vehicular impacts in relation to new developments. When considering the impacts of a project such as the JAAP it is important to ensure that all aspects of surface access are considered and not just the traffic element and sustainable travel options should be included.

### Existing Information

- One of the first chapters that should be included in a TA, according to the DfT Guidance is reference to current planning policy in the context of the development proposals. The submitted TIA does not indicate or acknowledge any background planning policy references for the site.
- Following the DfT Guidelines further, there should be a section on existing or baseline information. The submitted report does not contain any background information relating to whether a scoping report was produced, or whether any agreement was reached with Rochford or Southend-on-Sea regarding the extent of area to be considered, what peak hours were agreed to be covered, or the extent of the study area being considered in relation to the proposed action plan. There is also an absence of any background data relating to the existing operation of the area, in particular the airport.
- It would be expected that the main headline policies are highlighted in the TA to ensure that the development is consistent with these policies. A gap has been identified in that the submitted report does not include for baseline transport data to cover road, rail, bus and air. Background information should be presented to quantify the existing situation and to act as a baseline from which the future impacts can be measured.

### Assessment Years

- The DfT highlights the need for opening year and future year assessments to be carried out. The submitted Halcrow report does include a range of different scenarios being considered in terms of growth, but these are only being assessed for one peak hour (AM peak period) and for one future year of 2021. There is also no evidence presented that supports the year of assessment or that assessing one peak period has been agreed.
- In a background check of the JAAP Preferred Options it is noted that the area is being considered to be developed in phases. A gap is therefore identified in that the TA should seek to reflect these phases in relation to years of completion. A clearer understanding of the development phases and how each of the sites is accessed as the action plan is implemented is required. Agreeing additional assessment years relating to the opening of each phase and then a final future assessment should be considered.

### Assessment of Public Transport

- Although the Halcrow report covers the road network capacity there is no information presented that considers the public transport network other than a mention about modal split.
- It would be expected that a TA would cover the current capacity of public transport networks in the area such as rail, bus, walking and cycling. This would allow a baseline to be established that would then enable the impacts of the action plan to be fully understood.

### Person Trip Generation

- One of the key changes in the DfT TA Guidance relates to the assessment of the impacts relating to a development. The focus is now firmly on assessing people impacts rather than just vehicle impacts. Within the Halcrow report there is no person trip generation presented, only vehicle trip generation. As indicated earlier the report presented focuses on the vehicle impacts and not the wider transport impacts.
- To reflect the DfT Guidance it is expected that person trip generation should be included. This allows a more robust assessment of the development proposal impact and helps identify the impact on non-car modes of travel.



### Development Proposals

- As part of the DfT Guidance, development details should be provided. Although there are a number of overall scenarios considered in the report, there is no clear indication as to how these relate to the individual development phases being considered for the JAAP.
- A gap is identified whereby a clearer understanding of the impacts relating to the phased development of the JAAP is provided. This should then reflect the assessment years already highlighted as a gap earlier.

### Development Impacts

- The Halcrow reports goes into detail relating to the vehicle trip rates and includes a traffic impact assessment for a number of key junctions around the area. However, no consideration appears to have been presented relating to distribution or assignment on sustainable modes. It is also noted that there is gap in the analysis in that only the AM peak hour has been assessed. No consideration appears to have been given to other peak periods and the impact of the area action plan on these.
- A clearer understanding on the impacts of the area action plan would be required to conform to the DfT Guidance. Providing justification or evidence of agreement as to why only one peak hour has been assessed is recommended. As part of understanding the impacts a consideration towards presenting a trip distribution diagram should be considered as a clear way understanding movements generated by the JAAP.

### Sustainable Travel Measures

- As outlined in the latest Guidance it is expected that consideration should be given to sustainable modes. There does not appear to be any indication within the Halcrow response that covers this. There is reference to modal split but this is not supported with how these trips are distributed amongst sustainable modes.
- A considered way forward to address this gap would be to produce a Framework Travel Plan as a minimum.

