



STRATEGIC AVIATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP
of the Local Government Association

Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group

Thursday 24 October 2013
2.30 PM

Milbank Room
Local Government House
Smith Square
London SW1P 3HZ

To: Members of Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group (SASIG)

Copy to: Named officers for briefing purposes

<http://www.lga.gov.uk>

www.sasig.org.uk

Guidance notes for visitors

Local Government House, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ

Welcome!

Please read these notes for your own safety and that of all visitors, staff and tenants.

Security

All visitors (who do not already have an LGA ID badge), are requested to report to the Reception desk where they will be asked to sign in and will be handed a visitor's badge to be worn at all times whilst in the building.

Fire instructions

In the event of the fire alarm sounding, vacate the building immediately following the green Fire Exit signs. Go straight to the assembly point in Tufton Street via Dean Trench Street (off Smith Square).

DO NOT USE THE LIFTS.

DO NOT STOP TO COLLECT PERSONAL BELONGINGS.

DO NOT RE-ENTER BUILDING UNTIL AUTHORISED TO DO SO.

Members' facilities on the 7th floor

The Terrace Lounge (Members' Room) has refreshments available and also access to the roof terrace, which Members are welcome to use. Work facilities for members, providing workstations, telephone and Internet access, fax and photocopying facilities and staff support are also available.

Open Council

"Open Council", on the 1st floor of LG House, provides informal meeting and business facilities with refreshments, for local authority members/officers who are in London.



Toilets

Toilets for people with disabilities are situated on the Basement, Ground, 2nd, 4th, 6th and 7th floors. Female toilets are situated on the basement, ground, 1st, 3rd, 5th, and 7th floors. Male toilets are available on the basement, ground, 2nd, 4th, 6th and 8th floors.

Accessibility

Every effort has been made to make the building as accessible as possible for people with disabilities. Induction loop systems have been installed in all the larger meeting rooms and at the main reception. There is a parking space for blue badge holders outside the Smith Square entrance and two more blue badge holders' spaces in Dean Stanley Street to the side of the building. There is also a wheelchair lift at the main entrance. For further information please contact the Facilities Management Helpdesk on 020 7664 3015.

Further help

Please speak either to staff at the main reception on the ground floor, if you require any further help or information. You can find the LGA website at www.local.gov.uk

Please don't forget to sign out at reception and return your badge when you depart.

Notification

Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group - Thursday 24 October 2013

A meeting of the **Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group** will be held on **Thursday 24 October 2013 at 2.30pm** at the offices of the LGA, Local Government House, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ. The arrangements for the day are set out below:

Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group (SASIG)

Task Group Meeting (officers) 10:00 – 11:30 – Meeting Room 2

Member-led Promotion & Marketing Group (Members) 11:45 – 13:15 - The Abbey Centre, 34 Great Smith Street

Meeting (Members & officers; observer attendees from 15:00) 14:30 – 16:30 - Milbank Room

Tea and coffee will be provided from 2.15 pm.

Attendance Sheet

Please ensure that you sign the attendance register as it is the only record of your presence at the meeting.

Order of Business

The order of business and papers are **attached**.

Location

A map showing the location of Local Government House, Smith Square is printed on the back cover.

Contacts

SASIG: Anna Mahoney (Tel: 020 8541 9459; e-mail: sasig@surreycc.gov.uk)

LGA: Virginia Ponton (Tel: 020 7664 3068; e-mail: virginia.ponton@local.gov.uk)

Attendance:

Please could you contact (virginia.ponton@local.gov.uk) to confirm attendance and any additional requirements by **midday Tuesday 22 October**.

Agenda

Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group - Thursday 24 October 2013

SASIG Task Group Meeting (officers)	10:00 – 11:30
SASIG Member-led Promotion & Marketing Group (Members)	11:45 – 13:15
SASIG Meeting (Members & officers; observer attendees from 15:00)	14:30 – 16:30

	TIME	PAGE
SIGN-IN & REFRESHMENTS	14:00	
1 Welcome & apologies for absence not already tendered.	14:30	
<i><u>For discussion & decision:</u></i>		
2 Minutes of previous meetings and matters arising. (SASIG Meeting 28 June 2013; CAG Meeting 4 October 2013) Any other business - please notify in advance. (sasig@surreycc.gov.uk ; (020) 8541 9459)	14:35	3
3 SASIG Membership Survey.	14:40	-
4 SASIG Account – 2013/14 Account to Date & Proposed 2014/15 Budget.	14:45	23
5 Project Development & Funding Opportunities – Feedback from ‘Task Group’ and ‘Member-led Promotion & Marketing Group’ Meetings.	14:55	31
6 Airports Commission – Submissions to Date and Future SASIG Involvement.	15:00	41
7 Aviation Policy Update.	16:15	73
<i><u>For information:</u></i>		
8 Airports Commission Discussion Paper ‘Noise’. (<i>response submitted</i> 16 September 2013)	16:20	85
9 Any other business - please notify in advance. (sasig@surreycc.gov.uk ; (020) 8541 9459)	16:25	
10 Dates for future meetings: Friday 7 March 2014 Friday 27 June 2014 Friday 24 October 2014 Friday 13 March 2015		
CLOSE	16:30	

**ITEM 2: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND MATTERS ARISING.
(SASIG MEETING 28 JUNE 2013; CAG MEETING 4 OCTOBER 2013)**

**Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group
Minutes of Meeting**

Friday 28 June 2013, Local Government House at 11:00

1 Welcome and apologies for absence

SASIG Chairman, Cllr Jamie Macrae, welcomed the Group to the meeting and invited apologies from the floor.

A full list of apologies and those present is attached at **Appendix A** (pg.11).

Actions

SASIG office to circulate an invitation to Councillors for the Airports Commission Engagement Event to be held on 7 October 2013.

2 Constitutional Matters – Election of Chairman & Vice Chairmen, Review of SASIG Constitution.

The Chairman explained the importance of the Annual General Meeting for the SASIG group of Councils, which includes both those with airports and supporting infrastructure in their Authority area, and those who are overflowed.

The Group considered election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen for the 2013/14 year:

Chairman					
Nominee		Proposed by		Seconded by	
Name	Authority	Name	Authority	Name	Authority
Cllr Jamie Macrae	Cheshire East Council	Cllr Jackie Cheetham	Uttlesford DC	Cllr Andrew Bosmans	Doncaster MBC

Vice-Chairmen					
Nominee		Proposed by		Seconded by	
Name	Authority	Name	Authority	Name	Authority
Cllr Andrew Bosmans	Doncaster MBC	Cllr Jackie Cheetham	Uttlesford DC	Cllr Jamie Macrae	Cheshire East Council
Cllr John Furey	Surrey CC	Cllr Jamie Macrae	Cheshire East Council	Cllr Andrew Bosmans	Doncaster MBC
Cllr Jackie Cheetham	Uttlesford DC	Cllr Jamie Macrae	Cheshire East Council	Cllr Andrew Bosmans	Doncaster MBC

There being no other nominations for the posts, these Members were confirmed as Chairman and Vice-Chairmen respectively.

The Group then considered the proposed SASIG Constitution and mission statement and suggested two amendments as follows:

- that the mission statement include stronger reference to the economic aspect of the Group's work [insertion of "economics" at sentence one, paragraph two of the mission statement]; and
- that sentence two, paragraph one of the mission statement be removed as it is unnecessary and understates SASIG's relevance to a range of Authorities.

Decisions

SASIG Chairman 2013/14 - Cllr Jamie Macrae (Cheshire East Council) **elected**.

SASIG for Vice-Chairmen 2013/14 - Cllr Andrew Bosmans (Doncaster MBC), Cllr John Furey (Surrey CC), Cllr Jackie Cheetham (Uttlesford DC) **elected**.

The Constitution and mission statement of SASIG, as amended, were **agreed**.

Action

Circulate revised 2013/14 SASIG Constitution and mission statement.

EDITOR'S NOTE: enclosed at **Appendix B** (pg.13).

3 Minutes of previous meetings and matters arising (SASIG Meeting 1 March 2013; CAG Meeting 7 June 2013)

The Group considered the Minutes of the previous meeting and attention was drawn to a number of points:

- Pg. 11 – *SASIG Finance and Membership Services Report* – the SASIG Director updated the Group on the two action points. Work was underway on a targeted programme of recruiting new Authorities into SASIG membership, and similarly investigation of European funding avenues had been progressed.
- Pg. 19 – CAG Minutes – *National Aviation Policy Update* – the SASIG Chairman stressed the need for SASIG to establish a similarly productive working relationship with the new Aviation Minister, Simon Burns MP, as it held with his predecessor, Theresa Villiers MP.
- Pg. 20 - CAG Minutes – *National Aviation Policy Update* – the SASIG Chairman advised the Group that the SASIG office team will be working to highlight SASIG and its work in the national media, as and when warranted and with the agreement of the Group.

Decision

The Minutes of the previous SASIG and CAG meetings were **agreed** by the Group as correct records.

Actions

SASIG membership and SASIG office team to recruit new Authorities into SASIG membership.

SASIG membership and SASIG office team investigate European funding avenues.

SASIG office team and Board to establish a similarly productive working relationship with the new Aviation Minister, Simon Burns MP, as it held with his predecessor, Theresa Villiers MP.

SASIG office team to highlight SASIG and its work in the national media, as and when warranted and with the agreement of the Group.

4 **National Aviation Policy Update – SASIG Submissions to the Airports Commission**

The SASIG Director provided an update on the timescales and milestones for the work of the Airports Commission, noting that the Commission would be holding two Public Evidence Sessions on 9 July 2013 in Manchester and 10 July 2013 in London. The Group noted the points made in SASIG's assessment criteria submission which have been incorporated by the Commission in their selected 'Sift Criteria' which will be used to assess options for aviation capacity in stage two of the Commission's work.

The Group were informed that Sir Howard Davies and Sir John Armitage had both read the SASIG response and commented on the points made, suggesting an encouraging resonance of SASIG's views amongst the commissioners.

The Group provided feedback on the draft 'Key Issues' submission to be made by SASIG and the SASIG Director detailed potential extra areas to be included. In the discussion members of Group made a number of points, summarised below:

- *Noise from surface access* – noise from surface access should not be divorced from other considerations as the noise of freight and increased road transport can have as large an effect on communities as noise from over-flying or ground noise.
- *Economics and capacity of surface access* - the 'Key Issues' submission should recognise that road networks have a finite capacity and the extra load on roads (if not designed for the right volume of traffic) can negatively affect local economies.
- *Phrasing* - the submission should refer to newer aircraft as 'potentially less noisy' rather than 'quieter'. It was also noted that the more efficient aircraft were not necessarily quieter (e.g. open engine fairings).

