



Guidance Document 01: Submitting evidence and proposals to the Airports Commission

February 2013

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

Web: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/airports-commission

Email: 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/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: 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

Foreword	4
1. Introduction	7
Assessing the need for capacity	8
Short and medium term options	9
Long term options	9
Further work	10
Next steps	11
2. Proposals for making the best use of existing capacity in the short and medium terms	12
3. Proposals for providing additional airport capacity in the longer term	14
Economic factors	16
Social factors	17
Climate change impacts	17
Local environment impacts	18
Accessibility	19
Feasibility considerations	20
4. Summary of key dates and next steps	22
5. Confidentiality and information transparency	23
6. How to make a submission	24

Foreword

This is the first in a series of papers the Airports Commission will be issuing over the next two and a half years. It explains the Commission's intended approach to the subject of airport capacity, and in particular how we plan to engage with all the relevant constituencies of interest. We therefore hope it will be widely read.

While this is the Commission's first paper, ours is not the first review of airport policy and provision in the UK. Some, like me, will even recall the Roskill Commission, which reported back in 1968 and recommended a new airport at Cublington, with a minority report favouring Maplin Sands. Neither airport was built.

The last in-depth review of UK airports was carried out in preparation for the last Government's White Paper in 2003. That exercise led to the conclusion that a second runway should be built at Stansted, followed by a third at Heathrow, if certain key environmental standards could be met. Neither of these developments has yet occurred.

Indeed, no new runways have been built in the South East of England since London City Airport opened in 1987 and no new full length runways have been built from scratch for decades even before that. The degree of consensus needed to push through projects of great long-term significance has been lacking.

But we cannot simply return to these past recommendations. Looking back, it is remarkable how much has changed since the last review.

Overall aviation demand forecasts have been adjusted downwards, partly attributable to the recession, but also to higher oil prices and taxation. On the other hand, the Open Skies agreement and other changes in the aviation industry have seen more long-haul traffic shifted to Heathrow, leaving it full even after the opening of Terminal 5.

The 2003 White Paper referred to climate change and the particular impact of aviation on global warming, but did so at a time when policies were far less developed. Since the Stern Review, the Climate Change Act 2008 and the Committee on Climate Change's report of 2009, the policy context has changed significantly.

In the industry itself, much has changed. Low cost carriers are far more significant. There has already been consolidation amongst 'flag carriers' in Europe, with the prospect of more to come. The airline alliances are now far more important in influencing schedules and passenger behaviour.

New aircraft like the Airbus A380 and the Boeing 787 are respectively larger and longer range than previous equipment. Both are more fuel-efficient and quieter than the aircraft they replace.

Airport ownership in the South East has changed since the Competition Commission report of 2007. The former British Airports Authority has been broken up. Gatwick is already in new ownership and Stansted will shortly follow. The regulatory environment within which airports operate has also changed, with the regulator's duties now clearly focused on promoting consumer interests, where appropriate by promoting competition.

Airline consolidation in Europe has driven more long-haul consolidation in other countries, too, with Frankfurt, Schiphol, Madrid Barajas and Paris Charles de Gaulle emerging as dominant continental hubs, while the connectivity of second-tier airports has declined. These hub European airports have nurtured links with UK regional cities. And the significance of Dubai and the other new 'global hubs' in the Gulf has grown markedly in the last decade. They are also now well connected to the larger UK regional airports, giving travellers a wider range of options on some long-haul routes, especially to Asia.

Developments in surface transport have altered the picture, too. Crossrail will shortly come into operation, and the Government's support for HS2 is clear. Both will potentially expand the catchment areas of airports linked to them.

For all these reasons we need a new look and a fresh start. That is why I was pleased to accept the Government's invitation to chair the Commission.

Some have questioned the need for a detailed analysis of the options. My colleagues and I are sure they are wrong on that point. The changes I have briefly outlined explain this need for a new assessment. Others have pessimistically forecast that the problem, which has perplexed and confounded successive governments for decades, will remain insoluble. Again, we disagree.

A fresh and independent view, at arm's length from politics, may well be able to make progress. A body without any vested interests or preconceived views, which is able to review the evidence dispassionately, to engage widely, to exercise its judgement and make well-considered and integrated recommendations, provides the best chance of enabling broad agreement to be reached and lasting decisions taken.

