

Airport Capacity Programme Board (ACPB)

13 July 2017

Attendees

	Caroline Low (Chair)	
Farha Sheikh	Rupesh Mehta	Brett Welch
	Lucy Chadwick	
Tony Poulter		Sacha Hatteea
Rosalind Smith-Reid	Sarah Bishop	Rosemary Hopkins
– item 4	Jack Goodwin – item 5	– item 7
– item 6	(observing)	(observing – summer intern)

Apologies	Dan Micklethwaite, , Martin Capstick, Stuart White,
------------------	---

Note

1. Minutes & Actions 15 June 2017 meeting

1.1. Caroline Low (CL) welcomed everyone to the meeting.

1.2. The board reviewed the minutes and actions of the previous meeting on 15 June 2017. () raised a comment on Item 7 of the minutes from the previous meeting regarding surface access governance.

Action 170713/1: Secretariat to update meetings from 15 June 2017.

1.3. CL provided an update on the announcement made today regarding the Airports NPS timeline.

2. Programme Update and Risk Register

2.1. () gave an update using the programme dashboard. She highlighted key updates (including that Lillian Greenwood MP has been elected as Chair of the Transport Select Committee) and that there were two new risks on the risk register relating to Surface Access.

[REDACTED]

2.2. She referred the Board to HAL's latest delivery plans, with key dates set out on the programme dashboard. She noted that until HAL 'fix' their masterplan in 2018 these dates remain subject to change.

2.3.

2.4.

3. Early Consultation Analysis

3.1. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) gave a summary of her paper. She explained that the report from OPM (external contractor appointed to analyse consultation responses) is being prepared and is a factual report comprised of what people have said in response to the consultation.

3.2. The Board discussed paragraph 21 in the paper. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) asked whether DfT would be able to measure whether we had reached out to certain groups eg BAME communities. [REDACTED] acknowledged that this is not possible to do from the consultation responses but that other sources provide some evidence of levels of engagement with different groups. SH informed the Board that there is a report relating to communication channels used and BAME groups that were targeted.

3.3. The Board discussed timings for sharing early findings from the consultation analysis with Ministers and across Whitehall.

Action 170713/3: Consultation Team ([REDACTED]) to provide advice to Secretary of State on high level outcomes of complex response review in September.

- [REDACTED]
- 3.4. [REDACTED] noted that the timeline assumes that consultation analysis will continue after any further consultation has been launched. CL confirmed this was the case and the team have assessed this as being a small and manageable risk as the key responses will have been analysed by this point.

4. Potential Further Consultation

- 4.1. Following on from [REDACTED] paper at the previous ACPB meeting in June, JG provided further details on the proposed further consultation. He outlined that this is proposed to take place in the autumn, lasting 8 weeks. He noted that the Airports Commission had set a precedent for further consultation relating to new evidence.
- 4.2. JG confirmed that advice from Sir Jeremy Sullivan (independent consultation adviser) has been to not undertake consultation during major holidays (eg. Christmas) and that smaller scale roundtable events (rather than public information events) would be appropriate.
- 4.3. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) queried how the further consultation process would handle responses from the same responders to the initial consultation. (ie. does this count as two responses).
- 4.4. Tony Poulter (TP) asked for clarification on the wording 'in light of new info' in JG's paper. JG explained that a further consultation could include evidence or developments that have arisen from the initial consultation, resulting in the government updating the draft Airports NPS (as appropriate)..
- 4.5. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) queried the rationale for not undertaking public events. JG noted that the basis for the further consultation is primarily related to changes to the evidence base rather than changes to policy positions. He also noted that DECC had taken a similar approach to its further consultation on the new nuclear power NPS.
- 4.6. Ros Smith-Reid (RSR) noted that HAL plans to undertake its first DCO consultation in December 2017 and there will be an overlap with the DfT's proposed further consultation on the Airports NPS.
- 4.7. The Board discussed communications and stakeholder engagement for the further consultation, including decisions around leaflets for example. The consultation team was asked to explore the likely positions of campaign groups and other key stakeholders. TP noted that that it will be important to provide early advice to Ministers on the scope of the further consultation.
- 4.8. The Board discussed further work which is underway to develop policy areas to supplement parliamentary handling.

[REDACTED]

Action 170713/4: Consultation and Comms Team to return to ACPB to provide an update on the further consultation process including comms and stakeholder engagement.

