



**Meeting of the Airports Commission
14th October 2014 - 10:00 – 13.00
Rm 6.02 Sanctuary Buildings**

Attendees:

Commission Members:

Howard Davies - Chair (HD)
Julia King (JK)
Ricky Burdett (RB)
Vivienne Cox (VC)

Secretariat:

Phil Graham

[REDACTED]

Apologies:

John Armitt (JA)

External Attendees:

Consultants:

[REDACTED] : PwC – Agenda item 5
[REDACTED] : Jacobs – Agenda item 6
[REDACTED] : Jacobs – Agenda item 6
[REDACTED] : CAA – Agenda item 6
[REDACTED] : CAA – Agenda item 6
[REDACTED] : International Transport Forum
(OECD) – Agenda item 7
[REDACTED] : SEO – Agenda item 7

Expert Advisory Panel Members:

Andrew Kempton – Agenda item 6
Peter Mackie – Agenda items 7,8
Brian Pearce – Agenda items 7,8

1. Welcome

HD welcomed attendees to the meeting and asked whether there were any updates to the register of interests from Commissioners. There were none.

2. Note of last meeting

There were no comments on the note of last meeting and the note was agreed.

3. Round up of stakeholder meetings attended

No stakeholder meetings had taken place since the last Commission meeting.

The statements regarding airport expansion at recent Party Conferences were discussed. The need for a decision regarding airport expansion had been mentioned by the Conservatives and Labour, whereas the Liberal Democrats had ruled out any support for expansion in the South East airports.

The Airports Commission was seeking clearance from DfT to appoint a Communications agency, Brunswick, to help with proactive media handling for the consultation period. Brunswick would help to focus media and wider public attention on the issues that are being consulted upon, and to communicate the key messages on the decisions and considerations from the Interim Report.

4. Consultation Timing and Content

The Secretariat gave an update on the timing of the consultation. The Secretariat was reasonably confident the planned deadline (28 Oct) could be met, even though there had been delays in receiving some of the reports. The time available for quality assurance would be limited, although the Secretariat was working with the consultants to improve this as far as possible.

The scheme promoters had, however, expressed concern regarding the lack of opportunity for them to review consultation documents prior to consultation. Although the Secretariat had not previously intended to share the Commission's consultation documents (as opposed to the supporting technical materials) with promoters, Counsel had advised the Secretariat that it would be advantageous for the promoters to have an opportunity to review the documents prior to launch, particularly with a view to identifying any factual inaccuracies.

It was proposed therefore to provide the promoters with a short period in which to review and provide comments on draft consultation documents (in addition to the on-going sight of consultant and technical reports). This additional stage in the process would push the consultation launch to 11 Nov. Commissioners agreed to consider the options and make a final decision on 15 Oct.

Action: PG to contact John Armitt on this issue to seek any view prior to the Commission reaching a decision.

The Secretariat presented the Commission with a revised draft agenda for the public discussion sessions planned to take place during the consultation period. The Commissioners were given an outline of the schedule and the different stakeholder slots were agreed after discussion. The Commission also asked the Secretariat to organise a separate stakeholder event which focused on London issues.

5. Appraisal Modules: Community and Quality of Life Consultation Document: Sustainability Assessment

Quality of Life:

██████████ (PwC) presented the Quality of Life analysis to the Commission. The report looked at quality of life from a wellbeing perspective and considered any links to proximity to an airport. This is an emerging area of research, using untested data. The analysis was over-arching and not scheme specific, focusing on identifying the balance between various impacts, e.g. exposure to noise vs. access to employment. Careful presentation of the results would be needed, given the ground-breaking nature of the analysis. The Commission asked if there were any comparators that could be used such as proximity to main roads or prisons etc.

Community:

The Secretariat presented the Community analysis. This mainly qualitative report addressed impacts on community cohesion in terms of loss of housing, and access to community facilities and resources. Relating to this, the report considered the mitigation measures proposed by the scheme promoters. Additionally, the report included a high-level equalities screening and assessment of distributional impacts. The Commission noted access to places of worship was an important factor to be considered alongside other community services.

6. Appraisal Modules: Environmental Modules Consultation Document: Sustainability Assessment

██████████ (CAA) set out the noise assessment methodology, noting the results and key points of difference with the scheme promoters' own analysis. Andrew Kempton, member of the Expert Advisory Panel (EAP) expanded on how the modelling was carried out and its sensitivity to assumptions.

██████████ (Jacobs) presented the air quality assessment and its emerging results. Discussion included the principle different sources of emissions, the rate of change for each scheme and some relative factors affecting air quality emissions. It was noted that additional dispersion modelling could further strengthen understanding of these impacts, and that the Secretariat was considering how this might be taken forward in the later stages of the Commission's work to validate the consultation analysis.

7. Appraisal Module: Strategic Fit, including Airline Competition Report

FINAL

The Secretariat presented the current shape of the Strategic Fit module. [REDACTED] (SEO Economics) and [REDACTED] (OECD) presented the analysis that had been carried out for the Commission airline competition work. Working with the Secretariat, they had developed a set of likely airline responses for each capacity expansion option, to predict what kind of impacts on connectivity and competition these responses could generate. This was a qualitative study, stating the direction of impacts (positive or negative) for each airline response. The different forecast scenarios were analysed as part of this work, together with the likely implications for the key airports. Members of the Expert Advisory Panel (Peter Mackie and Brian Pearce) participated in the discussion, offering views on what was the most likely response scenario and its potential connectivity and competition impacts. Options for follow-up work to the airline competition report were discussed.

8. Appraisal Modules: National Economy and Local Economy Consultation Document: Economic Case

The Secretariat presented an update on the approach it was taking in relation to estimating the economic impacts, introducing dividing the assessment into welfare impacts (Micro) and GDP/GVA impacts (Macro). These two groups were then broken down to smaller entities, and it was identified which could be monetised and which could not be. The session concentrated on the direct economic benefits for each of the schemes across the passenger scenarios and the draft GDP/GVA figures. The latter analysis was, however, not yet finalised. Members of the Expert Advisory Panel (Peter Mackie and Brian Pearce) participated in the discussion, offering views on the approach that was taken. The Commission noted the approach and suggested that care should be taken about the presentation of the GDP/GVA analysis, and particularly the construction impacts.

9. Final Remarks

The Commission considered the next day's Commission Meeting agenda and was reminded of the opportunity to hold specific discussions with the Secretariat during these two days, if needed.