It is my ambition that the Airports Commission will be able to play that role objectively and rigorously in considering the crucial questions of whether new airport capacity is needed and, if so, where and how it should be provided. As this paper explains, we will follow a process which is comprehensive, rigorous, open and inclusive.

The members of the Commission bring a diverse span of experience and knowledge to their task. We will take a broad view. We recognise that the ways in which people live and move in London and other global cities are changing fast. The values which citizens attach to different forms of connectivity, and to the character of their environment, are evolving. We aim to set our recommendations in a wider societal context which will respond to the aspirations of the communities served and affected by airports. We will look for an integrated approach, which establishes the links between different transport modes, rather than seeing airport policy in isolation. In the end, a balance will need to be struck and hard choices made, but our chances of producing recommendations which attract broad support will depend substantially on the quality and breadth of the external engagement which we receive.

I would therefore encourage a wide range of organisations, and individuals, to offer their views. We will not be able to make progress if the debate is dominated by a small number of voices, be they airport operators, airlines and architects, or campaign groups focused on

specific issues. All these groups have a role to play, and we will listen carefully to what they have to say. But it is also important for a wider range of interests to be heard – from the business community through to those who depend on aviation to visit friends and family, and from experts in topics as diverse as airspace operations, ornithology and human health.

So I conclude with a plea for all interested parties to engage constructively with the process. The task is an essential one for the whole nation. We believe that with a new and more inclusive approach to decision-making, we can produce a plan which attracts sufficient support to form the basis of airport planning in the UK for the next 50 years.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Howard Davies". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'H' and a long, sweeping tail.

**Sir Howard Davies,
Chair, Airports Commission**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The membership of the Airports Commission was announced on 2 November last year. We have been tasked with the production of two reports - an interim report by the end of 2013 and a final report in summer 2015. In carrying out our work, we are determined to follow a process which is comprehensive, rigorous, open and inclusive. This will enable us to develop the greatest possible degree of consensus around a way forward for the country's airports and to deliver recommendations that properly reflect the national interest.
- 1.2 We will also seek to take an integrated approach, making sure that our work reflects the full spectrum of relevant issues, whether they be economic, social, environmental or operational, and considering the wider effects of aviation connectivity and infrastructure at the local, regional, national and global levels. In reaching our recommendations, a careful balance between different interests and objectives will need to be struck.
- 1.3 Our ambition therefore is to propose a sustainable and integrated strategy, which considers not only how to meet the UK's aviation capacity and connectivity needs, but also looks at the broader consequences of our recommendations – for example on the well-being of local communities, the strength of the regional economy or the diversity of nearby ecosystems and habitats – and identifies measures to avoid, reduce or mitigate potential negative consequences and maximise the positive effects.
- 1.4 The UK is not the only country to find itself confronted with issues of airport capacity. While there are unique factors to the UK's situation, the questions we face are applicable to many nations, particularly those which are home to a world-city. We are eager to learn from the experience of other countries, both in assessing the need for capacity and in providing additional capacity where required.
- 1.5 The main purposes of this guidance note are to explain how we plan to put these principles into practice as we take forward the work programme which will inform our interim report, and to explain to those who have an interest in contributing specific proposals how they might best engage with the Commission.
- 1.6 Our terms of reference set out the following requirements for our interim report:
- The Commission should report no later than the end of 2013 on:*
- *its assessment of the evidence on the nature, scale and timing of the steps needed to maintain the UK's global hub status; and*

- *its recommendation(s) for immediate actions to improve the use of existing runway capacity in the next 5 years – consistent with credible long term options.*

1.7 We believe that to meet the requirements set out in the terms of reference for both the interim and final reports, we will need to produce an interim report that meets three key objectives:

- To examine the evidence on the nature, scale and timing of the UK's future aviation capacity and connectivity needs to maintain the UK's position as Europe's most important aviation hub.
- To make recommendations for any immediate actions to improve the use of existing runway capacity in the next five years and to consider other short and medium term measures for making the best use of existing capacity that might be further developed before the Commission's final report.
- To consider long-term options – including major infrastructure and any surface transport needs they may entail – and to identify a list of credible options, consistent with our conclusions on the assessment of need, to be further developed before the Commission's final report.

1.8 We have established the following loose definitions for short, medium and long term options:

- **Short term options** are those which could be delivered without the provision of additional runways or terminals, within 5 years of the publication of our interim report in December 2013.

- **Medium term options** are those which do not require the provision of additional runways or terminals, but which may need more than 5 years to deliver (for example, measures requiring significant planning approvals to be obtained or improvements in surface access infrastructure serving an existing airport).