- *Noise standards for the Airports Commission* – the Commission should be ambitious in producing guidance for expected noise standards, rather than a low minimum.
- *Use of secondary research and figures in SASIG's response* – it was confirmed by the SASIG Director that the submission will draw details from existing literature to support SASIG's policy positions on certain themes. However, the SASIG response will refer to the studies as a body of developing evidence, rather than defend or dispute certain studies.
- *Land-use planning at airports* – the Group confirmed that SASIG's response should explore planning issues and diversification of airport operators to mixed-use operations, noting that planning is a matter for local discretion. Where planning is working well SASIG will seek to capture and replicate good practice, but where lack of controls are causing problems this should be illustrated to the Commission. The role of Local Development Orders and Local Plans in light of the revocation of PPG 24¹ and the NPPF² should also be explored.
- *Cross-boundary issues* – details should be included regarding the 'duty to cooperate', which particularly affects areas where a major airport is abutted by several Councils.
- *Pre-determination* – where possible the SASIG submission should not pre-determine key issues. SASIG can continue to pursue its lobbying points through its seat on the Department for Transport Aviation External Advisory Group, the services of DeHavilland, and most effectively, through the work of individual Councillors.
- *Calculate and capture* – the Group agreed that SASIG's submission should reflect the work of the Group to capture and model the benefits and dis-benefits of airport developments in a realistic way. Providing this ability to monetise the full range of issues associated with airport development would be of great use to Councillors.
- *Promotion* – SASIG's submissions and work with Transport for London is a good opportunity to highlight the Group's good work to Councils around the country and
- *Development proposals* – it was noted that most development proposals for new airport capacity are now in the public domain and affected Councils can seize the opportunity to feed in their thoughts and considerations at an advanced stage.

The Group noted that SASIG officers would be present at the Airports Commission's two Public Evidence Sessions on 9 July 2013 in Manchester and 10 July 2013 in London.

The Airports Commission also plan a separate event specifically for Councils on 07 October 2013, which the majority of the commissioners will attend.

¹ PPG 24 – Planning Policy Guidance Note 24 – 'Noise' (now obsolete).

² NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework

(https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

Decisions

The group **agreed** that:

- 1) the 'Assessment Criteria' submission that SASIG made to the Airports Commission (March 2013) be applied and publicised at all relevant opportunities by the SASIG membership, to maximise application of the group's work and attract new member Authorities; and
- 2) that a further 'Key Issues' submission be made to the Airports Commission by SASIG, revised to incorporate comments made at the meeting and subsequent feedback.

Actions

SASIG membership to apply and publicise at all relevant opportunities the 'Assessment Criteria' submission that SASIG made to the Airports Commission (March 2013), to maximise application of the group's work and attract new member Authorities.

SASIG membership to inform the SASIG office should they be attending either the 09 July or 10 July Public evidence sessions.

SASIG Director to circulate for comment from the SASIG membership a revised 'Key Issues' submission

SASIG Director to conclude and supply 'Key Issues' submission to the Airports Commission by 19 July 2013.

5 **SASIG Account & the Future of SASIG – 2012/13 Year-End Out-turn & 2013/14 Outlook**

The SASIG Director began this item by noting that SASIG's work with Transport for London had stirred interest from several Authorities in joining SASIG and the team were in dialogue with five or so Councils regarding membership. As the political debate over the future of UK airport capacity grows it was hoped that further expressions of interest would be received.

The SASIG Chairman then clarified the recommendations and that the proposed marketing task group would consist of Councillors and there would be a separate officer-led task group to develop funding bids to the point where the Group could consider them for approval.

.....continues.....

In discussion the following points were raised:

- *Promotional materials* – the SASIG Chairman drew the Group's attention to the promotional slides SASIG officers have produced which members of the Group can utilise when promoting SASIG in their local areas, for example at Local Transport Body (LTB) meetings, Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) meetings, and through other local networks.
- *Opportunities with LEPs* – given the Government's backing for Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and support for infrastructure delivery through these groups, LEPs were identified as a potential future source of funding should they wish to commission SASIG's expertise.
- *In-year account balance* – it was confirmed that the 2012/13 in-year account balance was negative, although the 2012/13 year-end balance was positive due to draw down of reserves. This is also projected to be the case for the 2013/14 budget.

The SASIG Chairman explained that although work was progressing fruitfully on a revised membership fee structure, the Group must make a decision at the meeting to ensure the immediate viability of the Group. The Chairman and SASIG Director had re-examined all items of expenditure to eliminate or reduce costs, including paring down print and meeting room costs. The retention of the DeHavilland Parliamentary monitoring service represented excellent value for money.

Cllr Jackie Cheetham, a SASIG Vice-Chair, added that Councils were entering into a crucial time where SASIG's influence would be vital. It would be disastrous for the Group to cease during this time, and just as potential sources of medium-/long-term funding had been identified and were being explored.

The Group also noted that certain Authorities directly affected by airport activity are not currently in membership of SASIG and undertook to stress the value of the Group to colleagues in these Authorities at the political level, in support of the continuing work of the SASIG office.

Decisions

The Group:

- **approved** the 2012-13 SASIG account out-turn report;
- **approved** the 2013-14 SASIG Budget on the basis that revised 2013/14 subscriptions meet the imminent funding gap (see **Appendix C**, pg. 15);
- **agreed** that an active Task Group drawn from Councillors amongst the SASIG membership be set up to market SASIG and increase the size of the SASIG membership;
- **agreed** that an active Task Group drawn from the officers amongst the SASIG membership be set up to support project approval for funding bids (financial approval, technical expertise and incorporation of partners);

- **agreed** that account summaries be supplied to the Chairman and Vice Chairmen in order for adjusting action to be taken as appropriate. This is required to support a flexible and rapidly responsive business model during the transition phase towards the new funding model, requiring clear direction on a regular monthly basis; and
- **agreed** that any new Authorities wishing to join SASIG will be charged on the basis of the revised membership rates, and will be charged on a pro-rata basis if they join mid-year.

Action

SASIG office team to circulate to the SASIG membership the publicity presentation for the membership's use when promoting and advertising the Group.

6 SASIG submission to the Airports Commission – 'Assessment Criteria' (submitted 15 March 2013)

The SASIG Chairman reiterated that incorporation of many of the Group's policy positions in the Airports Commission's final assessment criteria was a great success. Member of the Group added that the Aviation Policy Framework should set the tone for the work of the Airports Commission.

Decision

The Group **noted** the SASIG submission to the Airports Commission – 'Assessment Criteria'.

Action

The SASIG membership to apply and publicise at all relevant opportunities the SASIG 'Assessment Criteria' submission to the Airports Commission, to maximise application of the group's work and attract new member Authorities.

7 SASIG Annual Report to LGA Executive – 2013 (submitted 2 May 2013)

Decision

The Group **noted** the 'SASIG Annual Report to LGA Executive – 2013'.

Action

The SASIG membership to apply and publicise at all relevant opportunities the 'SASIG Annual Report to LGA Executive – 2013', to maximise application of the group's work and attract new member Authorities.



STRATEGIC AVIATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP
of the Local Government Association

SASIG Meeting

Item 2

24 October 2013

8 Any other business

The SASIG Chairman thanked the SASIG office team for their hard work since the previous meeting.

Action

SASIG membership to use the calendar of SASIG meetings and relevant events of interest that is available on the SASIG website (www.sasig.org.uk/calendar-of-events).

Appendix A

Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group, Friday 28 June 2013

Attendance & apologies lists

Present	Authority
Cllr Jamie Macrae	SASIG Chairman (Cheshire East)
Cllr Nigel Shaw	Broadland DC
Cllr Andrew Bosmans	Doncaster MBC (SASIG Vice-Chairman)
Cllr Colin Ellar	Hounslow LB
Cllr Colin Yarwood	Mole Valley DC
Cllr Dorothy Ross-Tomlin	Reigate and Banstead BC
Cllr John Furey	Surrey CC (SASIG Vice-Chairman)
Cllr Jackie Cheetham	Uttlesford DC (SASIG Vice-Chairman)
Cllr David Sleight	Wokingham BC
John Walchester	Broadland DC
Darl Sweetland	Buckinghamshire CC
Neil Clark	Cornwall Council
Stephen King	Doncaster MBC
Paul Donovan	Hertfordshire CC
Rob Gibson	Hounslow LB
Wendy Rousell	Luton BC
John Coates	LB Richmond
Penny Button	Thanet DC
Andrew Taylor	Uttlesford DC
Steven Bailes	Uttlesford DC
Sue Janota	Surrey CC
Anna Mahoney	SASIG Director
Mark Mason	SASIG Information Officer
Liam Paul	LGA Member's Services

.....continues.....



STRATEGIC AVIATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP
of the Local Government Association

SASIG Meeting

Item 2

24 October 2013

Apologies	Authority
Cllr Mike Carver	East Herts DC
Cllr Darren Cooper	Sandwell MBC
Cllr Marian Rough	Spelthorne BC
Richard Worrall	SASIG Honorary President
Conal Kearney	Cheshire East Council
Val Beale	LB Hillingdon
Charles Loft	LGA

2013/14 SASIG Constitution and Mission Statement

MISSION STATEMENT AND TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE STRATEGIC AVIATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

Mission Statement

SASIG works to ensure that UK aviation policy is implemented in a manner that reconciles economic, social and environmental issues.

Terms of Reference

- 1 The Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group (SASIG) shall provide the forum within the Local Government Association (LGA) for all local authorities to discuss strategic aviation policies and major aviation issues.
- 2 SASIG will contribute to the work of the LGA in responding to Government and the European Commission on all aviation issues that have a strategic planning, transportation, land use, economic or environmental health dimension. SASIG, where appropriate, will work through and in conjunction with the LGA. SASIG will make representations direct to Government and elsewhere arising directly from the SIG's special interest. SASIG shall not act in a way that conflicts with or undermines LGA policy as a whole or damages the interests of member authorities.
- 3 SASIG will develop its role and pursue its objectives in accordance with an annual work programme, which will be kept under review so as to ensure consistency with LGA policy and meet with the aspirations of a wider membership.
- 4 SASIG will operate under the following constitution:
 - (i) Each authority in membership is entitled to designate one Member and/or one officer to attend each meeting of the Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group.
 - (ii) Whilst the Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group will seek to work by amicable agreement amongst the authorities, the formal position is that only one person from each member authority is entitled to vote.
 - (iii) There is no objection to additional Members and officers attending meetings to observe and speak with the permission of the Chairman.
 - (iv) A Chairman's Advisory Group and a Technical Officers Group, with representatives drawn from around airport locations on the Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group, will be maintained to assist in taking initiatives forward but with no specific executive powers unless so authorised or at times when urgency dictates that responses must be made between meetings.
 - (v) A Chairman and up to three Vice Chairmen will be elected annually to ensure a broad geographical spread of interest.

.....continues.....

- (vi) The role of Honorary President may be filled by an appropriate person.
 - (vii) The Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group shall submit an annual report to the LGA and shall table other reports for LGA meetings as and when necessary.
 - (viii) The Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group shall set an annual subscription rate for membership based on an assessment of its likely annual expenditure on staff, consultants, printing/publicity and other costs. These costs will be apportioned between member authorities on a formula to be agreed.
 - (ix) Authorities joining SASIG in any quarter of the financial year shall pay the relevant proportion of the annual subscription.
 - (x) Authorities shall be advised of the forthcoming subscriptions each autumn for their approval. The absence of a response to the contrary indicates approval.
 - (xi) Authorities resigning from SASIG shall give notice in writing prior to the end of the financial year.
- 5 The Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group will keep its working methods and subscriptions under review with the aim of setting the subscription for all members at the lowest practical level. The current subscriptions are listed below.
- 6 Surrey County Council will provide financial management services to SASIG and ensure that all income and expenditure is controlled and audited within their normal practices.