### Mitigation Measures

- Although the Halcrow report covers the impacts on the highway network the proposed mitigation measures are not clearly identified. There is mention of improved public transport and highway improvements but these are not indicated in any detail.
- To address this gap consideration would be expected to be given to a range of potential mitigation measures that could be provided as part of the JAAP to off-set any identified impacts on all modes.

### Summary

- 2.21 Overall the Halcrow report is considered a pre-2006 style Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) in that it covers impacts relating to vehicles with junction capacity modelling being included. There is little information provided that should be considered necessary for a post 2006 Transport Assessment (TA). A TA should include the all modes approach and wherever possible be based on people trips and include sustainable travel and mitigation measures.
- 2.22 In addressing the gap analysis it is considered that a completely revised report is produced to a Transport Assessment level based on the DfT Guidance.

## Economics

### Initial Review

- 2.23 The reports provide a sound baseline analysis of existing socio-economic and property market conditions. However, the assumptions regarding future job generation in all documents (particularly the Preferred Options and Evidence Base) are questionable. The Preferred Options report states that a total of 7,380 jobs will be created including jobs at the airport (6,200 jobs at the employment allocations including redevelopment of the existing Aviation Way Industrial Estate).
- 2.24 The key issues arising from the review are:
- a) It is assumed that all employment development will be at a density typical of offices. Even though the proposed site allocations contain a significant amount of business park-type development, the sites are also identified for B2. It is our opinion that these assumptions are overly optimistic and are very much maximum figures.
  - b) The job generation figures are gross job estimates and no account is given to the potential for job displacement which may occur as a result of existing local employers vacating their premises and moving to premises at the airport employment sites. For the assessment to be more robust, job generation should demonstrate net additionality in accordance with the Government's Green Book economic appraisal guidance.
  - c) There is little evidence behind the assumptions regarding job creation at the airport. These need to be identified and made explicit in the reports.
- 2.25 The employment generation estimates should be revisited and further evidence provided in terms of jobs growth at the airport itself.
- 2.26 The employment land demand evidence indicates that total demand for additional B1 floorspace in Southend and Rochford Districts amounts to 110,000 sqm for period 2006-2021. The JAAP indicates that the employment allocations will generate 109,000 sqm of additional floorspace + 15,000 sqm through redevelopment of the Aviation Way Industrial Estate). Consequently, it is possible that the proposals could flood the market and result in the land not being taken-up or encouraging the displacement of occupiers from existing industrial and business areas.
- 2.27 Consequently, the extent to which there will be sufficient demand to take up the proposed amount of floorspace should be considered. Further evidence would be required to back this up.

## 3. Strategy for completion of Draft JAAP

### Strategy background

- 3.1 Our recommendation is that the evidence base is refined and strengthened where appropriate. This will provide a sound basis for a redrafted Preferred Options document, with the Preferred Options based on those set out in the Preferred Options document, but with the required supporting information and the required reasoned justification and audit trail. The evidence base should be used to demonstrate that mitigation of effects of the Preferred Options on the baseline is possible.
- 3.2 We do not propose to update the Issues and Options report. However, we consider that re-consultation of the Preferred Options report, alongside a Sustainability Appraisal of those Preferred Options.

### Evidence base

- 3.3 We consider that the following should be undertaken:

- Specialist review of each chapter; and,
- Redrafting of each chapter to fill any gaps identified.

### Validation of operational assumptions

- 3.4 The primary task that will be undertaken is a validation of airport operational assumptions. We will undertake a validation of the operational assumptions of the JAAP, particularly the size thresholds of 2mppa and 48,000 tonnes of freight per annum to identify whether these are appropriate for the airport. The outcome of this validation exercise is key to the remainder of the work, and will be used to inform and validate the preferred options.