- **Long term options** are those which involve the substantial development of a new or existing airport site. This includes the delivery of any surface access links or other infrastructure required to ensure that the new airport capacity can be utilised.

Assessing the need for capacity

1.9 To help us to form our assessment of need, we will be publishing a series of papers summarising the evidence and seeking views on the most important background issues. The first of these will be on demand forecasting. It is clear that we need a baseline view of the likely demand for flights in the future, both on an unconstrained basis, and within the context of the Government's policies, including, in the context of the Climate Change Act, anything it might conclude or decide about climate change, before we can make sensible decisions on capacity.

1.10 We plan further papers on, for example, the arguments surrounding the concept of a hub airport, and on environmental issues, including noise and climate change. We will hold focused discussions around these papers, inviting written submissions and holding public evidence sessions, to inform our thinking further. Each paper will include information on how people and organisations interested in the topic can contribute to the debate, so those

issues are not covered further in this guidance document.

- 1.11 We should stress that the Commission has not yet reached a view on the need or otherwise for additional aviation capacity in the UK, and will only reach such a view following a comprehensive review of the evidence and having considered all submissions that are made. We will bring together our work on the assessment of need with that on options for the short, medium and long term prior to the publication of our interim report. By way of example, this will allow us to assess not only the specific impacts of any proposal on greenhouse gas emissions, but also to take a view on the overall level of such emissions from the aviation sector that is compatible with the UK's domestic and international commitments, in a world where aircraft technology, airspace design and surface access provision are continually evolving.

Short and medium term options

- 1.12 Our interim report will include recommendations for how the use we make of our existing airports and runways might be optimised. The significance of this work goes beyond simply understanding how to make best use of our current capacity; if significant new capacity is needed it will take some years to be brought into operation and we will need to understand how the UK might cope with demand in the interim. We are keen to explore all the options of this kind, recognising that many may have only a modest impact, but also seeking any more ambitious opportunities that may be identified. We will take into account the fact that some of them – extended flying hours, mixed-mode runway operation – may generate significant effects upon local communities which will need to be carefully considered. Some may also have implications for the longer-term solutions.
- 1.13 To inform this work, we are inviting those with an interest to submit evidence and ideas, and to make their views known. This will help us to identify measures we might not otherwise have looked at, as well as shedding further light upon issues we are already considering. Section 2 of this document invites those contributions. It also outlines our initial thinking on some of the factors which we will take into account in assessing the short and medium term options.

Long term options

- 1.14 Our interim report will also move our thinking forward on the longer term options, identifying those locations which seem to us to offer the best prospect of generating additional capacity at an affordable cost, should we reach a view that such capacity is required. This will focus on options which appear to have a strong possibility of being financeable and which could be achieved with environmental and other consequences which could be acceptable.
- 1.15 Getting to that point in 2013 will require drive and energy. Since the creation of the Commission was announced a number of new ideas for enhanced capacity, in the South-East and elsewhere, have been brought forward. Some of these are already well-developed; others are at the conceptual stage. Some have an obvious sponsor, such as an existing airport keen to expand capacity; but where this is not the case, the plans are bound to be less firmly based.

1.16 We see this process as a valuable step forward. The issue of the UK's airport capacity has perplexed governments and planners for decades. So creative thinking is welcome, whether it focuses on new ways of developing existing airports, or on brand new facilities. But there are also risks and dangers. The main risk is that a plethora of new proposals will create planning blight in the areas concerned, and anxiety among communities which might be affected if they go ahead. There is also the potential cost of nugatory work to consider.

1.17 In reaching our interim recommendations, part of the role of the Commission will be to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all of the plausible options. This may involve carrying out work of our own on identifying options and, where we believe an option may be credible but may lack an appropriately resourced external sponsor, ensuring that the option in question is developed to an appropriate level to allow it to be judged fairly. The lack of an external sponsor will be a material concern, in light of our interest in ensuring that options might plausibly be financed and delivered, but is not by itself sufficient to exclude an option from consideration.

1.18 In section 3 of this document, we set out how those with an interest in putting forward proposals can participate in this process. This includes a list of potential areas of interest that we have currently identified and which we would encourage scheme promoters to consider as they identify and develop their proposals.