Annual Membership Subscriptions for 2013/14

Districts around regional airports	£900
Districts distant from London airports	£900
Districts close to London airports	£1,800
Unitaries around regional airports	£1,800
Unitaries distant from London airports	£1,800
Unitaries close to London airports	£3,600
Counties around regional airports	£1,800
Counties distant from London airports	£1,800
Counties close to London airports	£5,500

June 2013

Appendix C

Approved 2013-14 SASIG Budget – detailing subscriptions per Authority (next page)

2013-14 SASIG Budget (as at 31.05.2013)

Balance held (as at 31.03.2013; £) 14,027.72

INCOME	
Membership subscriptions (existing Authorities)	72,740
Regional Aviation Workshops - SASIG & TfL	4,000
Additional Local Authorities	0
Win European funding	0
Consultancy (provision from SASIG office)	0
Selling networking speciality	0
TOTAL INCOME	76,740

EXPENDITURE	
Staff Salaries	
Director - full-time	53,200
Information Officer - full-time	21,300
Sub-total	74,500
Supplies & Publicity	
DeHavilland Information Services Ltd.	6,300
Meeting Rooms	1,500
Printing/Publicity/Publications	1,750
Telephones	300
Hospitality	100
Stationery & Equipment	100
Sub-total	10,050
Conferences, Training & Travel	4,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	88,550

Income minus expenditure (balance in-year; £) -11,810

Projected balance to be held (as at 31.03.2014; £) 2,218

SASIG membership subscriptions 2013/14 (agreed at SASIG AGM 28.06.2013)

Local Authority	2013/14 Subscription (£)
Broadland DC	900
Buckinghamshire CC	5,500
Canterbury City Council	900
Cheshire East Council	1,800
Cornwall Council	1,140
Crawley BC	1,800
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	1,800
East Herts DC	1,800
Essex County Council	5,500
Hampshire CC	1,800
Hertfordshire CC	5,500
London Borough of <u>H</u> illingdon	3,600
London Borough of <u>H</u> ounslow	3,600
Luton BC	3,600
Mole Valley DC	1,800
Reigate & Banstead DC	1,800
London Borough of <u>R</u> ichmond upon Thames	3,600
Slough Borough Council	3,600
Southend on Sea Borough Council	1,800
Spelthorne Borough Council	1,800
Surrey County Council	5,500
Thanet DC	900
Uttlesford DC	1,800
West Midlands Joint Committee	5,500
Royal Borough of <u>W</u> indsor & Maidenhead	3,600
Wokingham Borough Council	1,800
TOTAL	72,740

NOTES OF THE CHAIRMAN'S ADVISORY GROUP (CAG) MEETING HELD 4 OCTOBER 2013

Attendees:	Cllr Jamie Macrae – SASIG Chairman	(Cheshire East Council)
	Cllr Andrew Bosmans - SASIG Vice-Chairman	(Doncaster MBC)
	Cllr Jackie Cheetham – SASIG Vice-Chairman	(Uttlesford DC)
	Cllr John Furey	(Surrey CC)
	Cllr Nigel Shaw	(Broadland DC)
	Steve Bailes	(Uttlesford DC)
	Wendy Rousell	(Luton BC)
	Anna Mahoney	SASIG Director
	Mark Mason	SASIG Information Officer

ITEM 1: Apologies for absence

- 1 Apologies for absence were received from:

Rob Gibson, LB Hounslow

ITEM 2: Notes & Minutes of Previous Meetings, and Matters Arising (CAG Meeting 7 June 2013; SASIG Meeting 28 June 2013)

Decision

- 2 Minutes from the previous CAG Meeting 7 June 2013; SASIG Meeting 28 June 2013, were **agreed**.

ITEM 3: Airports Commission Programme.

- 3 The Airports Commission programme and the upcoming speech by Sir Howard Davies in London on 7 October 2013 were discussed.
- 4 Discussion covered: the submissions published by the Commission on 7 August 2013 to address long-term capacity needs; the shortlist report to be published in December 2013; the proposals' relationship to Airport Master Plans; blight; and surface access and infrastructure requirements.
- 5 There was an update from a conversation with David Elvy, Airports Commission Secretariat, Communications Manager. It was noted that the interim report to be published by the Commission in December 2013 would be a 'Command Paper', meaning the House of Commons should have first sight of the final report, thus publication of the report must be whilst the House of Commons is sitting.

Decisions

- 6 CAG **agreed** to recommend to SASIG the group supply minimum public engagement standards for scheme proposers to meet, in order to provide meaningful evaluation of the plans taken forward in Phase 2 of the Commission's work programme.
- 7 CAG **agreed** to recommend to SASIG they commission an external party to evaluate the detailed business cases and sustainability assessments that will be submitted for the shortlisted long-term development options in Phase 2 of the Commission's work, on the following basis – that it be amended to read: 'That SASIG considers commissioning an external party to evaluate the detailed business cases and sustainability assessments that will be submitted for the shortlisted long-term development options in Phase 2 of the Commission's work.'

Actions

- 8 SASIG office team to circulate to CAG the summary of questions to be raised at the Airports Commission Councillor's Briefing on 7 October 2013, along with background details from the Secretariat regarding the Commission's liaison with Central Government and Whitehall.
- 9 SASIG office team to circulate to CAG details of the Airports Commission Expert Advisory Panel, the Airports Commission's 'Sift Criteria', and a report by Transport for London outlining their response to the submissions.
- 10 SASIG office team to gather an understanding of likely cost for commissioning an external party to evaluate the detailed business cases and sustainability assessments that will be submitted for the shortlisted long-term development options in Phase 2 of the Commission's work.

ITEM 4: National Aviation Policy Update.

- 11 The policies covered in the update were discussed, particularly in relation to the Air Quality Management regime. In doing so, discussion returned to the Airports Commission and existing air quality benchmarks.

Decision

- 12 CAG **noted** the report.

ITEM 5: Project Development & Funding Opportunities

- 13 There was a discussion about how SASIG might support Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) using existing information and capacity.

Decisions

- 14 CAG **noted** the report.

- 15 CAG **supported** the strategy of networking with LEPs.

Actions

- 16 SASIG office team to ask SASIG membership to identify the most appropriate point of contact for their LEP.
- 17 SASIG office team to contact all LEPs to let them know what services SASIG can provide and how SASIG can input into their planning for next year.

ITEM 6: SASIG Account – 2013/14 Account to Date & Proposed 2014/15 Budget.

- 18 The proposed budget for 2014/15 was discussed, particularly about the scale of additional income that would be needed to supply greater resource in the SASIG office.

Decisions

- 19 CAG **agreed** to continued application of the current funding model.
- 20 CAG **agreed** to consider the figures presented for '2013/14 year-to-date' and '2013-14 projected'.
- 21 CAG **agreed** to recommend to SASIG that the proposed 2014/15 budget be approved, on the basis of the proposed membership subscriptions.
- 22 CAG **agreed** to recommend to SASIG that the membership make allocation in their 2014/15 budget for the SASIG subscription.
- 23 CAG **agreed** that Local Authorities joining SASIG in the current financial year do so under the same fee structure as proposed for the existing membership, with the added incentive of payment now covering the period to the end of the next financial year (31 March 2015).

Actions

- 24 SASIG office team to invite Authorities that have previously expressed an interest in joining the SASIG meeting on 24 October 2013 along with details about joining SASIG.
- 25 SASIG office team to arrange timings and venues on 24 October 2013 to allow for a Task Group meeting, a Member-led Promotion & Marketing Group meeting, a pre-meeting for the SASIG Chair & Vice-Chairs, and the SASIG meeting.
- 26 SASIG Chair and Vice Chairs to arrange a meeting with Sir Merrick Cockell, Chairman of the Local Government Association, to discuss SASIG.

ITEM 7: SASIG Member-led Promotion & Marketing Group

27 Actions from the Chair and Vice Chairs meeting of 30 August 2013 were discussed to inform the Agenda for the Member-led Promotion & Marketing Group meeting to be held on 24 October 2013.

28 The purpose and membership of this group were discussed.

Decisions

29 CAG **agreed** to recommend to SASIG Members they take on an active involvement in the Member-led Promotion & Marketing Group.

30 CAG **agreed** that the final Briefing Note for this group, setting out the group's purpose; membership; remit and approval mechanism.

31 CAG **agreed** that the activity programme be progressed by each relevant party.

Actions

32 SASIG office team to update action items for use at Member-led Promotion & Marketing Group meeting to be held on 24 October 2013.

33 SASIG office team to draft a letter for the SASIG membership to sign-off, ready for media circulation at the time of the Airports Commission publishing their interim report in December 2013.

34 SASIG office team to order double-sided business cards with details of the SASIG Director and SASIG Chair.

35 SASIG office team to make contact with the editor of Local Government Association fortnightly publication 'first' about drafting an article for publication.

36 SASIG office team to circulate to CAG mailing lists of the Members of Parliament who receive information from SASIG.

37 SASIG office team to arrange a Chair and Vice Chairs meeting for 19 November 2013.

ITEM 8: SASIG Task Group

Decisions

38 CAG **agreed** to commend the SASIG membership on their generous involvement to date, and encourage them to continue.

39 CAG **agreed** that the activity programme be progressed by each relevant party.

Actions

- 40 Activity programme to be progressed by each relevant party (see report put to SASIG meeting, and material circulated for Task Group Meeting to be held 24 October 2013.)

ITEM 9: SASIG Membership Survey

Decisions

- 41 CAG **agreed** to comment on the survey.
- 42 CAG **agreed** that the survey be circulated with papers for the SASIG meeting on 24 October 2013 (supplied as both electronic and hard copy survey).

Action

- 43 SASIG office team to circulate the SASIG Membership Survey as an enclosure with papers for the SASIG meeting on 24 October 2013 for the SASIG membership to complete and return.

ITEM 10: Airports Commission Discussion Paper 'Noise' (response submitted 16 September 2013).

Decision

- 44 CAG **agreed** to recommend to SASIG that the report be applied and publicised at all relevant opportunities by the SASIG membership, to maximise application of the group's work and attract new member Authorities.

ITEM 11: Any Other Business

Actions

- 45 SASIG office team to ask those attending the SASIG meeting on 24 October 2013 to prepare to discuss their council positions on airport expansion in their area.

