



## **Guidance Document 02:** Long Term Capacity Options: Sift Criteria

May 2013

Airports Commission  
6th Floor  
Sanctuary Buildings  
20 Great Smith Street  
London SW1P 3BT

Web: [www.gov.uk/government/organisations/airports-commission](http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/airports-commission)  
Email: [airports.enquiries@airports.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:airports.enquiries@airports.gsi.gov.uk)

© Crown copyright 2013, except where otherwise stated

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos or third-party material) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

# Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction</b>                           | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2. Sift criteria submissions</b>              | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>3. Information on individual criteria</b>     | <b>10</b> |
| <b>4. General guidance for scheme developers</b> | <b>19</b> |
| <b>5. Technical and expert support</b>           | <b>20</b> |
| <b>6. Publication of submissions</b>             | <b>22</b> |
| <b>7. How to make a submission</b>               | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Appendix A – Expert Advisory Panel</b>        | <b>24</b> |

# 1. Introduction

1.1 The Airports Commission's terms of reference require us to:

- examine the scale and timing of any requirement for additional capacity to maintain the UK's position as Europe's most important aviation hub; and
- identify and evaluate how any need for additional capacity should be met in the short, medium and long term.

1.2 In relation to options for major new infrastructure, we intend to publish in our interim report, which is to be completed by the end of 2013, our assessment of the most credible options for providing any new capacity, in the light of our wider assessment of need. This means identifying those proposals which seem to us to offer the best prospect of generating additional long-term capacity at an affordable cost, should we reach a view that such capacity is required. These would then be taken forward for more detailed development in the second phase of our work from 2014.

1.3 Our first Guidance Document published on 1 February 2013<sup>1</sup> described how organisations and individuals can submit evidence and proposals to inform this process, and requests that those parties with an interest in developing long-term proposals submit them to us by 19 July

2013. We also stated in that document that we would publish more details of our sifting criteria in the spring to help inform those submissions.

1.4 The purpose of this second Guidance Document is to set out the sift criteria the Commission will use to assess submissions on long term options. These criteria are set out in Table 1.1 of this document.

1.5 The sift criteria reflect the Commission's desire to take an integrated approach which takes account of the full spectrum of relevant issues, whether they be economic, social, environmental or operational, and considers a broad range of potential effects of aviation connectivity and infrastructure at the local, regional, national and global levels. This will include looking at the wider urban and regional impacts of new infrastructure, for instance on jobs, on local economies and communities and on quality of life, alongside both more direct economic benefits for the aviation sector and its users, and noise, air quality and other environmental impacts.

1.6 We believe that the sift criteria will enable us to balance the different and potentially competing interests and objectives which will need to be borne in mind as we review the options and proposals which have been submitted to us.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/submitting-evidence-and-proposals-to-the-airports-commission>

- 1.7 The sift criteria have been informed by the Commission's consideration of the key factors underpinning this process. They have also been developed by the Commission to be broadly compatible with HM Treasury's Green Book<sup>2</sup> and the Department for Transport's WebTAG<sup>3</sup> approach to the initial stages of option development and assessment. In line with WebTAG, we expect to carry out more detailed appraisals of the most credible options identified as part of the second phase of our work from 2014, should our assessment of need conclude that additional capacity is required. The sift criteria also take account of DEFRA's proposed Sustainable Development Indicators, on which it has recently consulted and the UK's legal commitments in the Climate Change Act 2008.
- 1.8 The sift criteria have also been informed by suggestions and submissions provided by stakeholders, as requested in our first Guidance Document. This is described in more detail in Chapter 2.
- 1.9 The sift criteria outline the information required by the Commission to enable us to reach informed recommendations on the most credible long term proposals to be taken forward for more detailed development and appraisal. A fuller discussion of each of the criteria is provided in Chapter 3 of this guidance document.
- 1.10 In conjunction with our work on long-term options, we are developing our approach to the assessment of short and medium term options for making best use of current infrastructure. This approach will, by necessity, vary in some respects from the long term sifting approach; in particular because the short and medium term options are less centred on the delivery of new infrastructure. However, our intention is to ensure consistency at the level of principle between the assessment approaches applied to short, medium and long term options. We are also conscious that the short term options, on which we will provide firm recommendations in our interim report, may in some cases require a more detailed assessment during 2013 than long-term options, for which we are undertaking a higher-level sifting process this year.
- 1.11 Our next milestone in relation to options for making best use of existing capacity in the short and medium term is for submissions and proposals to be sent to us by 17 May 2013. More details are provided in Chapter 2 of our first Guidance Document.