Further work

1.19 A key part of our work over the coming months will also be to develop in more detail the specific criteria that we will employ in identifying those options which merit more detailed consideration. We will say more about how this initial assessment of options will be carried out in the spring, once we have had a chance to consider the Government's final Aviation Policy Framework, due for publication in March. We would welcome suggestions for criteria that might be used to identify the most plausible options ahead of the interim report and would ask that they be submitted to us by **15 March 2013**.

1.20 If our interim report reaches a view that a significant increase in aviation capacity is needed, in the second phase of the Commission's work the recommended options will be developed into more detailed schemes, on which further public engagement will be sought. These will be subject to a thorough assessment process, including the development of detailed business cases and appraisals of sustainability. We will look not only at individual proposals in isolation, but also at how they might be combined.

1.21 We will therefore need to develop a rigorous framework for assessing options during this second phase of our work. This framework will need to be consistent with European and national legal requirements, and to enable a comprehensive view to be taken, which considers the full range of economic, social, environmental and other factors, and looks at the potential impacts of schemes at the local, regional, national and global levels.

- 1.22 We want to ensure that the outputs of this process are of sufficient depth and rigour to enable Government to make a swift decision on our recommendations and, if it accepts them, to move to implement them as quickly as possible. That is another reason, alongside managing the risks of blight, why it is necessary at the interim stage to identify a manageable number of credible options to take forward for further exploration.
- 1.23 The assessment process to be used in reaching our final recommendations in the second phase of our work is an issue in which many parties will have an interest and we will engage further in the course of this year on the options for how such a process might be structured, the potential methodologies of assessing the factors we have identified, and whether there are additional issues which should be taken into account. It is inevitable that our work will be based upon a dynamic set of criteria that will change and evolve in relation to the evidence submitted.
- 1.24 In considering options, in both the phases of our work, we will require the assistance of expert advisors from a broad range of disciplines and we have previously announced that we will establish an External Advisory Panel to provide such support. It is already clear that we will need specific advice focussed around issues such as economic and environmental assessment, the use of airspace and the estimation of project costs, as well as a range of other topics.
- 1.25 We are currently considering the composition of this Panel and potential appointments, and intend to publish details of its membership in the spring, alongside the information on how we shall carry out our initial assessment of options.

Next steps

- 1.26 Sections 4 and 5 of this document set out our approach to the publication of any submissions that are made and the timetables and next steps in the process. Finally, section 6 sets out the Commission's contact details, to which submissions of evidence should be directed.

2. Proposals for making the best use of existing capacity in the short and medium terms

- 2.1 As we work towards the publication of our interim report, we will consider options for making the best use of the UK's existing airport capacity in the short and medium terms. This is of crucial importance. Whatever our conclusion on the UK's long-term needs, any significant new capacity will take several years to deliver. Making the best use of the UK's existing infrastructure is therefore essential to minimising any negative impacts of potential capacity constraints upon the UK's economy in the interim period.
- 2.2 This work will also be important in ensuring that our long-term recommendations are reached on the basis of a genuine understanding of the potential capacity offered by the UK's current airport sector, and of the efficiencies that can still be identified.
- 2.3 We expect to carry out our own research, and to draw upon the expertise of relevant organisations including, in particular, the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) as the independent regulator and NATS as the organisation responsible for the day to day management of UK airspace, in order to develop a strategy for improving our use of existing capacity. However, we also welcome external submissions proposing options for consideration.
- 2.4 We intend to put forward definitive recommendations for short term measures in our interim report in December 2013 and at the same time to identify those medium term measures which merit further development for the final report in mid-2015. We will need several months to consider evidence and ideas. This will allow us to look at proposals both in terms of their merit in the short and medium term and also in terms of their alignment with the emerging conclusions on the need for capacity and the options for providing it in the longer term.
- 2.5 For us to have enough time to carry out this consideration and analysis, evidence and ideas on making the best use of existing capacity in the short and medium term should be received by **17 May 2013**. This allows those making submissions time to reflect on the Government's Aviation Policy Framework, which will be published in March. That document is likely to set out the Government's position on a number of issues of direct relevance to our consideration of short and medium term measures.
- 2.6 The length of submissions will, of course, be dependent upon the nature of the option under discussion. However, as an indication of the type of material we expect, submissions should ideally not exceed 15 A4 sides. Where we require more detail, we will contact submitters directly.