4.9. The Board discussed the timeline up to NPS designation and LC noted that the Secretary of State has set an expectation of laying the NPS in early June.

4.10. LC suggested that the upcoming DfT Stocktake meeting with Cabinet Office be used as an opportunity to test our assumptions regarding any requirement for a formal meeting of the Economy and Industrial Strategy (Airports) sub-committee or whether any recommendation to proceed to a further consultation could be conducted by a write round to the sub-committee.

5. Community Policy Developments

5.1. [REDACTED] summarised her paper. This is seeking agreement to the approach to progressing business rate retention as well as views on HAL's community engagement proposals and progress with statutory blight work.

5.2. The Board discussed the approach to progressing business rate retention and the proposed delivery mechanism. As noted in the paper, this is an area where more work is required to explore delivery mechanisms in more detail.

5.3. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5.4. [REDACTED] updated the Board on HAL's most recent proposal for the Community Engagement Board (CEB). [REDACTED] noted that HAL recently presented their proposals to the existing Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HACC) and how this had been received. It was suggested that it would be helpful for LC to raise this point with HAL given the importance of getting the design and implementation of community engagement right.

5.5. [REDACTED] noted that one of the key issues is selection of a chair for the CEB. It will be for HACC to agree a chair for the CEB and DfT has asked to see a shortlist of potential candidates.

5.6. [REDACTED] noted that questions remain on the structure and remit of the CEB. [REDACTED] noted that a key next step is setting a Terms of Reference for the CEB and that this will most likely be devised with the appointed chair.

[REDACTED]

5.7. [REDACTED] talked through the blight considerations outlined in the paper, highlighting two main issues relating to 1) whether HAL should be identified as the statutory undertaker and [REDACTED]

5.8. [REDACTED]

Action 170713/6: Community Engagement Team to return with an update on blight considerations.

6. Surface Access Progress Update

6.1. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) and [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) introduced their paper. This a copy of the team's paper submitted to BICC ahead of the next BICC meeting on 17 July.

6.2. [REDACTED] explained that the paper is not seeking a decision at this stage but sets out initial findings on alternative funding, financing and delivery options for Heathrow western and southern rail access schemes. The paper is seeking steer on whether the right models have been outlined and whether the right objectives against which to assess the options have been identified.

6.3. The Board welcomed the paper and noted that further work is required on the objectives, including senior level agreement on the surface access strategy for Heathrow to 2030 and beyond. TP noted that some prioritisation of the objectives would be helpful for taking this work forward.

6.4. Rosemary Hopkins (RH) noted that a greater understanding of sponsorship of the rail schemes is needed. CL noted that the draft Airports NPS does not specify rail access schemes, but rather targets for passenger mode share. HAL's analysis appeared to show there were a range of potential interventions and that the rail schemes may not be needed for 2030 in order to meet the mode share targets, particularly if a cordon change is put in place. The Board discussed the longer term need for the schemes, and noted that this is subject to further discussion and would require business cases for each scheme in their own right. It was noted that the long term strategic case for each scheme would need to be clearly articulated

6.5. [REDACTED] suggested it would be helpful to identify an interim milestone on Project Hexagon in September 2017, when there was a target to have outline HEX agreements. The Board discussed ensuring the appropriate governance for any Project Hexagon agreement being signed in December 2017 and that any such decisions/issues should come to ACPB beforehand.

[REDACTED]

6.6. The Board discussed the proposed models in the paper and LC noted that there needs to be a process for agreeing the set of models to be tested. [REDACTED] noted that Rothschild have also been asked to look at the options we identified, and consider whether there any other ones which could be considered. TP suggested undertaking some market testing/sounding but that this would need to be carefully handled so as to not set funding expectations.

6.7. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) spoke about the business case for the Western Rail link to Heathrow, discussing how the need for the scheme would be set out in the Strategic Outline Business Case (due to be completed in December).

6.8. The Surface Access Team for the Airport Capacity Programme and Rail Group colleagues will continue to keep the Board updated on developments, including feedback from the BICC meeting on 17 July.

7. AoB

7.1. The Board ran out of time for Item 8 (Update on HAL Schedule). The Board were directed to the key HAL milestones set out in the Programme Dashboard and asked to provide any further comments to the Programme Office Team.

7.2. CL thanked Ros Smith-Reid for a role in the programme [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Jack Goodwin is [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Deputy Director, Programme Delivery.