---

2 [www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/greenbook](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/greenbook)

3 WebTag is the Department for Transport's appraisal guidance which can be found at <http://www.dft.gov.uk/webtag/index.php>

| Table 1.1 Long term options sift criteria |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Strategic fit</b>                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What is the nature, scale and timing of the aviation capacity and connectivity delivered by the proposal? How will the proposal support or enhance the UK's status as Europe's most important aviation hub?</li> <li>● Does the proposal support the Government's wider objectives and legal requirements (for example, support of national and regional economic growth, re-balancing of the economy or alignment with national climate change commitments and global targets)?</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Economy</b>                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What are the potential national economic impacts of the proposal?</li> <li>● What are the likely impacts of the proposal on the regional/local economies surrounding a) the proposed site for new or enhanced capacity and b) other airports affected by the proposal?</li> <li>● What is the likely impact of the proposal on the UK aviation industry? How will other airports be affected by the proposals and what will the impacts of this be for air passengers and other users, airlines and the wider economy?</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Surface access</b>                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What estimate has been made of the surface access requirements of the proposal in relation to existing and new infrastructure?</li> <li>● Does the proposal provide effective surface access for passengers, businesses and relevant freight traffic?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Will surface access plans provide the capacity needed for expected future demand?</li> <li>– How does the proposal impact upon local traffic and congestion?</li> <li>– What is the expected surface access split between public and private transport?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● How will the proposal change journey times from major business and population centres for users of aviation services?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Environment</b>                        | <p><b>Air quality:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What are the air quality implications of the proposal (including impacts due to aircraft, air side operation and local surface transport links)? Are these consistent with the legal frameworks for air quality? What mitigation plans are proposed?</li> </ul> <p><b>Noise:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What are the noise implications of the proposal?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– How will the proposal alter current and predicted patterns of noise in the surrounding area?</li> <li>– What changes to noise profiles would be seen at other airports as a result of the proposal?</li> <li>– What measures are envisaged to limit or reduce the number of people affected by noise?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Designated sites:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does the proposal affect any designated sites (for example Sites of Scientific Interest or Special Protection Areas) and if so how might any effects be managed?</li> </ul> <p><b>Climate change:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How might the proposal compare, in terms of its impact on greenhouse gas emissions, with alternative options for providing a similar amount of additional capacity? What are the proposals plans for continuous improvement and reduction of carbon emissions over time?</li> </ul> <p><b>Other:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are there other significant local environmental impacts which should be taken into account?</li> </ul> |

**Table 1.1 Long term options sift criteria**

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>People</b>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How will the proposal impact upon the passenger experience (eg. choice, cost, accessibility, etc.)?</li> <li>● What are the likely local social impacts of the proposal, including impacts around the proposed location for new capacity and around any other airports which would be affected, for example on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– employment</li> <li>– housing and local communities</li> <li>– vulnerable groups</li> <li>– quality of life</li> <li>– health</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Are there other significant wider social impacts of the proposal which should be taken into account?</li> <li>● How does the proposer plan to engage with local communities in taking forward their plans?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Cost</b>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What is the estimated cost of the proposal, including surface access, land purchase, compensation and any other associated infrastructure? What are the associated cost assumptions and risks?</li> <li>● Is it likely that the cost can be met entirely by the private sector? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– If not, what is the likely split between public and private sector funding and how has this been calculated?</li> <li>– How would the proposal be financed?</li> <li>– What are the associated assumptions and risks?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |
| <b>Operational viability</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Is the proposal consistent with relevant safety requirements? What operational, safety and/or resilience risks are associated with the proposal? What measures are proposed to mitigate these?</li> <li>● Is the proposal deliverable within relevant airspace constraints? What assumptions underpin this assessment?</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Delivery</b>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What are the main delivery risks in the proposal?</li> </ul>  |

## 2. Sift criteria submissions

2.1 The Airports Commission's first Guidance Document asked for suggestions for sift criteria that might be used to help identify the long term options. The deadline for submissions

was 15 March 2013, and we received over 40 submissions from organisations and private individuals. Details of the organisations making submissions are provided in Table 2.1 below:

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| ABTA  | Friends of the North Kent Marshes        | Metrotidal Ltd and Thames Reach Airport Ltd                                   |
| Aviation Environment Federation                         | Foster + Partners                        | Natural England   |
| Association of International Courier & Express Services | Gatwick Airport Ltd                      | London Borough of Redbridge   |
| British Airways   | Gatwick Diamond Initiative               | Richmond Heathrow Campaign  |
| Biggin Hill   | Heathrow Airport Ltd                     | Royal Society for the Protection of Birds                                     |
| Birmingham  | London Borough of Hounslow               | Royal Town Planning Institute   |
| CAA (Civil Aviation Authority)                          | International Aviation Advisory Group    | Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group of the Local Government Association |
| Campaign to Protect Rural England                       | Kent County Council                      | Stop Stansted Expansion   |
| Cherry Lane Against Development                         | Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council | Surrey County Council   |
| Crawley Borough Council                                 | London Councils                          | Transport for London  |
| Environment Agency                                      | London First                             | TUC   |
| Essex County Council                                    | Manchester Airports Group                | UPS   |
| Friends of the Earth                                    | Manston Airport                          | UNITE   |

- 2.2 The sift criteria published in this document have been developed in the light of a full review of all the submissions received. We have also taken into account the Aviation Policy Framework document published by the Department for Transport in March 2013.
- 2.3 There were many key issues identified in our review of submissions. Some of the common recurring themes included the following:
- The importance of taking account of climate change impacts;
  - The need for proposers to develop effective plans for community engagement;
  - Surface access availability and costs as an important factor in identifying credible proposals;
  - The importance of considering financing issues (including the deliverability of private and/or public funding for proposals); and
  - Identifying the local economic impacts of any proposal.
- 2.4 In a number of cases, sift criteria or approaches were proposed which we believe would be more detailed than appropriate for Phase 1 of our work. These include planning permission issues, approaches to value for money appraisal, and issues to do with specific existing airports, and specific costs of mitigation of greenfield sites or lost homes. For long-term options, Phase 1, which will lead to the recommendations in our interim report in December 2013, is not the final decision making process but a high level sift process of options to identify the most plausible options to take forward into Phase 2.
- 2.5 We will, however, consider the criteria proposals made in these submissions as we develop the more detailed appraisal processes to be used in Phase 2. The Phase 2 assessment process will continue to focus on the key areas of interest identified by the Commission and set out in the sift criteria in this paper. The approach will be expanded, however, to incorporate a full Appraisal of Sustainability, covering the options under consideration, and the development of detailed business cases for each option.
- 2.6 In developing this approach, we will give consideration to the Government's appraisal guidance, including the HMT Green Book and DfT's WebTAG methodology. While the Commission's recommendations will not themselves constitute a National Policy Statement (NPS), in order to support the implementation of our recommendations, should a future Government wish to do so, we will take into account the requirements for NPSs set out in the Planning Act 2008, as well as the frameworks set out in the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (2001/42/EC) and other relevant elements of the European legislative framework. We will also consider the approaches used in comparable projects to identify potential options and any wider good practice from which we might draw.

# 3. Information on individual criteria

3.1 This Chapter discusses the Commission's sift criteria in more detail, in order to enhance understanding of the criteria, to explain where appropriate how they have been developed, and to highlight specific areas of interest.

## Strategic fit

What is the nature, scale and timing of the aviation capacity and connectivity delivered by the proposal? How will the proposal support or enhance the UK's status as Europe's most important aviation hub?

3.2 The Airports Commission's assessment of the most credible options for enhancing aviation capacity over the long-term will be informed by our recommendations on the nature, scale and timing of the UK's aviation capacity and connectivity needs. In order to inform our appraisal of whether proposals are consistent with our assessment of need, scheme developers should set out the level of additional capacity and connectivity that could be delivered, and how and when this would be provided. This may include information on, for example, the number and type of additional flights supported and the scope for the proposal to facilitate the development of new routes.

3.3 Proposals should also explain how the impact of the proposal on UK airports relative to key European and

international comparators. In doing so, those making submissions may wish to set out their assumptions about the future development of the national and international aviation sector, including any potential future scenarios they have considered, and how these have influenced their proposals.

3.4 As the Commission process progresses, we will be assessing proposals against our emerging assessment of need, informed by the evidence presented in the Commission's discussion papers (including on potential future developments) and on submissions made in response to these.

Does the proposal support the Government's wider objectives and legal requirements (for example, support of national and regional economic growth, re-balancing of the economy or alignment with national climate change commitments and global targets)?

3.5 Where proposals are considered to support wider Government objectives, such as, for example, promoting regional or national economic growth or supporting re-balancing of the economy, this should be explained by scheme promoters in their submissions.

3.6 The Commission is reviewing the overall compatibility of growth in air travel with the national climate change commitments and global climate change

targets as part of its work programme assessing the scale and timing of any need for additional aviation capacity in the UK and we have recently published a discussion document<sup>4</sup> on this issue. This discussion document summarises the current evidence base in relation to this issue and provides an opportunity for those with an interest to submit evidence and make their views known. Given the importance attached to consideration of climate change issues in submissions to the Commission on sift criteria, we invite those developing proposals for enhanced capacity to also set out their assessments of how the growth in aviation enabled by their proposals can be accommodated within the national and international frameworks for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This might also include setting out how they consider long-term reductions in carbon emissions can be delivered over time.