- 2.7 In developing our strategy, a wide range of issues will be relevant, including factors such as:
- the amount of additional traffic capacity likely to be provided;
 - the timescale within which additional traffic capacity may be available;
 - operational feasibility, with particular reference to the continued ability to operate both UK airspace and airports in a safe manner, as part of the overall air traffic system;
 - changes to the number of people exposed to aircraft noise by the proposal and the extent of the noise to which they are exposed;
 - overall benefits to the consumer and to the UK economy, particularly in terms of increased connectivity;
 - cost implications, including for air passengers and freight users, the aviation industry and the UK taxpayer;
 - alignment with local economic growth and regional development strategies;
 - impacts on the emission of greenhouse gases covered by the Kyoto Protocol;
 - environmental impacts affecting the health of local populations, for instance in terms of air quality;
 - the potential need for new surface transport infrastructure;
 - implications for existing surface transport networks;
 - any legal (UK or EU) or technical barriers to implementing the proposal and whether these can be overcome; and
 - alignment with longer term options.

2.8 As explained in Section 1, we will draw upon the expertise of an External Advisory Panel to assist us in the assessment of options.

2.9 Where submissions rely upon technical assumptions, for example around noise or demand forecasting, the details of the assumptions and methodology used should be provided.

2.10 Where parties are making submissions on medium term proposals which carry substantial delivery costs, they may wish to reflect upon the factors for consideration around long term options set out in Section 3, as some of these may also be relevant at a later stage in the process. This is likely of particular relevance to proposals which involve the provision of new surface transport infrastructure, but may also apply to other proposals whose costs are driven by operational, construction or legal processes.

3. Proposals for providing additional airport capacity in the longer term

- 3.1 In our interim report, we will set out our considered view on the extent of any additional airport capacity that the UK might need. However, in light of the importance of this issue to the UK's economy, we have decided that, in parallel with this work, we should also begin the process of identifying possible means of meeting any long term capacity gap that might emerge. This means that, should we identify a capacity gap, we will be able to move quickly on the work of analysing and comparing the most credible options for addressing it. This will be essential if we are to make well-considered recommendations and, by the summer of 2015, provide Government with the materials that could form the basis of a National Policy Statement.
- 3.2 As we work towards the publication of our interim report, we will focus on identifying the most plausible locations for any additional capacity, but we will not be considering the specific positioning of new terminals or runways. The information required will therefore relate to the broad economic, social and environmental impacts of different locations for new capacity, as well as its operational, technical and commercial deliverability, rather than detailed engineering designs.
- 3.3 We are aware that a number of parties – including the owners of existing airports – have an interest in developing options for airport expansion or the construction of new airports. In some cases, parties clearly wish actively to promote options; in others, they might simply wish to explore and test them. We are prepared to co-operate with such parties wherever possible. We are also keen, however, to ensure that credible options which lack a properly funded sponsor are not neglected and receive sufficient development to allow them to be assessed fairly alongside the sponsored options.
- 3.4 To facilitate this process, we would be grateful if parties with an interest in developing proposals could send notification of their intention to do so by **28 February 2013**. This will enable us to identify any gaps in the options under consideration and to initiate our own work on options development if necessary. As set out in Section 1, where a proposal cannot attract any external sponsor willing to develop and promote it, that will be a relevant factor in our decision making.
- 3.5 The information required by the end of February is not extensive. As a minimum, we would request the following:
- if the proposal relates to the expansion of an existing airport, the name of that airport and the number (or range of numbers) of additional runways proposed;

- if the proposal relates to the construction of a new airport, the general location of the proposed site and an indication of capacity;
- a summary of any work that the submitter intends to carry out on developing the proposal; and
- contact details for the team or individuals leading the development of the proposal.

3.6 These submissions need not be lengthy documents; a few pages should be sufficient.

3.7 Following the submission of expressions of intent in February, the next deadline for submissions will be **19 July 2013**. By this date, we will need to receive outline proposals. These should give an overview of the level of additional capacity that would be provided, along with some of the key economic, social and environmental considerations. As stated above, we do not require detailed design and assessment materials at this stage; we are envisaging submissions of no longer than 40 pages. They may not need to include detailed designs for new runways and terminals, though in some cases those bringing proposals may wish to include them where they are fundamental to other areas of their analysis.

3.8 Those bringing proposals may wish to link them to forecast future aviation growth. We intend to look in detail at forecasts for future growth in demand for air transport and will be publishing a paper for consideration on forecasting. At present, however, parties making submissions may wish to refer to the Department for Transport's existing high, medium and low demand forecasts.