ITEM 12: Dates for future meetings:

<u>CAG meetings</u>	<u>SASIG meetings</u>
~~~~~ Thursday 13 February 2014 - TBC	Thursday 24 October 2013 Friday 7 March 2014



## ITEM 4: SASIG ACCOUNT 2013/14 & PROPOSED 2014/15 BUDGET

### Recommendations

- A That the SASIG membership approves the proposed 2014/15 budget, on the basis of the proposed membership subscriptions.
- B That the SASIG membership makes allocation in their 2014/15 budget for the SASIG subscription.
- C That the SASIG membership continues to promote the group and support income generation.

(see **Annex B**, pg.29).

### Executive Summary

#### 2013/14 SASIG Account

- 1 In accordance with the approved 2013/14 SASIG budget (at **Annex A**, pg.27), the budgeted in-year balance is - £11,810; a positive year-end balance can be achieved by using the monies in the SASIG holding account, yielding a budgeted year-end balance of £2,218.
- 2 Income from membership subscriptions during 2013/14 has been supplemented from fee-earning activities undertaken by the SASIG office team:
  - (i) payment from Transport for London (TfL) for SASIG involvement in a series of Regional Aviation Workshops; and
  - (ii) payment from Surrey County Council for SASIG involvement in Surrey Members' Aviation Seminar.
- 3 Income from additional Local Authorities is also being pursued, potentially around £10,000.
- 4 At the present time, the estimated 2013/14 year-end balance is projected to be £10,370 - the sum that will be transferred to the SASIG holding account.

#### 2014/15 Proposed Budget

- 5 The proposed 2014/15 SASIG budget presented at **Annex B**, pg.29, takes into account actual income and expenditure for the first half of 2013/14, and projected income and expenditure for the second half of 2013/14.
- 6 It is proposed that subscriptions and salaries increase in line with inflation; the figures in the proposed 2014/15 budget reflect this, and have been rounded.
- 7 This yields a proposed in-year balance of - £10,370. Through use of the sum in the SASIG holding account of £10,370 (i.e. the projected 2013/14 year-end balance), a positive proposed year-end balance of £1 can be achieved.

## 2013/14 Account

- 8 The SASIG budget for the current year (at **Annex A, pg.27**) provides for an office team of two from an income across 32 Local Authorities.
- 9 Expenditure on DeHavilland Information Services Ltd. has again proved its worth during the Autumn Party Conference season. For each Party's conference, DeHavilland supplied: details of fringe events; attendance at events of interest to SASIG; write-ups from those events; and political messages emanating from the main conference events. This is a cost-effective manner in which SASIG can support the membership's attendance at the Party Conferences, as well keeping the membership informed of activity and discussion taking place at the Conferences.

### **Additional SASIG income 2013/14**

- **Regional Aviation Workshops, SASIG & Transport for London (TfL)**

- 10 SASIG was involved with the series of Regional Aviation Workshops held by Transport for London (TfL) to present the London Mayor's aviation proposals, through provision of bespoke, tailored contact databases, along with assistance arranging speakers and supporting attendees, and speaking at the events.
- 11 SASIG Councillors kindly spoke at the events on the responsibilities for Local Authorities with respect to aviation – the need to provide travel and employment opportunities whilst reducing the local negative burdens. The SASIG Director spoke at the events about the Group's work and role; and SASIG's input to the Airports Commission on Assessment Criteria.
- 12 SASIG banners were displayed, and SASIG literature provided, at the events to showcase the group to the Local Authority representatives attending. Contact has been maintained with Councils attending those events, for instance, through invitation to this SASIG meeting.

- **Members' Aviation Seminar, Surrey County Council**

- 13 SASIG attended early discussions with Surrey County Council colleagues about event design, speakers and contact information, for a Surrey Members' Seminar.
- 14 The SASIG Director spoke at the event to 'set the scene' by illustrating the breadth and interconnectivity of aspects across the Council's remit that are pertinent to aviation development. This complemented presentation by the commissioned consultants of local assessments looking at economic and transport implications for Surrey. The issues were then brought together by the final speaker in the context of the challenge and opportunity of building a new airport.

## Additional Local Authorities

- 15 SASIG attendance at a Cheshire & Warrington Local Transport Body (LTB) meeting, and the series of Regional Aviation Workshops worked on with Transport for London (TfL) has led to contact being made with Local Authorities interested in the group and its work on strategic aviation. These Authorities are listed below:

Local Authority/Organisation	Fee (£)	Airport(s)
Woking Borough Council	900	Heathrow, Gatwick
North Warwickshire Borough Council	900	Birmingham
Exeter City Council	900	Exeter
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	1,800	Gatwick
Wyre Forest District Council	900	Birmingham
City of Stoke on Trent	900	Liverpool, Manchester, East Midlands and Birmingham
Oxfordshire County Council	1,800	Oxford, Gloucester, Birmingham, Heathrow
Christchurch Borough Council	1,400	Bournemouth
Cheshire West and Chester	1,800	Manchester
East Devon District Council	900	Exeter

- 16 Income from additional Local Authorities could thus potentially be around £10,000. Authorities joining the group now have been offered membership until the end of the next financial year (i.e. to 31 March 2015) for the cost of the 2013/14 annual rate.

### Projected 2013/14 year-end balance

- 17 At the present time, the estimated 2013/14 year-end balance is projected to be £10,370. This will be the sum that will be transferred to the SASIG holding account.

### 2014/15 SASIG Account

- 18 Taking account of the year-to-date position, and projecting an estimated year-end out-turn for 2013/14, a proposed 2014/15 SASIG Budget has been prepared and is set out at **Annex B, pg.29**.
- 19 It is proposed that subscriptions and salaries increase in line with inflation; the figures in the proposed 2014/15 budget reflect this, and have been rounded.

- 20 This proposed income would maintain two staff in the SASIG office team, leaving one post vacant for the second consecutive year (Policy Officer post vacant since October 2012).
- 21 Expenditure on 'Supplies & Publicity' and 'Travel, Conferences & Training' has been reduced to the lowest level possible at which the Group can continue provision of meetings across the year. This level of expenditure does not provide for attendance at external events such as conferences.
- 22 In the absence of any additional income, a proposed in-year balance of - £10,370 is projected. Through use of the sum in the SASIG holding account of £10,370 (i.e. the projected 2013/14 year-end balance), a positive proposed year-end balance of £1 is projected.

## Conclusions

- 23 The ongoing support from and active involvement of the current SASIG membership has been instrumental in securing continuation of the group, for which thanks are extended by the SASIG Chairman and office team.
- 24 Steps are being taken to increase income for the group. This has already been forthcoming from selling our networking specialism, and speaking at a Members' seminar in support of the internal aviation conversation. The membership is invited to advise of similar opportunities for future income generation.

Contact Officer: Anna Mahoney, SASIG Director  
Tel.: (020) 8541 9459 / 07968 832 687  
Web: [www.sasig.org.uk](http://www.sasig.org.uk)

Email: [sasig@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:sasig@surreycc.gov.uk)  
Date: 14 October 2013

Table 1 - Approved 2013-14 SASIG Budget

Balance held (as at 31.03.2013; £) 14,027.72

<b>INCOME</b>	
Membership subscriptions (existing Authorities)	72,740
Regional Aviation Workshops - SASIG & TfL	4,000
Additional Local Authorities	0
Win European funding	0
Consultancy (provision from SASIG office)	0
Selling networking speciality	0
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>76,740</b>

<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	
<b>Staff Salaries</b>	
Director - full-time	53,200
Policy Officer	0
Information Officer - full-time	21,300
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>74,500</b>
<b>Supplies &amp; Publicity</b>	
DeHavilland Information Services Ltd.	6,300
Meeting Rooms	1,500
Printing/Publicity/Publications	1,750
Telephones	300
Hospitality	100
Stationery & Equipment	100
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>10,050</b>
<b>Conferences, Training &amp; Travel</b>	<b>4,000</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>88,550</b>

Income minus expenditure (budgeted in-year balance; £) -11,810

Balance budgeted to be held (as at 31.03.2014; £) 2,218

**Table 2 - Membership subscriptions for 2013/14**

<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>Subscription (£)</b>
Broadland District Council	900
Buckinghamshire County Council	5,500
Canterbury City Council	900
Cheshire East Council	1,800
Cornwall Council	1,140
Crawley Borough Council	1,800
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	1,800
East Herts District Council	1,800
Essex County Council	5,500
Hampshire County Council	1,800
Hertfordshire County Council	5,500
London Borough of <u>H</u> illingdon	3,600
London Borough of <u>H</u> ounslow	3,600
Luton Borough Council	3,600
Mole Valley District Council	1,800
Reigate & Banstead District Council	1,800
London Borough of <u>R</u> ichmond upon Thames	3,600
Slough Borough Council	3,600
Southend on Sea Borough Council	1,800
Spelthorne Borough Council	1,800
Surrey County Council	5,500
Thanet District Council	900
Uttlesford District Council	1,800
West Midlands Joint Comm.e (Birmingham City Council)	5,500
Royal Borough of <u>W</u> indsor & Maidenhead	3,600
Wokingham Borough Council	1,800
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>72,740</b>



Table 3 - Proposed 2014/15 Budget

<b>Projected balance to be held (as at 31.03.2014; £)</b>	<b>10,370.85</b>
<b>INCOME</b>	
	<b>£</b>
Membership subscriptions (existing Authorities)	75,185
Additional Local Authorities	0
Win European funding	0
Consultancy (provision from SASIG office)	0
Selling networking speciality	0
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>75,185</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	
	<b>£</b>
<b>Staff Salaries</b>	
Director - full-time	55,000
Policy Officer	0
Information Officer - full-time	22,100
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>77,100</b>
<b>Supplies &amp; Publicity</b>	
DeHavilland Information Services Ltd.	6,300
Meeting rooms	700
Printing/publicity/publications	450
Telephones	200
Hospitality	50
Stationery & equipment	30
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>7,730</b>
<b>Travel, Conferences &amp; Training</b>	
	<b>725</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>85,555</b>
<b>Income minus expenditure (projected in-year balance; £)</b>	<b>-10,370</b>
<b>Projected balance to be held (as at 31.03.2015; £)</b>	<b>1</b>

**Table 4 - Proposed Membership Subscriptions for 2014/15**

<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>Subscription (£)</b>
Broadland DC	930
Buckinghamshire CC	5,700
Canterbury City Council	930
Cheshire East Council	1,860
Cornwall Council	1,175
Crawley BC	1,860
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	1,860
East Herts DC	1,860
Essex County Council	5,700
Hampshire CC	1,860
Hertfordshire CC	5,700
London Borough of <u>H</u> illingdon	3,710
London Borough of <u>H</u> ounslow	3,710
Luton BC	3,710
Mole Valley DC	1,860
Reigate & Banstead DC	1,860
London Borough of <u>R</u> ichmond upon Thames	3,710
Slough Borough Council	3,710
Southend on Sea Borough Council	1,860
Spelthorne Borough Council	1,860
Surrey County Council	5,700
Thanet DC	930
Uttlesford DC	1,860
West Mids Joint Comm.e (Birmingham City Council)	5,700
Royal Borough of <u>W</u> indsor & Maidenhead	3,710
Wokingham Borough Council	1,860
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>75,185</b>

## ITEM 5: PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

### Recommendation

That the contents of the report be noted.

### Glossary

C2C LEP	Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership
ESIF	European Structural and Investment Fund
LEP	Local Enterprise Partnership

### Executive Summary

- 1 This report outlines potential areas for project development for SASIG to pursue. These areas so far include: 'calculate and capture' – improved economic assessment, community taskforce, data, information provision, and noise.
- 2 Recently Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (C2C LEP) requested partners and stakeholders to submit their areas of interest for potential partnership working opportunities for the European Structural and Investment Fund (ESIF). SASIG responded to this request in support of the LEP's overarching objectives: strengthening research, technological development and innovation; enhancing the competitiveness of small- and medium-sized enterprises; supporting the shift to a low carbon economy; promoting employment and supporting social mobility; and promoting social inclusion and combating poverty. These are shown at **Annex A (pg.35)**.

### Introduction

- 3 SASIG is continually exploring funding sources through discussions with the membership, meetings and networking events. One of the potential areas of funding which has been considered has been developing project work to work into bids. Any funding secured through this route would also have the effect of raising the profile of the group.
- 4 The SASIG office team have considered and discussed a range of potential project areas. This paper attempts to capture these areas and update the membership on the progress of securing project funding.

### Potential project areas

- 5 Five potential project areas have been identified where it is felt that SASIG are in a strong position to explore, due to its network of local authority membership and expertise. These are: 'calculate and capture' – improved economic assessment, community taskforce, data, information provision, and noise. Each of these area described in more detail below.

- 6 'Calculate and capture' – SASIG has been working to support improved economic assessment of aviation. This could be through a comprehensive, agreed methodology for calculating the economic value of aviation, yielding a net illustration that better accounts for the full range of impacts, both positive and negative.