## Economy

What are the potential national economic impacts of the proposal?

3.7 The Commission is reviewing the evidence on the links between connectivity and the economy as part of its work programme assessing of the scale and timing of any need for additional aviation capacity in the UK. We have also published a discussion document on this issue. This document summarises the evidence base in relation to this issue and provides an opportunity for those with an interest to submit evidence and make their views known. We invite those developing proposals to set out their assessments of how the additional aviation capacity

and connectivity enabled by their proposals impacts upon the nation's economy as a whole – including supporting growth across the UK's regions. This could include impacts on trade, foreign direct investment and tourism, as well as how it enhances access to international aviation services for both passenger and freight users throughout the country.

What are the likely impacts of the proposal on the regional/local economies surrounding a) the proposed site for new or enhanced capacity and b) other airports affected by the proposal?

3.8 Airports can have a significant impact on the local/regional economies, both in a direct and indirect sense. Scheme promoters should set out their assessment of these effects in their submissions including details of how their assessments have been made. This could include, for example, impacts on local employment opportunities, changes/access to specific pools of labour, local agglomerations and investment, housing stock, impacts on regional business growth and fit with regional strategies. This list is by no means exhaustive and proposers should include any additional impacts and appropriate assessment. This is also an opportunity for those proposals which include changing or closing operations at another site to explain how those changes will affect upon the local/regional economy/s of the other affected site/s, and how they would propose to mitigate and manage those impacts.

4 Thematic discussion papers can be found at our website <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/airports-commission>

What is the likely impact of the proposal on the UK aviation industry? How will other airports be affected by the proposals and what will the impacts of this be for air passengers and other users, airlines and the wider economy?

3.9 The aviation sector is in itself a significant contributor to the UK economy. The Commission will be interested in examining the implications of proposals for the health and long term viability of this sector. This will include making an assessment of the implications for the airline industry, as well as for the ability of the UK's airports to be competitive upon the international stage and how this environment will benefit air passengers and freight operators. The Commission will also be interested in the benefits to passengers, other users and the national economy as a result of any changes in the level and nature of competition between airports and/or airports within the UK as well as internationally.

### Surface access

What estimate has been made of the surface access requirements of the proposal for both existing and/or new infrastructure?

3.10 For each proposal, the Commission will be interested in understanding how airport users (including passengers and freight users) and workforce will access the airport site. Many of the likely proposals may require the delivery of additional surface transport infrastructure above and beyond existing networks. Where this is the case, the Commission will need to understand the likely scope and estimated cost of this new infrastructure, including how these estimates have been calculated and any

assumptions underpinning them. Potential enhancements to existing infrastructure may also need to be considered, particularly where this infrastructure already suffers, or is forecast to suffer from capacity constraints.

Does the proposal provide effective surface access for passengers, businesses and relevant freight traffic? Will surface access plans provide the capacity needed for expected future demand? How does the proposal impact upon local traffic and congestion? What is the expected surface access split between public and private transport?

3.11 The Commission is interested in how the surface access elements of proposals can meet the needs of the various groups of airport users. Specifically, the Commission is interested in how the airport will be accessible to leisure passengers, business users and freight and logistics companies who depend upon air freight networks. As part of its work, the Commission will consider issues such as the ability of people and organisations to reach the transport as well as the share between different transport modes. It will also consider the associated benefits of the proposal to wider transport users and the impact upon local traffic and congestion issues. Issues around mode share, (showing the percentage of passengers arriving by public and private transport) may be of particular relevance to the Commission's considerations of environmental factors such as air quality, emissions and noise, as well as to their implications for transport issues such as congestion.

How will the proposal change journey times from major business and population centres for users of aviation services?

- 3.12 Efficient journeys between airports and major population and business centres are of particular importance to many airport users. Accordingly, the Commission would be interested in understanding the likely end-to-end journey times between key business hubs, population centres and the airport site, and how these differ from the current and forecast situation without the proposed new infrastructure. This should not be restricted to access from important locations in London and the South East, as well as other business clusters such as in the Thames Valley and around Cambridge, but should also consider journey times to major conurbations and economic centres elsewhere in the UK. This might also include identifying changes to journey times resulting from impacts on other airports (e.g. where the closure or scaling back of another airport leads to a deterioration in access to air services from some areas).