3.9 We are particularly interested in proposals which bring an integrated approach to the issue, taking into account a broad range of factors, including possible problems raised by the proposal and means of resolving or mitigating them. Those preparing proposals may wish to consider whether they could draw upon expert advice from outside their own organisation. We are also interested in receiving proposals that might have implications for more than one site, which might involve growth at a number of airports, or enhanced surface transport links between them.

3.10 We expect that in many cases there may be significant barriers to implementing proposals. We will want to explore these barriers and consider possible means of overcoming them. It might be useful if proposals could facilitate the early identification of such barriers and indicate whether they stem from legal (UK or EU), technical or other sources.

3.11 We will be publishing more details of our sifting criteria in the spring, in time to inform submissions. We will also begin our work on developing the assessment and consideration processes that could be used in the second phase of our work, following the publication of our interim report at the end of 2013, to determine the recommendations in our final report. This work will include public engagement on the detailed process and criteria that we will use.

3.12 For the time being, we have identified six broad categories of factors which we would encourage scheme promoters to consider in developing their proposals:

- economic factors;
- social factors;
- climate change impacts;
- local environmental factors;
- accessibility;
- feasibility considerations.

3.13 A more detailed discussion of these is provided below. Some may be of more relevance to the detailed assessments we will make in phase 2 of our work than in formulating our initial recommendations at the end of this year. Nevertheless, they may help to inform promoters' development of options and provide a useful structure for framing evidence submissions, though submitters should by no means consider themselves bound to cover every point at this stage.

3.14 Where submissions rely upon technical assumptions, for example around noise or demand forecasting, details of the methodology used and any assumptions made should be provided.

Economic factors

3.15 Airports are important to the UK's economy, both in terms of the access they provide to the rest of the world and their direct and indirect impacts upon local communities in their capacity as employment hubs.

3.16 To inform the consideration of potential economic impacts, scheme promoters may wish to explain how their proposals would operate, including for example the types of aircraft and the mix of short,

medium and long-haul traffic they would be able to accommodate, and to set out their views as to how they would expect the airline sector (including full-service, low cost and freight carriers) – and potentially other airports in the UK and internationally – to respond when the additional capacity becomes available. These issues will, of course, also be of relevance in relation to other factors, including noise impacts.

Impacts on the UK economy through the provision of international connectivity

- Alignment with the likely growth in demand for travel and ability to service that demand.
- Access to areas of international business growth and emerging markets, both directly and through regional connecting flights.
- Facilitation of UK trade in goods and services.
- Impacts on tourism and other non-business travel, both inbound and outbound.

Impacts on the local economy through the direct effects of airports

- Impacts on the local and national economy through both direct and indirect effects on employment and skills.
- Impacts on business location and alignment with local and regional economic strategies.
- Impacts in respect of inward investment to the UK.
- Impacts on other airports.

Consumer impacts

- Impacts on the price of air travel to passengers and the overall passenger experience, including the end-to-end journey.
- Impacts on the air freight industry, its customers and associated business sectors.
- Impacts associated with changes in the competitive environment in the airline and airport sectors.

Social factors

- 3.17 Airports and airport development can have a number of impacts upon local communities, both beneficial and disruptive. Access to airports and air travel can have a significant impact upon quality of life, both within and beyond the local community.

Social and community impacts

- Alignment with city and regional development policies.
- Impacts on identified regeneration or growth areas – including on local businesses and employment.
- Impacts on social cohesion and addressing deprivation.
- Impacts on well-being in local communities through factors such as employment benefits or health effects.
- The potential disruption or displacement of local communities to enable the delivery of new infrastructure.
- The extent to which proposals enhance or impair access to air travel for different communities within the UK.

- “Urbanisation effects” particularly in rural or Green Belt areas resulting from major new infrastructure.

Climate change impacts

- 3.18 There are two issues relating to climate change which the Commission will need to consider in preparing its interim report.

- 3.19 The first is the overall compatibility of growth in air travel with the national and global climate change targets. We intend to consider this as part of our assessment of the scale and timing of any need for additional aviation capacity in the UK, taking into account both existing evidence, and new evidence as it emerges, and providing opportunities for those with an interest to submit evidence and make their views known. We do not therefore require those developing proposals for new aviation capacity to provide evidence on this issue as part of their submissions, though they may wish to engage in that wider debate.