### Further studies required

- 3.5 Over and above the separate studies indicated below, this will include, but is not limited to:
- PPG2 assessment of proposed amendment of green belt boundaries;
  - Lighting impact assessment - An assessment will be undertaken to ensure that the lighting of the proposed development will not have an undue impact on the operation of the airport. The report will also look at the proposed lighting issues associated with the development of the airport to ensure that this development does not have an undue impact on surrounding land uses;
  - Work to meet the requirements of PPG17 relating to the reconfiguration of recreational facilities;
  - An assessment of the proposed loss of agricultural land;
  - Transport Assessment - We will undertake a full Transport Assessment of the proposal to current DfT guidelines. This will encompass the effects of the full extent of the commercial development proposed for the area north of Aviation Way, as well as the operational impacts of the airport and associated development associated with the growth scenario chosen, within the environmental capacity of the local area;
  - Park and Ride assessment - The assessment of the proposed park and ride facility will be based upon the Atkins study of park and ride facilities in Southend on Sea. It will consider whether the proposed park and ride is viable at the location set out in the JAAP Preferred Options report;

- Air Quality Assessment - A desk based assessment of air quality will be undertaken to test the assumptions within the Evidence Base report and to test the scenarios used to reach the preferred options, utilising Defra TG09, ICAO Environmental Database and DMRN screening; and,
  - Flood Risk Sequential Test - We will undertake a sequential test based on the current Strategic Flood Risk Assessment data to ensure that the Preferred Options are compliant with PPS25.
- 3.6 This will enable the environmental capacity of the site to be identified and compared with the operational capacity of the airport. The evidence base will also inform the supporting strategies needed to accompany the preferred options.

## Preferred Options Report

- 3.7 We suggest a structure such as the following:
- Vision – setting out vision of JAAP area including addressing of policy context;
  - Choices – setting out the path between Issues and Options and Preferred Options and giving more definition to the proposed options;
  - Consideration of alternative development strategies – re-analysing the Issues and Options scenarios and linking the choices on how these have been taken forward to the evidence base;
  - Preferred options – set out justification of each use of each area of land;
  - Policies – setting out policies and reasoned justification for each;
  - Supporting strategies – setting out the findings of the strategies for each policy area – planning, transport, airport operations, environment; and,
  - Implementation strategy – setting out how the plan will be implemented and phased.

## Sustainability Appraisal

- 3.8 This should be prepared for the Preferred Options report and should be available for consultation on the revised Preferred Options report.

## Other reports

### Health impact assessment

- 3.9 A health impact assessment will be undertaken to ensure that the Preferred Options take account at a strategic level of the potential impact on health. This will be based on best practice for HIAs to accompany development plan documents.

## Further information required

- 3.10 To ensure that we are utilising all available information and not duplicating information already gathered, we request a list of available information. We will also require access to existing electronic files and mapping, including information on file formats to ensure that they are compatible with Atkins software. This applies particularly to mapping and GIS data.

## 4. Programme for preparation of submission documents

- 4.1 The local planning authorities have indicated a preference that the JAAP should be submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2010. This will require the completion of the draft Submission JAAP by the start of October 2008 to allow passage through the decision making processes in each of the Councils. However, we do not consider that this is feasible as we consider that the Preferred Options will require further consultation, along with the Sustainability Appraisal to meet the requirements of the Regulations.
- 4.2 Additionally, given the extent of the evidence base work that is required it is unlikely that this programme is achievable. We consider that the work required to strengthen the evidence base is significant. It would not be in the Councils' interest to disregard this in favour of expediency. It is recommended, therefore, that the Councils reflect on the timescales given the extent of work required to bring the JAAP to submission.
- 4.3 Given the comments made at both Preferred Options and issues and options stages, it is strongly recommended that the Government Office for the East of England (GO-East) be engaged with prior to further public consultation on the redrafted Preferred Options. We suggest that this engagement take the form of a meeting with GO-East.
- 4.4 An indicative programme designed to deliver the above work scope within a realistic timescale is set out in Table 4.1. This programme is based upon any further evidence base documentation beyond already initially reviewed being made available as soon as possible. It is also based upon being able to set up an early meeting with an airport management representative to be able to review and validate operationally the proposed constraints on the airport, including the upper thresholds for passengers per annum and freight per annum.