## Environment

### Air quality

What are the air quality implications of the proposal (including impacts due to aircraft, air side operation and local surface transport links)? Are these consistent with the legal frameworks for air quality? What mitigation plans are proposed?

- 3.13 The Commission is interested in understanding any air quality implications of proposals, including those associated with aircraft and airside operations and from local surface

transport links. Where any locations already identified as Air Quality Management Areas might be affected, either positively or negatively, this should be documented, and where any risk of exceeding air quality thresholds is identified, scheme developers should explain how they would mitigate these effects to comply with the legal frameworks governing this issue. As with other criteria, scheme promoters should consider effects both at the proposed site for new infrastructure, but also at any other sites that may be affected as a result.

### Noise

What are the noise implications of the proposal? How will the proposal alter current and predicted patterns of noise in the surrounding area? What changes to noise profiles would be seen at other airports as a result of the proposal? What measures are envisaged to limit or reduce the number of people affected by noise?

- 3.14 We recognise that the noise impacts of proposals for additional aviation capacity are an important concern for stakeholders. The Commission is therefore interested in understanding the noise implications for any proposals made. This should include information on both day and night noise impacts and on any measures the proposer intends to limit or reduce the number of people affected by noise. In setting out their proposals, scheme developers may wish to have reference to the Government's Noise Policy (NPSE), the Aviation Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework. Those affected by changes in airport capacity may not be restricted to the areas and communities in the vicinity of the proposal, but could also include

communities close to other airports that may be affected by any proposal. For example, if a proposal assumes the closure or scaling back of an existing airport, or changes to arrival and/or departure routes, these assumptions would need to be documented and the noise implications for both locations considered in the submission. Proposed scheme developers should also consider any significant noise implications of surface access.

**3.15** As well as setting out changes in noise impacts for local communities, scheme promoters should also consider whether their proposals would have other noise impacts that should be taken into account – for example, in relation to increases in noise over previously tranquil areas, including but not limited to National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Where there is potential for such impacts to occur, proposers should document this in their submissions, including the potential trade offs between tranquillity and community noise impacts that might be made.

**3.16** Proposers should explain in their submissions how their noise assessments have been derived, including setting out any methodologies used and the baseline scenario which they have adopted for comparison with their proposal. Any assumptions underpinning this baseline or the assessed impacts of the proposal, for instance in relation to expected changes in aerospace technology, should be documented in the proposal.

## Designated sites

Does the proposal affect any designated sites (for example Sites of Scientific Interest or Special Protection Areas) and if so how might any effects be managed?

**3.17** The Commission is keen to understand the impacts of proposals upon any designated environmental sites. These may include, for example Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Special Areas of Conservation or Ramsar sites amongst others<sup>5</sup>. Where a proposal might have implications for any designated site, proposers should document this in their submission, and set out any measures they would put in place to mitigate these effects. It should be noted that effects may not be restricted to designated sites in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site for new capacity. Scheme proposers should consider where appropriate the relevant environmental regulations and directives governing this area. Proposers should clearly state the assumptions they have made and assess whether any residual impacts may remain following mitigation.

## Climate change

How might the proposal compare, in terms of its impact on greenhouse gas emissions, with alternative options for providing a similar amount of additional capacity?

**3.18** The Commission's consideration of climate change will primarily focus on the overall compatibility of any potential growth in UK aviation with national and international climate change

<sup>5</sup> For more detail on designated sites, see the Natural England website at: <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/designations/>

frameworks. This is because the climate change impact of a given number of flights is not expected to vary greatly due to the geographic location of the airport from which they depart (e.g. the emissions from a given number of flights departing from Heathrow is likely to be broadly equivalent to the same number of flights departing from Gatwick). However, the Commission will consider whether any proposal made could generate significantly greater or fewer emissions relative to other potential options. This might potentially include, for example, carbon emissions resulting from construction, airport operations or surface access. Scheme developers may therefore consider in their submissions whether there are specific carbon implications of their proposals which may differentiate them from other potential options. They should also set out any plans or measures proposed to deliver reductions in carbon emissions over time.

#### Other

What other significant local environmental impacts should be taken into account?

**3.19** Where proposals may have other significant environmental impacts beyond those outlined above, these should be identified and documented. This might include, for example, impacts on landscape and/or townscape, water availability and flooding, biodiversity or historical and archaeological sites. In considering potential environmental impacts, scheme developers may wish to have reference to the factors set out in DEFRA's Sustainable Development Indicators.

#### People

How will the proposal impact upon the passenger experience (eg. choice, cost, accessibility, etc.)?