- 3.20 The second is the relative climate change impacts of different options for providing additional capacity – resulting for example from the scale of construction required, or the operational efficiencies that might be generated. Scheme promoters may therefore wish to consider whether there are specific factors related to greenhouse gas emissions in respect of which their proposal might differ from other schemes, and how any such emissions might be managed or avoided. Relevant areas could include:

- Impacts upon the efficient use of airspace, such as the reduction of “stacking”;

- Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from construction works associated with proposals;
- Emissions from airport buildings;
- Emissions associated with ground operations, or take off and landing procedures, at the airport;
- Emissions relating to surface access options for the proposed scheme;
- Any climate change adaptation measures that might be necessary to ensure the long term resilience of the proposal.

3.21 We would suggest that those developing proposals which contain assessments of greenhouse gas emissions limit their assessments to the six gases covered by the Kyoto protocol.¹

Local environmental impacts

3.22 Airports and airport development have substantial local environmental impacts. Noise is perhaps chief among them, but other important issues, such as air quality and impacts upon conservation and habitats are also relevant.

3.23 There is no firm consensus on the way to measure the noise impacts of aviation and this is an issue on which we will carry out further detailed work and public engagement. Until that work is completed, to help us make objective comparisons between proposals, those giving rise to noise implications should set out the details of the methodology and assumptions used to calculate and assess those implications.

¹ Carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) perfluorocarbons (PFCs) and sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆)

Noise

- The size and rough distribution of the population affected by noise from the proposal, including potential impacts on communities affected by noise from other airports
- The scale of noise impacts
- The implications for the need for night flights
- Any current and future measures that might be taken to mitigate noise impacts, as well as the potential costs of these measures.

Air quality

- The impact of the proposal upon local air quality through the emissions and distribution of:
 - sulphur oxides;
 - nitrogen oxides;
 - particulate matter; and
 - other emissions with direct health impacts.
- Any measures that might offset or reduce the health impacts of these emissions
- Any possible breaches of the legal framework governing air quality
- The overall health impacts of atmospheric pollution generated by the airport and its associated surface transport.

Other local environmental impacts

- Other implications of proposals for the local environment, including (but not necessarily limited to) impacts on:
 - biodiversity (including the impact on bird life);

- conservation – including impacts on protected sites;
 - landscape and townscape;
 - heritage sites;
 - water resources;
 - flood protection; and
 - disposal of waste associated with airport activities, particularly of potentially hazardous chemicals.
- Environmental assessments of proposals deemed credible will be carried out as part of the detailed development phase following the publication of the interim report.
 - Changes in access to aviation from major population centres, and areas of expected population growth.
 - Improvements in access to international connectivity from areas previously poorly served.
 - Changes in the overall numbers of people and businesses with access to international aviation services by public transport and by private transport.
 - Impacts upon internal connectivity within the UK, and consequent access to international aviation services, including specific social and economic impacts on Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Accessibility

3.24 A key factor for any proposal for new aviation capacity will be the ease of access for those using it. Most people do not travel simply to reach an airport itself. It is rather a key point on a longer end-to-end journey. Transport links also need to be available to support those who work at airports or for the businesses located around them. Those developing proposals should therefore consider how those schemes might change the accessibility of aviation connectivity for different communities and from different locations, how workforce travel might be provided, the impacts of their proposals on existing transport networks, and how any specific issues that they raise might be addressed.

Impacts on access to aviation connectivity

- Changes in access to aviation from key business districts and other areas reliant on international connectivity.

Surface transport integration and associated infrastructure development

- Integration with the existing surface access transport network and any additional pressures created.
- The need for additional surface transport capacity, and how that would be delivered.
- The likely balance between the number of passengers travelling to the airport using public transport and private cars.
- The provision of surface transport links for the airport employees and the associated workforce.
- The consequential need for parking facilities.
- Associated benefits (such as relief from wider capacity constraints) that would be provided through surface transport investment.

- Other associated infrastructure that forms part of the overall airport proposal, including (but not limited to):
 - flood defences; and
 - surface transport.

Feasibility considerations

Affordability and financeability

- The probable cost of developing the airport infrastructure required by the proposal.
- The cost of developing any surface transport links or other associated infrastructure required to support the proposal.
- Costs associated with mitigating impacts on local communities and with providing compensation where impacts cannot be mitigated fully.
- The commercial attractiveness of the proposal for private investors, and the measures and incentives necessary to obtain such investment.
- How costs would be met, including costs for:
 - the UK taxpayer;
 - air passengers;
 - commercial investors;
 - airlines (eg. through the need for additional facilities).