Table 4.1 - Indicative Programme

	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	W11	W12	W13	W14	W15	W16	W17	W18	W19	W20
<b>Evidence Base Strengthening</b>																				
Planning policy review	X	X																		
PPG17 recreation study		X	X	X	X															
PPS25 sequential test		X	X	X	X															
PPG2 Green belt justification		X	X	X	X															
Employment land justification		X	X	X	X															
Airport operational options detailing/justification	X	X																		
Health Impact Assessment							X	X	X											
Lighting Assessment						X	X	X												
Park and Ride Assessment						X	X													
Transport Assesment			X	X	X	X	X	X												
Air quality assessment			X	X	X	X	X	X												
Noise			X	X	X	X	X													
Ecology			X	X	X	X	X													
Contaminated land			X	X	X	X	X													
Surface Water Management +Flood Risk			X	X	X	X	X													
Cultural heritage			X	X	X	X	X													
<b>Preferred Options Report redrafting</b>																				
Vision and objectives				X	X															
Options and Alternatives				X	X	X	X	X	X											
Preferred options justification							X	X	X											
Policies								X	X	X	X									
Supporting strategies								X	X	X	X									
Implementation strategy							X	X	X	X	X									
Document production												X	X							
Technical review			X						X		X									
Inception meeting																				
Progress meeting	X					X				X										
Meeting with GO-East										X										
Draft for officer review														X	X					
Incorporating officer comments																X	X			
Final draft																			X	

## 5. Study Team

- 5.1 Paul White, a Director of Atkins Planning, will take overall responsibility for delivering the assignment. He is a Chartered Town Planner with over 30 years international planning experience which includes several airport planning projects in the UK and overseas. Paul was the project director of the recent study to assess proposed environmental safeguards at London Southend Airport.
- 5.2 Jon Barker is nominated as Project Manager with day to day responsibility for the assignment. He is a Principal Planner who heads the Atkins' Planning Team in London. He is a Chartered Town Planner with 15 years experience which includes projects at London Luton Airport and London City Airport. Jon was the project director of the recent study to assess proposed environmental safeguards at London Southend Airport.
- 5.3 Richard Ainsley will be undertaking the day to day management of the specialists and preparing the planning documents. Richard is a chartered town planner with 8 years planning experience in the private and public sector. Richard has been involved with a range of regeneration policy frameworks. He has recently completed work on the Greenwich Peninsula SPD, Whitechapel Masterplan, and Grays Town Centre Masterplan where his work has included assessing development capacity, appraising land uses, facilitating stakeholder consultations and developing strategy and policy frameworks. Richard is currently involved with a developing a masterplan for New Road in Rainham for the Thames Gateway Development Corporation. The 30ha brownfield site is predominantly used for industrial purposes at present and requires a masterplan in order to develop a mixed use urban community. He has also recently completed an infrastructure study for the whole of the county of Hertfordshire, on behalf of the County Council and the constituent boroughs and districts. Richard has a strong background in strategic planning gained through working on numerous LDF evidence base studies and through his time working at the London Borough of Merton prior to joining Atkins, where he was responsible for writing the Borough's Open Space Strategy and developing policy for the review of Merton's Unitary Development Plan.
- 5.4 Technical review will be undertaken by Jon Barker who will look at the airport operational aspects and Roger Savage who will review the development plan document produced against the criteria for soundness. Roger is an Associate Planner with considerable planning, research and consultation experience including work on overseas projects. He has been involved in a wide range of planning projects and studies in a variety of fields including tourism, town centres, regeneration, sustainable development, housing, industrial and mixed use development, open spaces and environmental and socio-economic impact assessment. Roger has experience of DPDs and SPDs for development frameworks and planning and design guidelines for new residential communities and mixed use projects including development frameworks for new mixed use communities at the Greenwich Peninsula and Three Mills, urban extensions at Crawley and Burgess Hill as well as preparing a masterplan for the renewal of an existing community at Kidbrooke, London.
- 5.5 The remainder of the study team will also comprise experienced specialist consultants in their field, including Jamie Jamieson who is Atkins' Chief Aviation Consultant with over 30 years' international airport planning experience; Roger Tompsett who has been working in the noise and noise mapping field for over 35 years; and Paul J Taylor who is head of Atkins' air quality team, with 18 years of experience, in particular working with Department for Transport on the future development of London Heathrow Airport. James Worthington is a Chartered Landscape Architect who will contribute towards the Green Belt Review and Lighting Assessment. Richard Coburn will lead on aspects relating to the economic rationale and benefits

