



**Meeting of the Airports Commission
14 January 2014 – 10:00 – 13:00
Rm 6.02 Sanctuary Buildings**

Attendees:

Commission Members:
Howard Davies – Chair
Julia King
Ricky Burdett
John Armitt

Apologies:

Vivienne Cox

Secretariat:

Phil Graham



1. Welcome

Howard Davies (HD) welcomed the Commissioners to the meeting. There were no changes to the register of interests to be recorded.

The main objectives of the meeting were outlined:

- To further discuss the approach to Phase 2 and sign off the draft assessment framework to be published on 16 January.
- To consider the approach to the inner estuary studies and sign off the documentation to be published on 16 January.

2. Note of last meeting

Commissioners were given further time to sign off the minutes from the last two meetings of 2013 to ensure they fully reflected the timeline of decision making and included all relevant information as discussed at the meetings and teleconferences.

3. Round up of stakeholder meetings attended

HD reminded all that he would be giving the keynote speech at UK Runways conference on 16 Jan to launch the consultations on the Appraisal Framework and the inner estuary studies.

There was consideration of whether Geoff Muirhead could resume his position on the Commission as no MAG airport was on the shortlist. However as MAG may have an interest in which airport is the final recommendation it was agreed that this would not be appropriate.

HD explained that an FoI request from Mark Reckless MP had been received which asked for a draft copy of the interim report. The secretariat explained that, in accordance with its policy of transparency, it would broadly follow the terms of the FoI Act in providing information of this kind, and so would consider whether this information would meet the criteria for exemption and respond to the MP accordingly.

It was agreed that now the interim report had been published the minutes of Commission Meetings could be published in the interests of transparency.

Phil Graham (PG) explained that the DfT response to the interim report was expected in March. The Commission noted that they hoped this would support the recommendations, especially the establishment of an independent noise authority.

4. Phase 2 Strategy

██████████ outlined the timetable for the appraisal work on the current options and ██████████ outlined the timetable for the inner estuary feasibility studies.

In respect of the Estuary option, the Commission emphasised the importance of ensuring that if this were to be taken forward for full consideration the timetable for consultation should still allow for full consideration of the evidence base and ensure a fair evaluation of all the short-listed options.

██████████ outlined the delivery road map set out from summer 2015 to the start of the build and operation. The Commission noted that an inner Estuary option would be likely to present different delivery challenges and that there may be a need to consider estuary-specific issues alongside any specific issues with the other options. However, the Commission agreed that the initial focus of this workstream should be on generic challenges which would apply across all options.

The Commission emphasised the importance of avoiding conflicts of interests in appointing the consultants to be used in Phase 2. The Secretariat explained that conflicts would be identified and taken into account in the procurement process. The Secretariat would also continue to work with CAA, NATS, Network Rail etc. Given the continuing analysis of the Estuary option, the Secretariat was considering what working arrangements, if any, should be put in place with TfL in respect of surface transport issues.

FINAL

The Commissioners wanted reassurance that consultants will have the necessary expertise (in house or brought in) to deal with socio economic work, including the effects of airport closure. This might include expertise on land valuation and property market effects. PG noted that the secretariat was refreshing the members of the Expert Advisory Panel and this issue would be considered as part of that process and that there would be scope to sub-contract such work if the primary contractors were unable to provide the necessary expertise.

PG noted that there would be significant overlaps between Heathrow Hub (HHub) and Heathrow Airport Limited's (HAL) proposals in a number of areas, and that HHub may need access to information from HAL to develop its scheme. It was suggested by the Commission that the two organisations could be encouraged to share information and to work together on blight issues.

The role of other airports (regional and in the South East) in managing capacity issues during the interim period before new capacity was built was discussed, e.g. raising the planning cap on Stansted. The Secretariat explained that they intended to consider these issues as part of the Phase 2 work programme.

PG stated that he had briefed the DfT Perm Sec. on the appraisal framework. The Permanent Secretary had raised the possibility of HMG providing guidance regarding any possible funding availability. The Secretariat was asked to explore this further with the Department for Transport in due course.

Stakeholder engagement in Phase 2 was discussed including visits to shortlisted sites, presentations from proposers and those against the proposals. The Commission considered the option of holding public evidence sessions to inform its consideration of the Estuary option, but decided this would not be appropriate as site-specific sessions of that kind had not formed part of the Phase 1 sift process for the other options.

5. Draft Appraisal Framework

The Commission reviewed a final draft version of the Phase 2 Appraisal Framework. Stephen Howe (SH) explained how the Commissioner's comments had been incorporated into the revised version. In particular:

- the document had been trimmed, especially the scheme design elements located in Annex B, to ensure that the Commission is not asking for an unnecessarily detailed level of scheme design given the likelihood that only one of the projects will be progressed;
- the documents' objectives, scheme design elements and appraisal modules, and the relationship between these three inter-locking elements, had been refined;
- a number of minor amendments had been made to the introduction to make it clear that that Commission will be entitled to require further information - and stipulate further objectives, should this be required - at a later point in the process.

FINAL

The Commission cleared the Appraisal Framework for publication.

6. Estuary Project

Following on from the earlier discussion of timelines there was a brief discussion on the consultation documents to be published on the 16 January. Flood risk mitigation was included as a specific issue to be addressed. The secretariat would need to be clear that the numbering of the studies is not an indication of relative importance and has no hierarchical significance. The numbering was purely to aid identification of the different studies through the course of the analysis.

The Commission cleared the draft ToR consultation document and the call for evidence document.

7. Review of Phase 1

There was no discussion required on this item.

8. AoB

There were no items raised.