Deliverability

- The likely timescales associated with:
 - design;
 - planning processes; and
 - construction.

- Proposals for managing the development and construction periods – including addressing any impacts on the operation of existing airports or infrastructure.
- Any particular challenges associated with delivering the proposal, including:
 - any need to amend legislation;
 - the risk of challenge;
 - any hurdles to the proposal presented by UK or EU law; and
 - any further Government or regulatory interventions required to enable delivery.

Operational feasibility and safety

- Proposers should be able to demonstrate that their projects are deliverable efficiently as part of the overall air traffic system.
- Proposals should not jeopardise the safety of users of air transport and should be mindful of safety implications for those living or working under flight paths.
- Any other relevant operational factors, including (but not limited to):
 - bird strike;
 - prevailing winds and weather conditions;
 - prevalence of fog; and
 - the cost and feasibility of mitigating the above.

Adaptability to future demand

- Proposals should set out clearly whether, how and to what degree they would be able to adapt to changes in future demand, in the short, medium and long terms.
- This might include an assessment of their adaptability to likely future developments in aircraft technology and the composition of airlines' fleets.

4. Summary of key dates and next steps

Short and medium term measures	Long term measures
Submissions received no later than: 17 May 2013	Expressions of intent sought by: 28 February 2013
	Suggestions for sifting criteria to be used in developing the interim report sought by: 15 March 2013
	Outline proposals sought by: 19 July 2013

- 4.1 We will be publishing our approach to criteria for sifting proposals in the spring, in time to inform the more detailed submissions. Alongside this, we will publish details of our plans to engage expert advisors from across a broad spectrum of disciplines. We will also begin our work on developing the assessment and consideration criteria and processes that could be used later in the Commission's work to determine the recommendations in our final report, which will include public engagement on the relevant criteria.
- 4.2 In **December 2013**, we will publish our interim report, which will include our recommendations on options for the short and medium terms and will include our list of the most plausible options for delivering any additional capacity required in the longer term.
- 4.3 Following this, we intend to work with the sponsors of credible proposals to carry out further work on developing and assessing them. Where a proposal deemed to be credible does not have a sponsor, the Commission will itself initiate work to develop it further.
- 4.4 We have not yet finalised the programme of work that will lead to our final report. However, it is likely that each of the listed proposals will be developed into a **draft proposal** (which will include draft impact assessments) by the summer of 2014, which will then be subject to public scrutiny, as well as expert analysis. This will allow draft proposals to be developed into **final proposals**, submitted to us during the first quarter of 2015, allowing time for them to be assessed and compared ahead of our final report in the summer of 2015.
- 4.5 We intend to run an interactive process, making more information available as we take forward our work and offering further chances for stakeholders to share views and evidence with us. Further details will be made available via the Airports Commission's website, which can be found at: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/airports-commission

5. Confidentiality and information transparency

- 5.1 In line with our commitment to an open and transparent process, we intend that submissions will be published on our website. We welcome comments on submissions and consider that public scrutiny of submissions is a useful means of testing their effectiveness.
- 5.2 However, we recognise that, particularly during the early stages of the process, parties making submissions may want certain sections of those submissions to be treated in confidence for the time being, to protect commercial confidentiality, or reduce the risk of creating blight for local communities. In particular, we do not intend to publish the “intention to submit” documents that we have requested by 28 February.
- 5.3 As a minimum, from the point of view of publication, each proposal must include a high level outline that we will publish. Beyond this, should there be specific elements of submissions, such as proposals for financing, or the sites for runways and terminals, that submitters would prefer not to be made public in this initial phase, then we will take this into account in determining which information should be published, provided the sections which are considered to be confidential are clearly identified.
- 5.4 We expect that proposals which are identified as meriting further development following the publication of the interim report will be subject to a far greater degree of public scrutiny and challenge. We anticipate that there will be far less scope to treat information about listed proposals as commercially confidential at that stage.

6. How to make a submission

Submissions should be made electronically. In exceptional circumstances we will accept them in hard copy, if you need to submit them in hard copy from, please provide 2 copies to the Commission Secretariat.

Electronic submissions should be e-mailed to airport.proposals@airports.gsi.gov.uk

Hard-copy documents (2 copies) should be sent to:

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

We regret that we are not able to receive faxed documents.

Contact Information

Website: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/airports-commission

Email: airports.enquiries@airports.gsi.gov.uk