- 7 Community taskforce – In 2012 SASIG provided support to the London Borough of Hounslow to facilitate an 'Aviation Community Taskforce'. This taskforce brought together Local Authority representatives, an aviation NGO and an aviation residents group. Discussion addressed coordinated, collaborative consensus around actions that would improve the current conditions for communities affected by airport operations. SASIG is well placed to play a similarly facilitatory role in the future. Future project work could usefully draw on the group's network, experience and expertise.
- 8 Data – Developing the project work for the 'calculate and capture' European Regional Development Fund bid raised issues about the accessibility of data. This is principally because the data owners are private companies (i.e. airline operators) and a great deal of the data in this area is often regarded as 'commercially sensitive'. At the Officer-led Task Group meeting in June 2013 it was agreed that work might usefully be done exploring the issue of aviation data availability and accessibility.
- 9 Information provision – One of the major roles that SASIG has is to provide information for its membership. The quality and depth of information provision is regarded as one of the strengths of the organisation. Greater resourcing would allow scope for development through wider dissemination, for example; developing projects in this area and securing project funding would enable SASIG to do this.
- 10 Noise – SASIG's response to the most recent Airports Commission discussion paper on aviation noise, suggests that a greater understanding of the community response to noise is an essential prerequisite for an improved noise management and reduction regime. It is clear that there are gaps which could be addressed through project work in the area of aviation noise, for the benefit of the communities the SASIG membership represents.
- 11 SASIG continues to explore avenues for funding for any work under these high level project areas; for instance, the Big Lottery Fund and the Heritage Lottery Fund.

## **Coast to Capital (C2C) Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and European Structural and Investment Fund (ESIF) priorities**

- 12 Recently the Coast to Capital (C2C) Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) held a consultation exercise inviting partners and stakeholders to submit objectives for future collaborative working under the European Structural and Investment Fund (ESIF). This exercise requested responses in accordance with pre-established thematic objectives:
  - Strengthening research, technological development and innovation.
  - Enhancing access to and use and quality of information and communication technologies.
  - Enhancing the competitiveness of small- and medium-sized enterprises.
  - Supporting the shift to a low carbon economy in all sectors.



STRATEGIC AVIATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP  
of the Local Government Association

- Promoting employment and supporting social mobility.
  - Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty.
  - Investing in education, skills and lifelong learning.
- 13 To support this process SASIG submitted five potential areas where work might be undertaken under these thematic objectives, see Table 1 in **Annex A (pg.35)**. The aim was to ensure the links between the SASIG's potential project areas (described above) and the LEPs thematic objectives, in order that some or all of these areas might be addressed.

### Conclusions

- 14 This report has outlined the progress that SASIG has made in developing project based work, to both raise the profile of the group and secure long- and medium-term funding.
- 15 The group's unique selling points are reinforced through SASIG's selected list of potential project areas.
- 16 Work continues in exploring potential funding opportunities, requiring ongoing support from SASIG membership, which is being actively and expertly provided through both the Member-led Promotion Group and the Officer-led Task Group.

Contact Officers: Mark Mason, SASIG Information Officer; Anna Mahoney, SASIG Director  
Email: [sasig@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:sasig@surreycc.gov.uk) Web: [www.sasig.org.uk](http://www.sasig.org.uk)  
Tel.: (020) 8541 9459 / 07968 832 687 Date: 14 October 2013





STRATEGIC AVIATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP  
of the Local Government Association

SASIG Meeting

24 October 2013

Item 5

Annex A

SASIG SUBMISSION TO COAST TO COAST (C2C) LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (LEP), SEPTEMBER 2013

Objective	High level priority for intervention	Rationale for intervention and type of results anticipated	Possible sources of match funding
<p>Strengthening research, technological development and innovation</p>	<p>Measuring the impacts of transport connectivity associated with airports.</p>	<p>Any work in these areas would be timely within the context of the current debate around airport expansion across Europe. Particularly in the United Kingdom with the Airports Commission currently examining how to make the best use of existing UK airport capacity, and whether this needs to be expanded.</p> <p>Potential results from any work under this priority would facilitate: a greater understanding of the holistic impacts of airports (including social costs and benefits), developing a methodology for calculating impacts systematically which could be use for all airports, and developing a best practice model of measuring impacts.</p>	<p>Local Authorities, LEPs, Airport operators, Research Institutes, Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group.</p>



STRATEGIC AVIATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP  
of the Local Government Association

**SASIG Meeting**

24 October 2013

**Item 5**

Objective	High level priority for intervention	Rationale for intervention and type of results anticipated	Possible sources of match funding
<p>Enhancing the Competitiveness of Small and Medium Enterprises</p>	<p>Facilitating networks between Airport operators, local authorities, and SMEs by directing aviation growth to locations where it will assist sustainable economic regeneration.</p>	<p>Airports can play an instrumental role in linking the UK to new markets, Earlier this year for example Heathrow Airport Ltd and Asia House produced a series of guides for SMEs who want to trade with the emerging economies to the Far East. This role can be doubly supported by local authorities who are equally well placed to play a facilitatory role to develop links between airport operators and local SMEs. The area benefits logistically with local SMEs having access to two major airports in Gatwick and Heathrow.</p> <p>There is a clear and present need for improved networks between airport operators, local authorities, SME to strengthen local economies and make them more resilient. Potential results from work under this priority would include improved local productivity, added value for local SMEs, stronger local and national economic supply chains and a greater distribution of economic growth.</p>	<p>Local Authorities, LEPs, Airport operators, SMEs, SASIG.</p>





**STRATEGIC AVIATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP**  
of the Local Government Association

**SASIG Meeting**

24 October 2013

**Item 5**

Objective	High level priority for intervention	Rationale for intervention and type of results anticipated	Possible sources of match funding
Supporting the Shift to a Low Carbon Economy in All Sectors	Encourage Governments and the aviation industry to make greater efforts to reduce aviation's impacts on climate change and encouraging a move towards a lower carbon local economy.	<p>Despite the reduction in carbon emission reductions from other sectors over the last decade the growth of air travel has contributed to an increase in total air pollution. The impact of aviation on the local and regional economy needs to be better understood before a shift towards a lower carbon economy is possible. Airport operators could play a key role in this.</p> <p>Work could usefully be undertaken to provide an assessment of the local and regional green economy. This would provide a measurement from where to start reductions and what reductions were necessary. Working with a network of local authorities would play a facilitatory and educational role to enhance the effectiveness of local policy-making and implementation.</p>	Airport operators, local authorities, SASIG.



**STRATEGIC AVIATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP**  
of the Local Government Association

**SASIG Meeting**

24 October 2013

**Item 5**

Objective	High level priority for intervention	Rationale for intervention and type of results anticipated	Possible sources of match funding
<p>Promoting Employment and Supporting Social Mobility</p>	<p>Encouraging a greater understanding of the impact of aviation on job creation and resulting economic benefits.</p>	<p>The social and economic impacts of aviation are scarce understood. Frequently research cites the economic benefits of investment in infrastructure (such as job creation). But this research consistently presents gross economic benefits as opposed to net. Airports can bring inward investment into areas but also localised blight which can turn investment away, and lead to some SMEs to relocate to provide a better customer experience and service.</p> <p>Work under this thematic objective would set out to develop a greater understanding of the net economic benefits of aviation, the spatial or temporal impact, thus creating a 'map' of the optimum areas for development against investment.</p>	<p>Local authorities, LEPs, SASIG.</p>



**STRATEGIC AVIATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP**  
of the Local Government Association

**SASIG Meeting**

24 October 2013

**Item 5**

Objective	High level priority for intervention	Rationale for intervention and type of results anticipated	Possible sources of match funding
<p>Promoting Social Inclusion and combating poverty</p>	<p>Improving communications and relationships between airport operators and local communities to facilitate a greater understanding of social need.</p>	<p>Airport development can lead to significant parts of local communities being affected by generalised blight (including decreasing property prices, spiralling decline in inward investment in the local economy and the migration of existing businesses). All of these factors can lead to people feeling isolated and socially excluded.</p> <p>Work under this objective would aim to promote social inclusion and tackle environmental blight. Potential results might include better public consultation, improved quality of information provision, improved relationships between airport operators and residents, and improved social environments.</p>	<p>Local authorities, airport operators, LEPs, SASIG.</p>



## ITEM 6: AIRPORTS COMMISSION – SUBMISSIONS TO DATE AND FUTURE SASIG INVOLVEMENT

### Glossary

AC	Airports Commission
CCC	Committee on Climate Change
DECC	Department of Energy & Climate Change
DfT	Department for Transport
DTA	'Drive-through airport'
ExTS	'Exhaustless takeoff system'
IAAG	International Aviation Advisory Group
HMT	Her Majesty's Treasury
HSR2	High-speed rail 2
MAG	Manchester Airports Group
mppa	million passengers per annum
TfL	Transport for London
WebTAG	Department for Transport's Transport Appraisal Guidance

### Recommendations

- A That the SASIG membership supplies minimum standards for scheme proposers to meet, with respect to public engagement, and surface access proposals, in order to provide meaningful evaluation of the plans taken forward in Phase 2 of the Commission's work programme.
- B That the SASIG membership considers how to maximise the collective potential of work being done locally by each Council.
- C That the SASIG membership considers commissioning an external party to evaluate the detailed business cases and sustainability assessments that will be submitted for the shortlisted long-term development options in Phase 2 of the Commission's work.



## Executive Summary

- 1 The Airports Commission (AC), the independent commission set up by the Government in September 2012 & Chaired by Sir Howard Davies, has been asked to examine the need for additional UK airport capacity, and should need be determined, to recommend to Government how this can be met in the short-, medium- and long-term.
- 2 Suggestions for the use of existing capacity in the short- and medium-term (i.e. the next five years) have been supplied to and are being considered by the Commission.
- 3 Submissions have also been made to the Commission by individuals and companies promoting options for provision of long-term capacity. A number of proposals put forward when the issue of long-term aviation provision has previously been debated nationally are also being looked at by the Commission.
- 4 The Commission has indicated they consider there is a need for additional aviation capacity, that this cannot be met at airports outside the South East, and that this can be achieved in accordance with the UK's domestic commitment to reduce climate change emissions.
- 5 The Commission's Interim Report, due in December 2013, will make recommendations for the use of existing aviation infrastructure along with consideration of long-term aviation development options.
- 6 Interested parties have been forming their positions in this debate, some of which have been made public. Across the SASIG membership, there are a variety of positions, pro- and anti- the various development options.
- 7 Across the SASIG membership, studies have been commissioned to inform local considerations. There could be value across the Group from the pooling of such information, maximising upon the potential of national collaboration.
- 8 The SASIG membership may like to consider commissioning an external party to evaluate the detailed business cases and sustainability assessments that will be submitted for the shortlisted long-term development options in Phase 2 of the Commission's work.

## Public Evidence Sessions, July 2013

- 9 The Airports Commission held two public evidence sessions in July 2013 (9 July in Manchester; 10 July in London). These sessions were an opportunity for the Commissioners to question, in public, interested parties covering the spectrum of input the Commission had received. They were also an opportunity for other interested parties to make a public statement.
- 10 The SASIG public statement focussed on the need for a net economic assessment in order to compare all the development options being considered in a manner that captures the positive and negative impacts, for the purpose of avoiding the worst of the negative impacts and capturing the best of the positive impacts.