**3.20** The Commission is keen to understand the impacts of proposals upon the end users of aviation. Accordingly, the Commission will consider issues such as the impacts of proposals on issues such as the range of choice of routes and carriers available to passengers and the cost of air travel. This may include consideration of the implications of proposals for the competitive markets which currently exist within the aviation industry, as well as the extent to which proposals could enhance or limit access to aviation service for customers from different geographical areas and social groupings.

What are the likely local social impacts of the proposal, including impacts around the proposed location for new capacity and around any other airports which would be affected, for example on: employment, housing and local communities, vulnerable groups, quality of life and health

**3.21** The Commission believes that its decisions must take into account a broad range of social impacts and we are therefore interested in examining the implications, both positive and negative, of proposals for communities and urban areas in the vicinity of the proposed sites.

**3.22** Airports play a substantial role in the economic life of their neighbouring communities, both as direct employers but also indirectly through the businesses which support them, and scheme developers should consider the

potential employment implications of their proposals, including for example the potential scale and nature of any job creation resulting from the proposal, and details of how any significant changes to the local workforce could be enabled and accommodated. Submissions should also consider where appropriate the potential consequences of changes at other airports, and if necessary how any negative effects might be mitigated. They should also set out how any quantified employment effects have been calculated and the assumptions used.

**3.23** Other relevant social impacts could include impacts on regeneration, where proposals support broader plans to promote growth and development in deprived areas, or impacts on local housing and associated infrastructure – for example, where construction would require significant numbers of demolitions or where new housing, schools etc would be required to support the proposal and its workforce. Where there is a risk that vulnerable groups or particular communities would be disproportionately affected, whether in the vicinity of the new capacity or any other site, this should be noted and any proposed mitigation explained. Effects on health, both positive and negative should also be given consideration.

**3.24** These assessments may be used to make an overall assessment of the impacts of proposals on local and regional quality of life. In doing so, scheme developers may also wish to set out whether and how their proposals might support any wider local or metropolitan strategies

What other significant wider social impacts of the proposal should be taken into account?

**3.25** Where parties developing proposals have identified other significant social impacts beyond those outlined above which they believe may be relevant to the Commission's deliberations, these should be identified and documented.

How does the proposer plan to engage with local communities in taking forward their plans?

**3.26** In order for any proposal to be deliverable, the involvement and engagement of local communities will be vital. The Commission is therefore interested in understanding how the proposer plans to engage with local communities, including local authorities, local businesses and other community stakeholders, as part of the development of their proposal. This will also help to inform the development of appropriate public engagement processes if the proposal is taken forward into Phase 2 for further assessment.

### Cost

What is the estimated cost of the proposal, including surface access, land purchase, compensation and any other associated infrastructure? What are the associated cost assumptions and risks?

**3.27** The delivery of airport infrastructure can involve significant expenditure. As a first step in understanding the likely financing requirements of any proposal, the Commission will need to understand its estimated total delivery cost, broken

down into its high-level component parts with a short description of what each would deliver. For example, the proposal should consider the cost of associated infrastructure like surface access requirements and the cost related to land purchase and compensation. Proposers should set out how these estimates have been calculated, including what allowances have been made for risk or optimism bias, and any assumptions underpinning them.

Is it likely that the cost can be met entirely by the private sector? What is the likely split between public and private sector funding if not? How would the proposal be financed? What are the associated assumptions and risks?

- 3.28 While the Commission accepts that parties developing proposals may not have fully developed financing plans at this stage, the Commission is nevertheless interested in understanding (based on the high level breakdown mentioned in the previous question) how the costs of a proposal might be delivered by the private sector and what aspects would require public funding or guarantees. The Commission is also interested in understanding any assumptions that have been made in calculating how a proposal might be financed. This might include, for example, any assessment of how the proposed airport's landing charges might be set and how it might attract investment. The information provided should enable the Commission to make an initial assessment of the commercial viability of the proposal.

## Operational viability

Is the proposal consistent with relevant safety requirements? What operational, safety and/or resilience risks are associated with the proposal? What measures are proposed to manage these?

- 3.29 The Commission is conscious that any proposal should not jeopardise the safety of users of air transport while being mindful of those living and working under the flight path. Scheme proposers should explain how it will comply with relevant safety requirements once operational, including documenting any specific safety risks and how these will be managed.
- 3.30 The Commission would also like to understand what risks may be associated with the proposal within the areas of operations, safety and resilience. These may include but are not limited to; bird strike, prevailing winds and weather conditions and prevalence of fog. Any risks described in the proposal will also need mitigation measures included along with the cost and feasibility of those measures. For resilience issues, the Commission will require a description of the measures that will show how the proposal will remain operationally resilient. In considering this criteria, scheme developers may also consider the need to understand and accommodate the potential impacts of climate change, for instance in relation to severe weather or flood risks.