## 6. Fee estimate

- 6.1 The attached fee estimate relates to reviewing and strengthening the evidence base and the production of a final draft Preferred Options Report.
- 6.2 Our fee estimate runs to the delivery of the final draft Preferred Options document, incorporating one consolidated set of officer comments which will include comments from officers from Southend on Sea Borough Council, Rochford District Council, and any other parties involved in the commissioning of the JAAP who wish to comment on the draft documents.
- 6.3 Further work to take the Preferred Options through the authorities' committees and public consultation will be subject to a further fee estimate, as will work to assist the authorities in taking the JAAP through examination will also be subject of a separate fee proposal.
- 6.4 The fee estimate includes the review work already undertaken on the soundness of the document.
- 6.5 The fee estimate is based on a capped figure. If it becomes apparent that the capped figure will be exceeded then we will advise the client accordingly, with a further estimate of the likely extra work required and await confirmation that this figure can be exceeded.

### Assumptions

- 6.6 Our fee estimate is based on the following assumptions:
- Any work which the client may require to be undertaken outside the scope of the work described above will be subject to a separate fee agreement based on the day rates to be agreed;
  - Five bound hard copies of the final draft of each Preferred Options and Evidence Base report and Executive Summary will be provided, along with an electronic copy;
  - We have allowed for three meetings with the authorities' officers and one meeting with GO-East;
  - The authorities or their partners will provide copies of previous reports, documents and digital mapping;
  - Our limit of liability is a maximum of £1m;
  - No further surveys are allowed for. If further surveys are required these will be charged to the client at cost;
  - Data such as Envirocheck reports related to contaminated land are charged to the client at cost;
  - Aviation use data is made available by the client or is available in the public domain free of charge; and,
  - No detailed air quality dispersion modelling will be undertaken for this commission,

### Payment Terms

- 6.7 Payment terms are as per the current agreement in place with Atkins Limited.



Table 6.1 - Fee estimate

	Project Manager	Tech review	Director review	Planning	GIS	Graphics	Economics	Airport operations	Transport	Air Quality	Noise	Ecology	Utilities	Contaminated land	Surface Water Management +Flood Risk	Cultural heritage	Landscape
	Jon Barker	Roger Savage	Paul White	Richard Ainsley & Planning Team support	Simon Hunt	Lee Blowers	Richard Coburn	Jamie Jamieson	Zoe Trower	Paul Taylor	Roger Thompsett	Heather Mansfield	Paul Milward	Philippa Meares	Ian Joyner	Tom Wilson	James Worthington
<b>Evidence Base Strengthening</b>																	
Evidence base/ co-ordination of specialists				2000												800	
Planning policy review				2300													
PPG17 recreation study				2500	1000												
PPS25 sequential test				2500	1000												
PPG2 Green belt justification				1000	1000												5000
Employment land justification							3000										
Airport operational options detailing/justification								3000									
Health Impact Assessment				2000													
Lighting Assessment								800									1500
Park and Ride Assessment				750					750								
Transport Assessment									6000								
Air quality assessment										6000							
Noise											3000						
Ecology												800					
Contaminated land														3000			
Surface Water Management +Flood Risk															2600		
Utilities infrastructure capacity													4000				
Cultural heritage																800	
<b>Sub total</b>																	<b>57100</b>
<b>Preferred Options redrafting</b>																	
Vision and objectives				1000													
Options and Alternatives				5500	2000				2000								1000
Preferred options justification				3000													
Policies				3000					1000								
Supporting strategies				4000			500		2000	1000	500	500		500	1000		2000
Implementation strategy				4000													
Document production						4000											
Technical review	2000	4000	2000														
Project management	5000																
<b>Sub total</b>																	<b>51500</b>
<b>Estimated total</b>																	<b>108600</b>