



**Meeting of the Airports Commission
20th May 2013 – 10.00 – 13.00
Rm 6.02 Sanctuary Buildings**

Attendees:

Commission Members

Sir Howard Davies – Chair

Professor Dame Julia King – by phone

Geoff Muirhead

Vivienne Cox

Apologies:

Sir John Armit

Professor Ricky Burdett

Commission Secretariat:

Phil Graham



1. Round up of stakeholder meetings attended

Howard Davies described his recent meetings with:

- The Mayor of London. It was noted that the Mayor had written to Commissioners requesting individual meetings. Agreement that Commissioners should respond individually to these invitations, but should feel under no obligation to take up the offer of a meeting.
- Brian Donohoe (Chair of the All-Party Parliamentary Aviation Group)
- Danny Alexander
- Northern Ireland stakeholders

Howard Davies also mentioned his recent letter to Louise Ellman MP (Chair of the Transport Select Committee) agreeing to consider the Committee's recommendations on Aviation Strategy in the Commission's work.

ACTION Secretariat to write to the Transport Committee at the appropriate time describing the Commission's handling of its recommendations. Phil Graham suggested following the approach used by the DfT in responding to the Committee's recommendations on HS2 (i.e. providing a letter following the interim report to explain how each recommendation had been dealt with in that report).

Howard Davies had forthcoming meetings with:

- The TUC
- Carolyn McCall (Chief Exec of easyJet)

ACTION Secretariat to circulate link to Birmingham Airport's recent report 'Great Airports for Great Cities'.

2. Phase 2 Planning ([REDACTED])

[REDACTED] Secretariat presented an update on planning and preparation for Phase 2.

The table of sift criteria generated discussion and a number of comments:

- It was suggested that there was a focus on negative impacts and that it would be helpful to include positive impacts too. An additional factor on managing local impacts (to include compensation arrangements etc) was also suggested.
- Insertion of a reference to child health was also requested, in light of a large number of impacts upon children.
- Some discussion of how the economic analysis will approach the issue of short term gains versus long term benefits.
- [REDACTED] Secretariat explained that where criteria were sponsor-led, it was proposed that the Commission would QA the sponsors' work. Where criteria were Commission-led, the Commission would carry out an independent assessment of the criteria and would not request a detailed report from sponsors on these criteria. Nonetheless, sponsors would be likely to have to complete a high level assessment of all criteria to assess project viability including compliance with all regulations and legislation

There was discussion of consultation with and involving the local community in any proposal. There was mention of the Schiphol framework of local consultation, which used an independently-chaired forum involving the local community and the airport.

ACTION Secretariat to consider best practise from other sectors in community consultation, e.g. mining or nuclear waste proposals.

3. Noise Paper ([REDACTED])

[REDACTED] Secretariat explained that they would seek the views of the Expert Panel noise experts on the outline noise paper, with a view to informing the noise assessment framework used in Phase 2.

Commissioners commented that whilst the scoping note captured most of the topics they wished to explore, the following issues should be given greater prominence:

- Analysis of a single noise event versus average noise contours
- Alternative options for presenting noise information to the public in addition to the 'scientific' approach?

- The psychology of noise, i.e. perception of noise versus the reality – is there any evidence to demonstrate that public perceptions of noise can be misguided?
- The stress induced by noise and its impact on quality of life
- The balance between sharing out noise amongst communities or having regular noise in one area and limited noise in another?

4. Presentation of 4 long term options

Howard Davies explained that the aim of this item was to identify the additional argumentation and analysis that might be required for the types of options that were expected to be submitted, in order to assure a robust evidence base for each. To inform this discussion, the Secretariat had looked at a high level at a range of potential long-term options that had already been the subject of public discussion and media coverage.

It was noted that Birmingham Airport's proposal should also be considered in any future discussion, on the basis of its potential future travel time from London. The secretariat explained that the options presented were simply a representative sample and did not imply any prioritisation.

In the long term, development and assessment of these options would be managed by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Secretariat. However the secretariat agreed to consider whether a single focal point should also be identified for each key option.

ACTION Secretariat to circulate all slides so that the full Commission could provide feedback.

No new capacity needed

Commissioners agreed that the following issues could merit consideration when considering options of this kind:

- Which routes does the UK need to serve better from Heathrow, which routes should be run from elsewhere and could the UK discourage transfer flows through Heathrow in order to free up capacity (since transfer flows could be constraining access for UK nationals to Heathrow's network)?
- How could Heathrow capacity be optimised for better use? What are the mechanisms available to do this? Manipulation of slots allocation (although potentially limited opportunity under the EU Slots Regulation), compulsory purchase of all Heathrow slots for reallocation, use of Public Service Obligations to instate international routes of strategic importance to the UK, using a mechanism to discourage transfer traffic through Heathrow.
- What other countries' plans for airport expansion are? Whilst plans for expansion in the Middle East are relatively well known, the same cannot be said for Europe.

2 + 2 + 2

Commissioners agreed that the following issues could merit consideration when considering options of this kind:

Gatwick

- More information required on surface access options and costs, particularly in light of current infrastructural developments (HS2/Crossrail)
- Although currently less opposed by local communities than Heathrow, Gatwick expansion does not have obvious supporters – how is this likely to develop in the future?
- Should Gatwick be expanded, can it attract enough passenger demand given its location (south of London)?
- Would airlines be potentially interested in financing a runway at Gatwick or would they 'vote with their feet' and move? What about Stansted?
- Would it be possible to finance surface-access improvements at both Gatwick and Stansted or would it be too expensive?

Thames Estuary options

Commissioners agreed that the following issues could merit consideration when considering options of this kind:

- What would happen to Heathrow under both of these scenarios and what would the impacts of Heathrow closure be on the Thames Valley, especially its business sector?
- What would be the slot allocation system for a new airport? Would the same 'grandfather' rights held by airlines at Heathrow transfer to the new airport or would the slot allocation system start afresh?

Outer Estuary

- Are the proposals for a floating or dredged airport? If floating, is the technology available or speculative?
- More detail on the relevant journey times from central London?

Inner Estuary

- Is the proposal for interdependent runways? Is the site sufficiently wide to facilitate this?
- Costings would need careful interrogation.
- Is there a flood risk since outside of the Thames barrier?

Heathrow 3 + 4

Commissioners agreed that the following issues could merit consideration when considering options of this kind:

3 runways

What are the timings for implementation of this proposal?

What would the capacity increase be?

4 runways

Is the proposal for 4 new runways and if so, why? Or are proposals for extensions to current runways?

Would Royal opposition be an issue?