

Airport Capacity Programme Board (ACPB)

18 October 2017

Attendees

Jack Goodwin (Chair for Caroline Low)	Rupesh Mehta	Sacha Hatteea
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Farha Sheikh
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Philip Andrews
Rosemary Hopkins	[REDACTED] (for Tim Stamp)	[REDACTED]
Brett Welch (dialled in)	Martin Capstick – joined from item 6 onwards	Sarah Bishop
[REDACTED] – item 3	Roger Jones – items 5 and 6	[REDACTED] – item 7
[REDACTED] – item 8	[REDACTED] – item 9	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] (observing)	[REDACTED] (observing)
[REDACTED] (observing)	[REDACTED] – item 7 (observing)	

Apologies	[REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Caroline Low, Tim Stamp, Lucy Chadwick, Tony Poulter, James Adutt
------------------	---

Note

1. Minutes & Actions

- 1.1. Jack Goodwin (JG) welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that Caroline Low was on leave.
- 1.2. JG highlighted that the Airport Capacity Programme was approaching a significant moment with the further consultation on the draft Airport NPS, and publication of the response to the Airspace policy consultation, to be announced shortly.
- 1.3. Sacha Hatteea (SH) told the board that documents required for the further consultation were ready, although full write-round clearance had not yet been obtained. He anticipated that the documents should be ready early w/c 23rd October. An 8-week consultation was planned, and anticipated to finish by Christmas recess. SH informed the board that one Government response would be produced for both NPS consultations and the final NPS would be laid before Parliament in June 2018, with a vote expected in the House of Commons, after which designation could take place by July 2018. He added that changes in the NPS and associated documents would be reflected in a change log, not via tracked changes as originally planned.

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- 1.4. [REDACTED] pointed the board towards the action log, highlighting that the majority of actions were either complete or on track. [REDACTED]

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- 1.5. JG invited the board's responses to the minutes from meetings on 17 August 2017 and 14 September 2017. [REDACTED] proposed a clarification to paragraph 6.8 from the 14 September 2017 minutes.

2. Programme update

- 2.1. [REDACTED] introduced the Programme Dashboard. He highlighted that the number of vacancies in Airport Capacity had decreased since the last meeting from 8 to 7 and that the forecasted spend for the Programme had decreased from £4.8 million to £4.5 million (reflecting new financial forecasts for the second quarter).

- 2.2. [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

3. Communications update

- 3.1. [REDACTED] advised the board that the communications team were pushing for a grid slot early during w/c 23rd October, ideally on Monday or Tuesday.
- 3.2. SH asked whether there were further consultation documents which needed to state the date of the grid slot. [REDACTED] confirmed that this was the case and was aware that confirmation of the date was required as soon as possible.
- 3.3. [REDACTED] introduced a draft Communications Handling Plan for the further consultation. He informed the board that there had been some changes to the plan since the paper was circulated.
- 3.4. [REDACTED] told the board he would circulate a press notice (ahead of the day of publication) to members.

Action 171018/1: Secretariat to circulate press notice to board members.

- 3.5. [REDACTED] told the board that the handling approach to the further consultation on the draft Airports NPS would focus on the strong case for action caused by the latest passenger demand forecasts showing even higher demand in the South East of England.
- 3.6. [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] whether the handling plan had been through No10. [REDACTED] responded that it had not, however it had been scrutinised at the highest levels within the Department for Transport. [REDACTED] confirmed that the programme had been working closely with No10 on its document suite.

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- 3.7. [REDACTED] asked whether there was any update on our longer term planning around achieving a positive vote on any NPS. [REDACTED] acknowledged that the handling plan for the further consultation focused on the short term. However he added that there were discussions about writing a story for Scotland for the announcement, and whether it would be beneficial to do a separate announcement for them. [REDACTED] added that stories had also been identified for different regions in the UK.
- 3.8. SH told the board that the communications team had written to two MPs in relation to noise contours.
- 3.9. [REDACTED] discussed the idea of reactive press handling during the announcement. He confirmed how the Department would respond in relation to any questions that may arise on the benefits of expansion at Gatwick (specifically that benefits do not overtake the Heathrow scheme until 2070). Long haul routes, better movement of freight and connections would also be highlighted.
- 3.10. [REDACTED] told the board that measures were being taken to ensure awareness, including increased engagement with local authorities. Caroline Low met with local councils on 13th September. [REDACTED] told the board that there had been no uptake of the government's offer of support for engaging with BAME communities. [REDACTED] also confirmed that Local Authorities who opposed expansion had been in touch with the Department for the first time.
- 3.11. Brett Welch (BW) asked about the annex to the handling paper, noting that it suggested that there would be a large number of documents published at the same time. Had thought been given to sign-posting people through what each document contained and dealt with – there was a risk DfT could be accused of hiding information or making it difficult to respond to the further consultation. [REDACTED] told the board that the list of papers given in the annex had been developed since it was circulated. He highlighted the large number of documents which would be published on the government's website alongside change logs. He advised the board that there would be a short summary of each document on the website to help users find material.