- 11 Notes of the sessions were issued by the Commission, and are available on the SASIG website¹. The following text is the public record of SASIG's statement as corrected for accuracy:

"Strategic Aviation and Special Interest Group (SASIG) Director Anna Mahoney called on the Commission ~~not just~~ to consider any future options based on the net economic benefit, ~~but also the benefit~~ to better illustrate the impacts on each specific locality and sector. It would allow the Commission to better take account of *issues beyond just* the 'needs and wants of consumers', she said. She also said her approach would allow the examination of past mistakes and help inform the discussion regarding mix of financing."

(~~indicates incorrect text~~; *indicates content provided but omitted from public summary*)

### Submission of long-term development proposals

- 12 Anyone wishing to make a submission about long-term aviation capacity had until 19 July 2013 to submit their preferred options to the Commission.
- 13 Fifty-two submissions and items of correspondence were published on the Commission's website² on 7 August 2013. A brief summary of these long-term options along with each scheme proposer is presented in **Annex A (pg.55)**.
- 14 The Commission has committed to publish in December 2013 a shortlist of the schemes they believe to be the most credible long-term options, taking into account their assessment of the need for additional capacity. There will be further opportunities to comment and submit views on these shortlisted options in 2014.
- 15 An information note was also published in August 2013, providing details of the processes and timings that may be established in Phase 2 of the Airports Commission's work programme, should the December 2013 Interim Report conclude that a significant increase in aviation capacity is needed. This information note included an indicative timeline for Phase 2 (**Annex B, pg.65**).
- 16 Comments on all development options – for short-, medium- and long-term proposals – were invited up to 27 September 2013.

¹ <http://www.sasig.org.uk/2013/07/public-evidence-sessions-transcripts-airports-commission-discussion-papers/>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/long-term-options-proposals-received-by-the-airports-commission>



## Commission's Briefing for Councillors, Monday 7 October 2013

- 17 The Commission held their second Briefing for Councillors on 7 October 2013. This event was an opportunity to hear the Chair of the Airports Commission:
- update on the work of the Commission;
  - look ahead to production of the Commission's Interim Report in December 2013; and
  - talk about the Commission's work in 2014.
- 18 Invitations for this event were sent by the Commission Secretariat to Council Leaders and Deputy Leaders, expecting them to be forwarded as appropriate, and relying on the network to spread the word to any overlooked parties. All SASIG Councillors received the invitation directly from the SASIG office; where Members were not able to attend, Officers could attend.
- 19 Sir Howard covered four key issues:
- i) compatibility with climate change commitment;
  - ii) aviation demand forecasts;
  - iii) in the event of there being no further capacity in the South East, will airline operators decant to airports elsewhere with spare capacity?.....and.....
  - iv) what ability/power does the Government have to force them to do so?
- 20 Sir Howard set out that the Commission has decided there is a need for further capacity, adding that existing available capacity is not sufficient to meet future demand in the South East of England.
- 21 Sir Howard referenced the lack of powers available for the Government to require airline operators to operate any particular route from any particular airport, suggesting that the desired services cannot necessarily be supplied by compelling airline operators to supply these routes through use of existing spare capacity at airports outside the South East.
- 22 Sir Howard also explained that in addition to the 52 proposals for long-term aviation development published on their website in August 2013, the Commission is also looking at six proposals that have been raised when the issue of aviation capacity has been debated in previous decades. SASIG has contacted the Airports Commission Secretariat to clarify which six proposals these are.
- 23 It was also stated that the Commission considers future growth is compatible with the Committee on Climate Change's (CCC) assessment of December 2009 that expansion plans in aggregate should be consistent with limiting passenger growth in 2050 to a maximum of 60% above 2005 levels.

## 'Emerging Thinking' speech, Monday 7 October 2013

- 24 In a speech describing the Airports Commission's emerging thinking, Sir Howard said the demands on the UK's busiest airports were likely to continue to grow "even if we take a more conservative view of future aviation demand than the Department for Transport has in the past".
- 25 He went on to say that the Commission thought it was difficult to see how the free market alone could resolve the capacity-demand imbalance in the South East. He added that regional airports are already serving their local markets effectively but thought it was difficult to see how they could absorb excess demand.
- 26 He concluded that "taken together, these considerations point to the need for new runway infrastructure in the South East of England in the coming decades"³.
- 27 The full text of the speech can be found on the Airports Commission website⁴.
- 28 Invitations for this speech had been spread across a range of interests, and the press was in attendance. Those who accepted the invitation to the morning briefing were invited to the afternoon speech.
- 29 The impetus for the speech came from Sir Howard, who was growing more uncomfortable about giving the impression that the Commission is not forming ideas on anything at all, when it is. The speech has a consultative element as the main themes are presented on the Commission's website with comments on them invited.

## Interim Report – December 2013

- 30 The Commission's Interim Report must meet 3 key objectives:
- **examine the evidence** on the nature, scale and timing of the UK's future aviation capacity and connectivity needs to maintain the UK's position as Europe's most important aviation hub;
  - **make recommendations for the use of existing runway capacity** in the next five years, and to consider short-, medium- and long-term measures for making the best use of existing capacity that might be further developed before the Commission's final report; and
  - **identify a list of credible long-term development options** - including major infrastructure and any surface transport needs they may entail, and consistent with our conclusions on the assessment of need, to be further developed before the Commission's final report.
- 31 Alongside the Interim Report, the Commission will publish a **draft appraisal framework** for comment, with the intention being to finalise the framework by March 2014, and apply it to the shortlisted long-term development options.

³ <http://www.sasig.org.uk/category/airport-commission/>

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/aviation-capacity-in-the-uk>

- 32 Sir Howard is likely to write most of the report himself; it is for Sir Howard to gauge acceptability to both the current and future Government.
- 33 No formal (i.e. Ministerial, or higher) sign-off is needed for the Commission's Interim Report.
- 34 **It will be published as a Command Paper** - 'if your work is likely to be progressed or adopted as policy it should be published as a Command Paper' (further details on Command Papers is at: <http://www.parliament.uk/about/how/publications/government/>)
- 35 This means that, technically, Parliament should have first sight of the Interim Report (although this has been bypassed in the past).
- 36 Publication of the Interim Report is therefore tied to the Parliamentary timetable: it must be published whilst the House of Commons is sitting, meaning it is **likely to be published on/around 17 December 2013**, as the Commons' rise on Thursday 19 December 2013.

## Phase 2

- 37 The second phase of the Commission's work will **develop the list of credible long-term options into detailed schemes** by subjecting them to a thorough appraisal process.
- 38 This process is already being resourced by the Commission, in terms of personnel, timetabling and advice.
- 39 For each scheme on the shortlist, proposers will need to work with the Commission to supply a detailed **business case** and **sustainability assessment** in order for the scheme to be considered further. Phase 2 appraisals will need to focus on the areas covered in the '**Sift Criteria**' issued by the Commission in May 2013.
- 40 It is not clear at this stage how the Commission will use the draft appraisal framework that it will publish for consultation in December 2013.

## Sustainability assessments

- 41 The Commission has set up a **Sustainability Reference Group** to support its development of a sustainability assessment framework. This advisory group comprises personnel from relevant Government Departments and statutory bodies (Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage), with input also being sought from the Commission's Expert Advisory Panel.

- 42 The final sustainability framework will be in accordance with the Commission's requirements, however, existing practice in this area will inform its development:
- 'Airport Development: Appraisal of Sustainability'⁵ – produced by civil engineering company Gifford (Southampton) for the Department for Transport, published in September 2010; and
  - the 'Appraisal of Sustainability' associated with the Ports National Policy Statement⁶ and that associated with the Nuclear National Policy Statement⁷.

### Business cases

- 43 The Commission is currently working with experts from the Department for Transport (DfT) and other Government Departments, and the Commission's Expert Advisory Panel, to develop a business case framework.
- 44 The Commission will tailor this framework specifically to their requirements, however, it will draw on best practice from Her Majesty's Treasury (HMT) Green Book for Strategic Outline Business Cases, and the DfT's WebTAG approach (transport appraisal guidance).

### Consultation in 2014

- 45 The Commission will run a national consultation during Autumn 2014 on the detailed business cases and sustainability assessments for each shortlisted development option. This will provide for the opportunity for public scrutiny and the supply of any additional evidence that interested parties may wish the Commission to consider.
- 46 A means by which the SASIG membership could be actively involved in this consultation could be through the Group taking on an external party to evaluate these submissions.
- 47 The Commission is only suggesting that scheme proposers *may* wish to consider the case for wider public engagement – not requiring it. However, the Commission's 'Sift Criteria' against which the shortlisted options will be compared states: "How does the proposer plan to engage with local communities in taking forward their plans?"
- 48 SASIG could contribute minimum standards for proposers to meet in terms of public engagement, and detail supplied in proposed surface access schemes.

---

⁵ 'Airport Development: Appraisal of Sustainability', produced by civil engineering company Gifford (Southampton) for the Department for Transport (DfT), Sep.2010, <http://assets.dft.gov.uk/publications/airport-development-appraisal-of-sustainability/report.pdf>

⁶ 'Ports National Policy Statement - Appraisal of Sustainability', produced by transport consultancies Atkins & MVA for the Department for Transport (DfT), Sep. 2011, [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/2386/111013-Ports-AoS.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/2386/111013-Ports-AoS.pdf)

⁷ 'Nuclear National Policy Statement - Appraisal of Sustainability', Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC), Oct. 2010, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/appraisal-of-sustainability-of-the-revised-draft-nuclear-national-policy-statement>

## Post-consultation

- 49 The Commission will carry out any additional analysis that it considers necessary, having reviewed its evidence base, in order to supply final recommendations to the Government after the 2015 General Election.

## Airports Commission – Working with Central Government

- 50 Sir Howard undertakes the **high-level political management** for the Commission; he has met with the key players (Prime Minister; Deputy Prime Minister; Chancellor; London Mayor; Vince Cable - Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills; Department of Energy & Climate Change Minister; etc.). Questions asked of these politicians are ‘what are your red lines?’, and ‘what do you need to know to be able to support the Commission’s recommendation?’
- 51 A less high-level **Whitehall Liaison Group** is also run, Chaired by Sir Howard, not attended by the Commission Secretariat. This comprises senior officials from key Ministries with whom Sir Howard meets every 2 or 3 months. This group fulfils a function similar to having Cabinet overview, and is intended to head off issues before they arise.

## Long-term aviation development options

- 52 Below are summary details of the types of proposers and submissions published by the Commission. The submissions described here are those 52 publicly available on the Airports Commission website⁸.

### Who made the submissions?

- 53 The largest proportion of submissions came from private individuals (15). Eleven submissions were made by consultancy groups, and 9 by architects and designers. Eight submissions were from airport operators. Four submissions were from local government bodies, two from Think Tanks and one each from a campaign group, a university, and a collaboration between an architects and designers and consultancy company.

### What kind of submission was proposed?

- 54 Thirty-eight submissions proposed the development of existing or new airports, while 14 submissions proposed limited or no new airport development, instead suggested developments to improve surface access to and between airports, or innovations to existing airport infrastructure to facilitate more rational use of existing capacity.

---

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/long-term-options-proposals-received-by-the-airports-commission>