Is the proposal deliverable within relevant airspace constraints? What assumptions underpin this assessment?

- 3.31 Proposals should be deliverable efficiently within European and UK airspace regulations. Scheme developers should set out any assumptions underpinning their assessment of deliverability.

### **Deliverability**

What are the main delivery risks in the proposal?

- 3.32 The Commission will consider the delivery risks for each proposal. This will include the risk to delivery during the planning and construction phase e.g. those associated with the legal and planning process; the financing of the proposal; and any technical, construction and engineering risks. Risks associated with the effective transition to the proposed solution whether it is within an existing airport or to a new airport site as well as the risks associated with ensuring the proposal is commercially attractive to airlines, passengers and businesses will also be considered. In order to inform our assessment of the level of risk associated with the delivery of each proposal, scheme developers should consider what delivery risks are associated with their proposals, how each of these risks could be mitigated, and any assumptions that underpin these assessments.

## 4. General guidance for scheme developers

- 4.1 We encourage proposers to be innovative in their submissions. In this light the criteria questions should be seen as a guide for submissions, not a fixed structure that all proposals must follow.
- 4.2 Where available, submissions should provide quantified information about the nature and effect of the proposals as well as details of how the estimations have been made. Where a quantified assessment cannot be made, proposers should provide a qualitative assessment and explain how this has been reached. In all cases, approaches and assumptions used within the proposal should be noted – including, for example, assumptions about future demand for aviation or in relation to future technological developments.
- 4.3 The objective of Phase 1 of the Commission's work programme is to identify a shortlist of credible proposals to be taken forward for further detailed development in 2014. It is in this second phase that full business cases, including cost benefit analysis and associated value for money assessment, will be developed. Therefore, in this phase we only require information on costs and benefits at a high level, and do not require scheme developers to carry out detailed modelling or to submit cost benefit analysis. We also do not require detailed designs for new runways and terminals at this stage, although these may be included if it is felt they are fundamental to the analysis within the proposal. In submitting any detailed designs, scheme developers should note the Commission's intention to publish the proposals submitted to it (see Chapter 6).
- 4.4 As set out in the Commission's February Guidance Document, proposals should be no longer than 40 pages.

# 5. Technical and expert support

## Technical advice

- 5.1 To support the Airports Commission in its consideration and assessment of proposals submitted, we have appointed a consortium of experienced technical advisers led by LeighFisher and Jacobs UK Ltd. The members of the consortium are set out below:
- LeighFisher (aviation planning and operations, and transport economics)
  - Jacobs UK Ltd (engineering, transport planning and environmental assessment)
  - KPMG (commercial advisors)
  - Bickerdike Allen Partnership (acoustic specialists)
  - Centre for Air Transport and the Environment, Manchester Metropolitan University

- 5.2 In addition, the Commission is putting in place agreements to enable it to draw upon expert advice and support from the Civil Aviation Authority and NATS. Finally, we have appointed PricewaterhouseCoopers to provide analytical and modelling support.

## Expert Advisory Panel

- 5.3 As well as the technical expertise and support for the sifting process that the consultants will bring, the Airports Commission has also stated that it will appoint an Expert Advisory Panel to ensure that the Commission has access

to the very best scientific and technical expertise on issues relating to its work. The Expert Advisory Panel will provide the Commission with an additional level of challenge and quality assurance from leading experts in their fields.

- 5.4 The function of the Expert Advisory Panel is to help the Airports Commission to access, interpret and understand evidence relating to the Commission's work, and to make judgements about its relevance, potential and application. The Panel is strictly an advisory body, and has no executive powers.
- 5.5 The Commission has now made its initial appointments to the Expert Advisory Panel, covering a range of fields including (but not limited to) climate change, aircraft noise, air quality, surface transport interfaces and economics. The Commission will keep the membership and terms of reference for the panel under review as its work progresses.
- 5.6 The initial appointments to the Expert Advisory Panel are set out in table 5.1 below. The Terms of Reference for the Expert Panel can be seen in Appendix A. All appointments to the Expert Advisory Panel are made in a personal capacity. Further information about the current Panel members, including biographical details, is available on the Airports Commission website.

