

**Minutes of the Extraordinary
Business, Infrastructure and Growth Committee
16 September 2024**

Present:

Councillor H.R.D. Williams (Chair)
Councillor J.R. Boughtflower (Vice-Chair)

Councillors:

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|------------|
| C. Bateson | T. Burrell | S. Gyawali |
| S.N. Beatty | D.C. Clarke | N. Islam |
| M. Beecher | M. Gibson | |

Substitutions: Councillors K. Howkins

Apologies: Councillors A. Mathur

16 Apologies and Substitutes

Apologies were received from Councillor Mathur. Councillor Howkins attended as their substitute.

17 Disclosures of interest

There were none.

18 Southern Access to Heathrow - rail proposals

The Committee considered a report on rail proposals for Southern access to Heathrow. The Group Head for Place, Protection and Prosperity outlined the schemes and their key objectives, and set out the three options available for consideration.

It was proposed by Councillor Williams, seconded by Councillor Boughtflower and **resolved** that the recommendation in the report be amended to the following:

Option 1 – To recommend to Council that Council fully support Heathrow Southern Rail (HSR).

Option 2 – To recommend to Council that Council fully support Southern Light Rail (SLR).

Option 3 – The Committee agree to defer any indicative decision of support for either scheme due to the lack of definitive information: instead to set up an all-party working group to examine all options in detail and report back to this Committee. Any final decision to be referred for a vote to full Council.

The Committee queried if either scheme was dependent on a third runway at Heathrow or a hotel development within Staines and were assured that they were not.

The Committee suggested that if a decision was taken to form a Working Group that part of their remit should be to consider wider implications including how best to get people to the train station in Staines and suggested talking with Surrey County Council regarding buses.

The Committee queried whether there was any urgency for a decision to be made on which scheme the Council would support. The Group Head for Place, Protection and Prosperity advised that much of the missing detail for the schemes may not be available until either scheme reaches the development consent order phase. The Committee were advised that conversations would need to be had with HSR and SLR as to what additional information could be provided to members to aid in decision making. The Committee were informed that there was probably no need for a decision this year.

The Committee referred to the ARUP report which stated that fare revenues would be complimented by parking revenues and queried where the parking revenues would come from. The Group for Head Place, Protection and Prosperity advised that when the report was put together it was pre-Covid and when a third runway was being considered. At that time a car park at Hithermore was also considered.

The Committee queried the projected cost estimate from 2019 for the SLR scheme of £400m and asked whether there was an updated figure. The Committee were advised that no further forecasting had been done but this could be an area to be considered should a Working Group be set up. The Committee were further informed that the light rail solution would cost around a third of the heavy rail solution.

The Committee reflected on a comment made by Heathrow Airport Limited that there was no physical infrastructure in place to accommodate SLR at Terminal 5. The Committee were advised that there had been previous significant discussions with Heathrow on options to provide SLR access. One of the recommendations from the ARUP scheme was for the SLR to review the connection of the light rail to Terminal 5.

The Committee requested that whoever is developing the scheme could provide information on the estimate of the carbon emissions their project would produce, including the downstream carbon emissions of Heathrow expanding.

The Committee observed that many of the documents they had been presented with had been created in 2016 – 2019 and needed to be refreshed. The Chief Executive advised that up to date figures for both schemes needed to be updated and that while much of the context may have changed, the basic premise of the SLR scheme was still to serve a Heathrow with two runways.

Councillor Gibson requested a named vote.

| | |
|----------|---|
| Option 1 | 0 |
| Option 2 | 0 |
| Option 3 | Councillors Bateson, Beatty, Beecher, Boughtflower, Burrell, Clarke, Gibson, Gyawali, Howkins, Islam and Williams - 11 |

The Committee **resolved** to defer any indicative decision of support for either scheme due to the lack of definitive information: instead to set up an all-party Working Group to examine all options in detail and report back to this Committee. Any final decision to be referred for a vote to full Council.

Councillors Bateson, Beecher, Boughtflower, Burrell, Clarke, Gibson, Howkins and Williams expressed an interest in joining the Working Group once the Terms of Reference had been established.

The meeting ended at 21:20