## Submissions proposing development at existing airports

- 55 Twenty submissions proposed the development of existing airports (a table presenting the proposed capacity at these airports is presented in **Annex C, pg.67**): Six of these proposed (between one and five) additional runways at Heathrow Airport, five proposed the expansion of Stansted Airport, two the expansion of Luton Airport, and one each the expansion of Birmingham, Cardiff, Fairoaks, Gatwick and Manston airports. Two submissions proposed the developments of airport pairs – one for Gatwick and Lydd Airports, and one for Heathrow and Stansted Airports.

## Submissions proposing new airports

- 56 Eighteen submissions proposed the development of new airports (the proposed capacity at these airports is also given in **Annex C, pg.67**). The majority of these were in different locations, but there was some commonality between the submissions.
- 57 Of those proposers that suggested development of new and existing airports all suggested some kind of development of the existing surface access arrangements.

### Thames Estuary

- 58 Six submissions were proposed for what is described as the Inner Thames Estuary (that is on existing land either along the Western part of the River Thames, or at the mouth of the Thames and the North Sea). Three of these were proposed for the Isle of Grain on the Hoo Peninsula in Kent⁹. Two were proposed at Cliffe, on the western end of the Hoo Peninsula, and one in Thurrock¹⁰.
- 59 Four were proposed in the area what is called the Outer Thames Estuary (further into the mouth of the Estuary and the North Sea). The main difference between these submissions and those proposing development in the inner Thames Estuary is that four of these submissions propose building new islands ('Britannia Airport and The Transport for London submission), or developing on reclaimed land ('Goodwin Sands' and 'Maplin Sands').

.....continues.....

---

⁹ The Hoo Peninsula separates the estuaries of the rivers Thames and Medway. It is dominated by a line of sand and clay hills, surrounded by an area of marshland composed of alluvial silt. It is approximately 30 miles east of central London.

¹⁰ A unitary authority at the mouth of the Thames Estuary – the centre of which is approximately 20 miles from central London.

Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Northamptonshire

- 60 Three submissions proposed new airports in the Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Northamptonshire area of England. One near Abingdon in Oxfordshire¹¹. One in the area of Twyford village¹² in Aylesbury Vale in the North East of Buckinghamshire, and one in RAF Croughton¹³ & Steventon¹⁴.

Severn Estuary

- 61 Two submissions proposed the development of new airports in the Estuary area of the River Severn – One on land at the side of the River Severn¹⁵ ('Severnside') and one on an area of reclaimed land (currently described as 'intertidal mudflats') in the mouth of the River Severn and the Bristol Channel ('Severn 24').

Kent and Sussex

- 62 One submission proposed the building of a new airport in the area close to Shoreham in the Sevenoaks area of Kent¹⁶ ('London East Airport'), while another proposed development at Walland Marsh between the town of Rye in East Sussex and the Dungeness headland in Kent¹⁷.

Essex

- 63 One proposed development of a new airport on Foulness Island, an island on the east coast of Essex, separated from the mainland by creeks, and from the sea by walls.

**Surface access required in advance of on-airport development**

- 64 Two submissions proposed improvement to surface access to facilitate later on-airport development:
- One submission proposed that an additional high-speed rail connection (HSR2) would enable the development of Birmingham Airport.
  - One submission proposed that extending Crossrail to Stansted would enable the development of Stansted Airport to replace Heathrow Airport in the future.

---

¹¹ Approximately 6 miles south of Oxford and approximately 65 miles west of Central London.

¹² Approximately 20 miles North East of Oxford 75 miles to the West of London.

¹³ RAF Croughton is a Royal Air Force station which is currently a United States Air Force communications base in Northamptonshire, to the southeast of Croughton village approximately 70 miles north west of London.

¹⁴ Steventon is a village and in Oxfordshire about 4 miles south of Abingdon (see footnote 2).

¹⁵ Approximately 30 miles to the east of Cardiff.

¹⁶ Described as within a triangle of three existing motorways - east of the M25, south of the M20, and north of the M26). Approximately 20 miles to the South East of central London.

¹⁷ On the south coast of England, approximately 60 miles south east of Central London.



**Submissions proposing developments to improve surface access to and between existing airports, by new or improved rail tracks, connections or systems**

- 65 The remaining submissions proposed minimal or no development at existing airports but instead, proposed major changes to existing infrastructure, or innovations to facilitate more rational use of existing capacity.
- 66 Seven submissions proposed developments to improve surface access to and between principally (but not exclusively) five existing airports: Heathrow; Gatwick; Stansted; Luton and London City, by new or improved rail tracks, connections or systems.
- One submission proposed utilising existing capacity across these five airports, to create a 'London Hub city'.
  - One submission proposed rail connection between these five airports treating them as a single system and linking them with a high speed underground orbital railway.
  - One submission proposed a magnet rail or MAGLEV track alongside, or over the M25, with spurs connecting these five airports.
  - One submission describes how multiple airports in the South East can be connected by fast rail links to a single point in central London, at a single London rail terminal.
  - One submission presents a series of options of how the rail network can be used to connect different airports and major locations (principally through the HSR2 network).
  - One submission proposed the development of The London Air Rail Transit System to better connect existing airports.
  - One submission proposed the establishment of 'compass point' rail links from Heathrow to the national intercity rail network providing direct high speed services from Heathrow to other UK cities.
- 67 Three submissions proposed increasing the capacity at existing airports through innovation.
- One submission proposed plans for a DTA. It proposed a new design for passenger handling and aircraft turnaround processes.
  - One submission outlines the proposal for an ETS.
  - One submission outlines various planned layouts of an airport which it is suggested would provide a more rational approach to structuring. No particular airport is named.



- 68 Two submissions proposed better use of existing capacity by changing policies at individual airports.
- One submission is an independent assessment of how existing capacity might be more rationally used e.g. re-allocating slots across individual airports and airline operators.
  - One submission presents a proposal for better use of existing capacity. It suggests limited expansion of terminal capacity by 15 million passengers at Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted, Luton and London City. The proposal outlines a London Dispersed Airport Structure without a hub airport.

## Conclusions

- 69 This report illustrates the breadth and complexity of the issues being deliberated upon by the Airports Commission.
- 70 The resources that had been put in place in anticipation of Phase 2 of the Commission's work programme meant it was not particularly unexpected that the Commission has determined there is a need for further aviation capacity provision, meaning that Phase 2 will be proceeded with.
- 71 Positions being formed and publicised by Local Authorities across the country are varied, and often conflicting.
- 72 The SASIG membership must continue being active in the policy development process, seeking strong messages to inform and drive the process.
- 73 Work carried out by the membership to inform their input to the Commission could usefully be maximised upon across the Group.
- 74 The Group's involvement in Phase 2 could be through:
- the commissioning of an external party to evaluate the detailed business cases and sustainability assessments that will be submitted for the shortlisted long-term development options;
  - supplying minimum standards to be met with regard to public engagement, and detailed surface access proposals; and
  - commenting on the draft appraisal framework the Commission shall be publishing for comment alongside their December 2013 Interim Report, for its application to the shortlisted long-term development options.



## SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS FOR LONG TERM OPTIONS PUBLISHED BY THE AIRPORTS COMMISSION (7 AUGUST 2013)

1. The submissions described here and in **Annex C, pg.67**, are the 52 proposals publicly available on the SASIG & Airports Commission websites¹⁸.

### Development at existing airports (sole airport)

#### Heathrow

2. Aras Global - This submission proposes the development of Heathrow Airport with a third runway parallel to the existing Southern runway in the mid-term and a fourth parallel Northern runway in the longer term. The submission also proposed improved surface access to the airport.
3. Centre for Policy Studies - This submission proposes: extending both of the airport's existing runways up to a total length of about 7,000 metres and dividing them so that they each provide two, full-length runways, allowing simultaneous take-offs and landings; providing a new terminal immediately north of Terminal 5; and connecting the airport with the M25 motorway, Crossrail, the Great Western Main Line and, as an option, an alternative HSR2 route via the airport.
4. Heathrow Airport Ltd. - This submission comprises three possible solutions for a third runway and three solutions for a fourth runway. The airport operator's submission outlines options for a runway to either the north, north-west or south-west of the existing airport.
5. Policy Exchange - This submission proposes the building of four parallel runways at Heathrow Airport, arranged in two sets of pairs, immediately to the west of the existing site. These would run above the M25 and Wrybury reservoir. The proposed expansion would mean three terminals, and parallel piers from which planes would depart. The proposal sees the reuse of all existing terminals except Terminal 4. All existing air traffic control, refuelling lines, maintenance and engineering facilities would remain. The Heathrow Express, Crossrail and Piccadilly Lines would continue to serve the airport, and would be extended to reach the new terminal.
6. Private individual - This submission proposes two new runways at Heathrow Airport to the immediate south west of the airport. It suggests the existing runways would be used for westerly landings and easterly take offs, with the new pair being used for easterly landings and westerly take offs. The proposal also includes a suggestion to incorporate operations at RAF Northolt with those at Heathrow, in concert with improved road and rail access between the sites, and to and from each airport.

---

¹⁸<http://www.sasig.org.uk/category/airport-commission/>  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/long-term-options-proposals-received-by-the-airports-commission>

7. Private individual - This submission proposes seven runways for Heathrow. It includes an aerial photo of where the seven runways could be placed.

## **Stansted**

8. First Class Partnership - This submission proposes a new four runway Stansted as a second hub airport in the South East of England. It is suggested this would require construction of a new 45km railway - an extension of Crossrail, from a new surface junction just east of ExCEL (Custom House) to Stansted. The line would run in tunnels for 10km from Excel to Fairlop Water, then 45km on the surface or shallow cutting, mostly alongside the M11 motorway. It will be a 100 mph railway with no new stations required.
9. MAKE Architects - This submission is for a four runway airport at Stansted, with associated surface access improvements:
  - changes to the West Coast Mainline;
  - a new Stansted Express;
  - extending Crossrail 1 and 2;
  - developing a new north to south Crossrail 3;
  - upgrading the 'East Anglia Loop' rail network; and
  - upgrading the road networks, principally the A120 and the M11.
10. Manchester Airports Group (MAG) - This submission proposes that Stansted Airport become a new London hub airport. It suggests initially one new runway could be located either to the east or the north west of the existing runway. In the long-term, three new runways would need to be constructed: two to the east of the current runway, the third to the north west.
11. MSP Solutions – This submission reviews a number of the publicly available proposals, exploring the options presented. The proposer concludes, based on cost and environmental considerations, that there are three options that would most appropriately meet the UK's future aviation capacity needs:
  - allow Heathrow to move to mixed mode operation;
  - build Stansted into a 4-runway hub airport to replace Heathrow which would close;
  - build a Severn Estuary Airport to replace Bristol and Cardiff Airports.The proposer does not indicate whether or not these options are mutually exclusive.

12. Transport for London (TfL) - This submission is for a new four runway airport at Stansted. The new airport would be located adjacent to the existing airport, which is assumed to remain open throughout construction and operation of the new airport. It is assumed that the existing runway and the most north-westerly of the new hub runways would be operated together, in segregated mode. This submission proposes that the traffic at Heathrow Airport would move to the new airport. The proposal states that the existing Heathrow Airport would have a 'different role' but does not specify what that role would be.

## **Luton**

13. Weston Williamson - The submission proposed a new four runway Luton Airport. The new Luton Terminals would be connected directly to the Thameslink rail line and by a light rail spur linking the West Coast Mainline at Tring and the East Coast Mainline at Stevenage. The authors also believe that HSR2 will release capacity from the West Coast Mainline allowing it to serve the airport better.
14. Private individual - This submission proposed that Luton Airport be expanded to a four runway airport which could be incorporated into an extended high-speed rail network by the construction of the 'Midland Express Rail Link': integration of high-speed rail lines 1 & 2; a second north to south high-speed line; Crossrail 1 & 2; and upgrades to the Midland Main Line.