| <b>Table 5.1 Expert advisory panel</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Name</b>                            | <b>Organisation</b>  |
| Professor Helen Apsimon                | Professor of Air Pollution Studies, Imperial College London  |
| Dr Charlotte Clark                     | Senior lecturer in Environmental and Mental Health Epidemiology, Barts and the London School of Medicine       |
| Professor Piers Forster                | Professor of Physical Climate Change, University of Leeds  |
| Dr Andrew Kempton                      | Chief Noise Specialist, Rolls-Royce  |
| Professor Peter Mackie                 | Research Professor of Transport Studies, University of Leeds   |
| Professor Andrew McNaughton            | Technical Director, High Speed Two Ltd and previously Chief Engineer, Network Rail                             |
| Professor Henry Overman                | Professor of Economic Geography, London School of Economics  |
| Mr George Paulson                      | Independent consultant; former Director of Safety and Airspace, Eurocontrol                                    |
| Dr David Quarmby                       | Chairman, RAC Foundation and previously Chairman of the Strategic Rail Authority and British Tourism Authority |
| Professor Andreas Schäfer              | Professor in Energy and Transport, University College London   |
| Professor Keith Shine                  | Professor of Physical Meteorology, University of Reading   |
| Mr David Starkie                       | Senior Associate, Case Associates  |
| Professor Callum Thomas                | Professor of Sustainable Aviation, Manchester Metropolitan University  |

## 6. Publication of submissions

- 6.1 In our February Guidance Document, we explained our intention to publish the proposals for new airport or runway infrastructure that have been submitted to us. This will ensure that individuals and organisations who may be affected by specific proposals, either positively or negatively, will have the opportunity to make their views known, and to provide any additional information or evidence; and that the Commission will be able to understand and take into account the views of stakeholders as we consider the proposals and reach our recommendations on any options to be taken forward for detailed development in the second phase of its work.
- 6.2 To allow this transparency, we intend to publish on our website later in the summer. For this reason, it is important that where submissions include material that proposers consider to be commercially confidential this is clearly identified, so that we may take this into account in collating material for publication.
- 6.3 In line with our commitment to an open and transparent process, however, we would expect to publish submissions in full wherever possible, and would urge those make submissions to consider how any confidential material can be reduced to a minimum. Where submissions are made by private individuals, however, we will redact personal information such as names and addresses (or other contact details) unless requested otherwise.
- 6.4 Scheme promoters should also consider the case for publishing full and/or summary versions their proposals themselves, in particular to promote an open dialogue with local and industry stakeholders on any potential plans.
- 6.5 More detailed public engagement will be carried out in Phase 2 of our work programme on any proposals taken forward for detailed development and consideration. We envisage that this will include a fuller public consultation process, as well as engagement with local authorities and communities in relevant areas and with industry and business representatives.

## 7. How to make a submission

- 7.1 The deadline for submitting outline long term proposals is 19 July 2013. We request that submissions, which should be no more than 40 pages long, are made electronically to Airport. [Proposals@airports.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Proposals@airports.gsi.gov.uk). All submissions received will be acknowledged.
- 7.2 Under exceptional circumstances we may accept submissions in hard copy. If you need to submit in hard copy, please contact us in advance. We will require 2 copies of any hard copy submission, which should be sent to the Commission Secretariat at Airports Commission, 6th Floor, Sanctuary Buildings, 20 Great Smith Street, London, SW1P 3BT.

# Appendix A – Expert Advisory Panel

## Purpose

The function of the Expert Advisory Panel is to help the Airports Commission to access, interpret and understand evidence<sup>6</sup> relating to the Commission's work, and to make judgements about its relevance, potential and application. The Panel is strictly an advisory body, and has no executive powers.

## Terms of reference

The terms of reference for the Expert Advisory Panel are to advise the Airports Commission on a range of issues including (but not limited to) aviation economics, climate change, aircraft noise, air quality, aviation technology, planning and engineering, and in particular to:

- act as a sounding board on scientific, commercial and technological issues relevant to the Commission's work;
- expose the Commission to the full range of views on issues relating to the Commission's work;
- advise on the quality, limitations and appropriate uses of research carried out by, or on behalf of, the Commission;
- advise on specific points from proposals on airport capacity where evidence is limited or further work is required;
- advise on specific issues and problems referred to it;

- help the Commission, where requested, to develop and maintain links with the external research community and industry experts; and
- provide research papers or presentations where requested by the Commission.

Given the range of issues that will have a bearing on the Commission's work, the Advisory Panel may need to convene smaller, more specialist, working groups to examine specific issues, drawing on external expertise where appropriate. This will be by agreement with the Chair of the Airports Commission.

---

<sup>6</sup> 'Evidence' in this context covers scientific, commercial and technological issues that may have a bearing on the Commission's work.

### **Contact Information**

Website: [www.gov.uk/government/organisations/airports-commission](http://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/airports-commission)

Email: [airports.enquiries@airports.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:airports.enquiries@airports.gsi.gov.uk)