4. Roads update

- 4.1. Philip Andrews (PA) presented his paper to the board providing an update for the board's information. He highlighted two key messages in this paper: 1) that there were increasing resources (and visibility) for this work and 2) that the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with HAL would ensure clear lines of accountability.
- 4.2. [REDACTED] thanked PA for the helpful update. He asked if the MoU would be coming to the board in November with the governance review and dependency mapping paper (as indicated on the Programme Dashboard). PA agreed that it was.

Action 171018/2: Philip Andrews to bring Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with HAL to ACPB in November.*

Post-meeting note: Work is underway to establish a new Heathrow Strategic Roads Board which will be led by Strategic Roads and Airport Capacity teams from within DfT. The aim of the first Heathrow Strategic Roads Board meeting in November is to provide senior-level DfT input into the HE/HAL MOU and is intended to be the vehicle for such documents to be discussed. This means that the **MoU will be coming to the board in December, not November as previously stated.*

- 4.3. BW asked whether the suggested respective roles and accountability of HE and HAL represented a new approach or was consistent with the approach used in similar HE / Private Sector projects in the past. PA confirmed that this approach was the standard developer relationship model which is commonly used when other large developments are located on or near a strategic road e.g. a large retail park. Highways England would set the minimum standards and were also acting as guardians of the network. They would not be involved in designing, funding, leading or constructing the M25 scheme. ■ pointed out that some of the phrasing in paragraph 1 was misleading in that case, namely the reference to 'both parties now have a draft ready for DfT endorsement which has taken into account DfT advice'. PA acknowledged this and suggested that his update at next month's meeting would focus on how relationships will work going forward, including the latest draft of the proposed MOU.
- 4.4. SH asked whether Highways England had sufficient resources. Rupesh Mehta (RM) said that there were measures being taken to ensure the MoU covered all risk areas, but that this was a work-in-progress. He added that the surface access team would be returning in November to clarify some of these issues.

5. Rail update

- 5.1. Farha Sheikh (FS) presented her paper to the board for information. She updated the board on two aspects. The first was CP6: a statement had been made regarding available funds on 13th October. A proposal for significant funds for enhancements has been made, but decisions around investment into particular schemes had not yet been taken, and would be subject to business cases. The second update was that market engagement activities on WRLtH and SRLtH would be commencing in spring 2018.
- 5.2. SH queried what precisely was meant by 'market engagement'. RJ responded that because WRLtH and SRLtH were so different, it meant different things for both. WRLtH was a lot more defined and had a different structure to SRLtH.
- 5.3. ■ asked if an update on HEXAGON discussions would be made at the next ACPB

Action 171018/3: RJ to provide an update on HEXAGON at the next ACPB.

6. Bus, Coach and Taxi services at Heathrow

6.1. This paper, introduced by Roger Jones (RJ), was for the board's information. It briefed the board on the current level and use of bus and coach services at Heathrow Airport along with taxi provision and usage. It asked the board to note that there is a work programme to understand the opportunities for increasing the role of these services in delivering the proposed mode shared targets included in the draft NPS, which is part of the wider work on Surface Access packages.

6.2. RJ highlighted that this was a significant area for the Programme: more people currently access Heathrow by bus and coach than by train and underground. He added that the Department's role would be a facilitator, not procuring services. He told the board that there was more work to be done on the overall level of services and the Department would be considering what could be done to encourage people to switch modes.

6.3. RJ highlighted another key area: consideration of where surface access infrastructure improvements could help. For example, better bus journey times provided by opportunities for buses to use the existing road network more effectively.

Action 171018/4: Surface access team to return to ACPB early in 2018 to give an update on buses and coaches.

6.4. RM added that there was scope to do more, and there was a need to understand what provision was already in place and where there were gaps.

6.5. ■■■ thanked RJ for his informative paper. He queried whether there would be challenges associated with buses dependent on Transport for London and Local Authorities who did not support expansion at Heathrow. RJ responded that the Department's understanding of this would be better in early 2018. ■■■ also asked if the next iteration of thinking around buses and coaches could set out the cost of any schemes versus their impact on mode share.

6.6. ■■■ pointed out the difficulty of looking at this information in isolation from rail. RJ acknowledged that a solution that optimised between the two modes was required. RM added that work had begun on this, and that HAL was also looking into it and what the relationship between the two modes might be. RJ highlighted that Transport for London were doing relevant work as part of the introduction of Crossrail. RM underscored the importance of encouraging Local Authorities to start thinking about this early on.

7. Heathrow M25 scheme development narrative

7.1. JG outlined that an update on HAL's consultation one (*their first pre-Development Consent Order consultation*) will be provided to the November ACPB. This will include high level options on the alignment of the M25 and other local roads.

Action 171018/5: Engagement team to provide an update on consultation one at the November ACPB.

- 7.2. [REDACTED] introduced his paper, which focussed on the work done to develop the M25 narrative. This paper sought a steer from the board on the narrative's direction, coverage and potential use.
- 7.3. [REDACTED] reminded the board that this work was prompted by a PAR recommendation for clearer communications and a plan for disruption caused by M25 work. He also informed the board that there had been an important M25 workshop to focus on the narrative and its development.
- 7.4. [REDACTED] commented that he found the paper to be comprehensive but he questioned whether safety issues needed to be more prominently communicated in this narrative. [REDACTED] drew the board's attention to the wording on safety and security within the narrative.
- 7.5. [REDACTED] added that the paper should ideally give an idea of the degree of disruption the proposed works could cause. [REDACTED] agreed, informing the board that the narrative would need to refer to international examples of how this could be delivered without causing significant disruption.
- 7.6. Martin Capstick (MC) queried the level of certainty about the design of the M25 crossover. A lack of certainty, he pointed out, would put the government in a difficult position.
- 7.7. Rupesh Mehta (RM) replied that the design was not final yet. [REDACTED] added that there had been discussion of communication media and methods.
- 7.8. JG suggested that the team might wish to be proactive in creating visualisations which could be used by the media, rather than the media creating their own. RM responded that HAL had produced visualisations.
- 7.9. SH highlighted the demand that the construction sector was likely to experience over the coming period, with other major projects such as generation schemes and HS2 commencing construction. PA highlighted that the latter was already happening and the paper needed to highlight that.
- 7.10. [REDACTED] recognised that this piece of work involved a substantial commercial negotiation for all parties involved in the potential construction of the Northwest Runway Scheme which would cross the M25. He asked whether the paper could address what the plan was and who would be delivering it. PA noted that as the scheme matures, and once the MoU had been agreed, how commercial arrangements could be reached would need to be surfaced.
- 7.11. BW felt that one of the aims for the narrative, in paragraph 11 of the paper, should be clarifying roles and responsibilities of the various parties.

[REDACTED]

7.12. [REDACTED] pointed out that HAL might have a preferred option but might need to consult on several; in which case, DfT would need to be more guarded on what it said in its M25 narrative.

7.13. [REDACTED] highlighted that the paper gave an end date of 2030 (on page 11), whereas analytical modelling was based on a 2026 deadline.

7.14. The chair acknowledged that the board had lots to input on this topic which was welcome, and there would be opportunity for further discussion in future ACPB meetings.

8. CAA Section 16 quarterly report / HAL's response to DfT re NPS dependencies

8.1. [REDACTED] gave a verbal update to the board on the third and latest CAA Section 16 quarterly report. He began by providing some background information on the reports, which were first commissioned in October 2016. He then informed the board that the latest report had been leaked to The Times [REDACTED]

8.2. [REDACTED] explained that S16 process had originally been expected to end in November. However given the adjustment to timelines caused by the General Election, officials have asked Ministers to agree to an extension of Section 16.

8.3. [REDACTED]

8.4. [REDACTED].

9. Airspace update

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

9.1. [REDACTED] informed the board that HAL had decided to delay their two runway airspace consultations, given the risk this could create to the NPS process underway. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

9.2. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

9.3. [REDACTED] presented a paper to the board updating them on the government's UK Airspace Policy consultation, progress on the production of a southern England airspace Masterplan by NATS, governance arrangements for the delivery of airspace changes and options for going further to bring forward airspace change in the SE (should airports be unwilling or unable to do so).

9.4. [REDACTED] asked whether a draft of the NATS masterplan would be available to view. SB said that unfortunately there would not be as the masterplan is intended as a complex internal document, rather than the form of information that would be expected to be made public for airspace changes processes. However, we should be able to report the headline findings of the masterplan.

9.5. With reference to Annex A, [REDACTED] commented that it would be helpful to see further on timings in the next couple of months.

Action 171018/6: [REDACTED] to return to ACPB in December with updated timings.

9.6. [REDACTED] went on to ask whether there was a connection between flight paths and slot allocation. SB responded that there was no link, however if the use of flight paths was constrained, this might have an impact on slot allocation.

9.7. BW asked what the legislative requirements of the proposals were. SB replied that ICCAN is non-statutory and therefore there were no legislative requirements.

10.AOB

10.1. JG thanked [REDACTED] for her role as Secretariat for the board, and welcomed [REDACTED] to the post.

10.2. Given time constraints, JG asked for suggestions for potential nominations for the Heathrow Community Engagement Board chair to be made outside of the meeting.

10.3. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

10.4. Rosemary Hopkins (RH) asked whether a number of actions suggested by the MPRG letter would be tracked through the board. JG confirmed that they would.

10.5. [REDACTED] told the board he found it helpful seeing a full forward look and asked whether it would be possible to have this for future meetings.

[REDACTED]

Action 171018/7: [REDACTED] to provide full forward look as standing item for future ACPB meetings.