## **Birmingham**

15. Birmingham Airport Ltd. – This submission is would involve development at the existing location, involving one new runway and a new terminal building, integrated with UK Central and HSR2 rail lines. It is proposed that the airport would provide capacity of up to 70 million passengers a year, and runway capacity of up to 500,000 flights per year.

## **Cardiff**

16. Western Gateway – This submission proposed the expansion of Cardiff Airport with an extended runway and improved terminal facilities, supported by a network of high-speed rail links connecting the airport to the rest of the country.

## **Fairoaks**

17. Fairoaks Operations Ltd. – This submission is made on behalf of Fairoaks Operations Limited - the licence holder for & operator of Fairoaks Airport in Chobham. Surrey (a general aviation airport, with a single 800 metre runway). The submission proposed extension of the runway to 1,200 metres, with development of the terminal building and the existing passenger facilities.

## Manston

18. Infratil Airports Ltd. - This submission provided outline proposals for the long-term development of Manston International Airport, increasing the runway length and terminal size, and developing the surface access. The submission proposed that the airport play a role as a long-term 'reliever' airport, which would: serve outbound business and leisure traffic from the south east corner of the region and inbound leisure traffic; target key price sensitive market segments (e.g. carriers displaced from higher cost capacity constrained airports); offer priority tertiary network carriers from Africa, Commonwealth of Independent States¹⁹, and near Asia a foothold in the London airport system while they wait for slots to become available at higher yielding airports; and attract charter carriers and regional carriers serving domestic and business destinations in Europe.

## Development at existing airports (airport pairs or groupings)

### Gatwick

19. Gatwick Airport Ltd. – This submission proposed a 'constellation' approach in which London would be served by three main airports, each with two runways. The submission identifies three southern runway options, each of which would offer different capacity and benefits and give rise to different impacts and effects depending upon their mode of operation: 'dependent segregated mode', 'independent segregated mode', and 'independent mixed mode'.

### Gatwick and Lydd

20. Private individual - This submission proposed additional runways and development of the terminal areas at Gatwick and Lydd Airports, along with stating the need for improved surface access for both airports.

### Heathrow and Stansted

21. Private individual - This submission proposed options for the expansion of Heathrow and Stansted Airports, along with necessary improvements to surface access for both airports. The Heathrow Airport option sees two new runways, one to the north and one to the south of the airport with changes to the operational design. The option for Stansted Airport is for it to be expanded to four or six runways.

---

¹⁹ The Commonwealth of Independent States is a regional organization whose participating countries are former Soviet Republics, formed during the breakup of the Soviet Union.

## Richmond Heathrow Campaign

22. Richmond Heathrow Campaign - This submission proposed limited expansion of terminal capacity by 15 million passengers at Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted, Luton and London City Airports. It further suggested that future forecasts of aviation demand are inflated and unrealistic, meaning that large scale expansion is not necessary. The proposal outlined a 'dispersed London airport' structure without a hub airport. This involves reducing international transfers at Heathrow thus releasing existing airport capacity for around 35 million per year of terminating passengers from the South East of England through to 2050.

## Submissions proposing new airports

### Inner Thames Estuary

23. Foster and Partners - This submission is for a four runway airport on the Isle of Grain on the Hoo Peninsula in Kent, suggested to have the capacity for 110 million passengers per year, and the suggested flexibility to grow to 150 million passengers per year. The submission also proposed cargo and airport support facilities along with multi mode surface access. Under this submission Heathrow Airport would be redeveloped as new housing.
24. Metrotidal Tunnel and Thames Reach Airport - This submission is from joint, independent private sector initiatives: the first a solution to providing a new Lower Thames Tunnel, the second a new hub airport in the Thames Estuary. Thames Reach Airport involves the phased construction of a new 24-hour airport beside the Isle of Grain. This submission does not state whether Heathrow Airport would remain open or close under its proposals.
25. Transport for London (TfL) - This submission is for a new hub airport at the Isle of Grain, approximately 30 miles east of Central London with four runways. The proposal also outlines the provision of rail and road enhancements, making the most of current and planned schemes such as Crossrail, High Speed Rail 1 and 2, and the new 'Lower Thames Crossing' project, as well as building brand new links. This proposal includes the closure of Heathrow Airport.
26. International Aviation Advisory Group (IAAG) - This submission proposed a new airport built in the area of Cliffe, on the western end of the Hoo Peninsula in Kent. The new airport would be called 'London Gateway Airport'. The submission also proposed road, rail and river access to the airport. Under this submission Heathrow Airport would be redeveloped as an 'Eco-City' encompassing new housing, retail and business stock.
27. London Medway Ltd. (collaboration of architects, academics & consultants) - This submission is for a four runway, 24-hour hub airport at on-shore land north of the village of Cliffe in Medway, Kent. The proposal includes high-speed rail links. It is presented as a direct replacement for Heathrow airport. The airport would be estimated to serve up to 140 million people per year.

28. Private individual - This submission proposed the development of 'London Thames Global' Airport in the Thurrock region, connected directly to Heathrow, which it suggests does not need expanding. It proposed that a dedicated high-speed rail shuttle will operate between the two sites. The new proposed site location is an expanded London Gateway Port and Logistic Park site which is currently being developed.

### **Outer Thames Estuary (island or reclaimed land sites)**

29. Beckett Rankine - This submission proposed a new 24-hour airport at Goodwin Sands: a four runway airport with the possibility of eventual expansion to six runways, each 4km long, and 1.5km apart. Plans for new and increased surface access to the airport are included.
30. Private individual - This submission proposed a new airport at Maplin Sands, on an area of reclaimed land in the Thames Estuary. The submission includes enhanced surface access to the surrounding area and directly to the island airport, via road, rail and river.
31. Thames Estuary Research and Development Company - This submission proposed an entirely new airport on a 'man-made' island in the outer Thames Estuary. It suggests that the new six runway, 24-hour 'Britannia Airport' is designed to cater for 172 million passengers a year.
32. Transport for London (TfL) - This submission proposed a new four 4km runway, hub airport in the outer Thames Estuary. Located 50 miles east of Central London, the airport would be built upon a reclaimed island 6km north of Herne Bay. The submission states that the island would be accessed from the west via a causeway/tunnel rail/road link, extending from the Isle of Grain to the airport. The site could also be accessed from the south via a causeway extending from the north Kent coast. Two links would increase surface access options. This proposal includes the closure of Heathrow Airport.

### **Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Northamptonshire**

33. Pleiade Associates - This submission proposed plans for a new four runway airport near Abingdon in Oxfordshire: four 4km runways, terminal capacity for 125 million passengers a year, and a new passenger railway station with eight platforms. This submission does not state whether Heathrow Airport would remain open or close under its proposal.
34. Private individual - This submission proposed a new airport in north Buckinghamshire at Twyford; no details regarding scale or infrastructure were submitted.



## **RAF Croughton, Northamptonshire & Steventon, Oxfordshire**

(see footnotes 9 & 10)

35. Progressive Aviation Group - This submission proposed two options for a new airport, 'London Gateway Airport' option one proposed a new site to be built to the south of Brackley with rail spurs to the proposed HSR2 line (providing track capacity allows) and to Aynho Junction which has direct rail links to: London Paddington, Reading, Oxford & the Birmingham line, plus the Chiltern railway line from London to Birmingham. It further proposed that the nearby RAF Upper Heyford could be the main car park and freight centre. The submission also proposed an option two: for the new airport to be built adjacent to the Great Western Main Line between Swindon and Reading. It proposed that the area to the south of the mainline could be used for the related airport infrastructure, supported by three enhanced national rail links.

## **Severn Estuary**

36. MSP Solutions - This submission proposed a new 'Sevenside Airport' be built in the Severn Estuary to replace the existing Bristol and Cardiff airports. The proposed airport would be planned to span part of the M4 motorway and the London-South Wales railway connection.
37. Private individual - This submission proposed a new two runway international hub airport be located in the Severn Estuary, 'Severn24'. The new airport would be built on intertidal mud-flats beyond the navigable channels serving Bristol. The proposal suggests development of the existing M4 along with national and suburban rail.

## **Kent and Sussex**

38. Private individual - This submission proposed a dispersed hub system of airports across London, including a new 'London East Airport'. It is proposed that air traffic with destinations to and from the north and east would leave from Stansted; air traffic with destinations to and from the south would leave from Gatwick. Air traffic with destinations to and from Asia and some parts of Europe would leave from the new 2 runway medium sized 'London East Airport', within a triangle of three existing motorways - east of the M25, south of the M20, and north of the M26. Heathrow would be used to fly to and from the Americas. All would require enhanced surface access.
39. Private individual - This submission proposed a four runway airport be built at Walland Marsh between Rye and Dungeness.

## **Essex**

40. Flagship Concepts - This submission proposed a major new airport in Foulness, which it states would accommodate 100m -200m passengers per year.

## Surface access required in advance of on-airport development

41. Avery Water Schabas - This submission outlines a plan to extend Crossrail to Stansted and develop the rail network infrastructure, and then suggests that the airport be expanded to replace Heathrow.
42. Kent County Council - This submission estimates that 210m passengers per year a could be accommodated by the expansion of existing London airports; along with better utilisation of regional airport capacity in the South East of England at Southend, Manston and Lydd airports in Kent, for point to point flights. UK capacity could be increased to 280m passengers per year if an expanded Birmingham Airport serves the London/South East market with HSR2 connection. The proposer considers this additional capacity and the connectivity it provides would meet the UK's aviation needs without a new hub airport.

## Improving surface access between existing airports

43. Interlinking Transit Solution Ltd. - This submission proposed that existing airport infrastructure can be better connected to solve capacity issues. The submission proposed development of the London Air Rail Transit System – what it describes as ‘surface access project that can be combined with other strategic aviation measures to increase aviation and rail capacity and maintain London’s hub status’. It is proposed that rapid rail would link airports and the existing rail network.
44. Greengauge 21 - This submission proposed a series of options for how the rail network can be used to connect different airports and major locations (principally through the HSR2 network).
45. Grimshaw Architects - This submission proposed utilising existing provision across five airports (Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted, Luton and London City), to create a 'London Hub City'. The proposal also called for improvements to the transport infrastructure of London.
46. Private individual - This submission proposed enhanced rail connections between five London airports (Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted, Luton and London City) treating them as a single system and linking them with a high-speed underground orbital railway.
47. Private individual - This submission proposed a magnetic rail or MAGLEV track alongside, or over the M25, with spurs connecting five London airports (Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted, Luton and London City).
48. Private individual - This submission proposed that multiple airports in the South East of England be connected by fast rail links to a single point in central London. The key concept in this submission is the creation of a single London rail terminal (an air passenger portal in the centre of London), connected by dedicated links to each airport. Air travellers go to (or arrive at) the same place – the universal hub – regardless of which airline/airport they use, getting a dedicated fast transit to their flight.

49. Quaestus (Poppleton) Ltd - This submission proposed to establish 'compass point' rail links from Heathrow Airport to the national intercity rail network - connecting national high-speed rail services into the 'compass point' - providing direct high-speed services from Heathrow to all primary UK regional cities. It further proposed to extend these links southwards from Heathrow by means of a dedicated high-speed rail route to Gatwick and beyond, to facilitate multi-site hub operation between the two airports.

### **Increasing the capacity at existing airports through innovation**

50. Büro für MEHR - This submission proposed plans for a 'drive-through airport' (DTA): a new design for passenger handling and aircraft turnaround processes. The design of DTA focuses on passenger flows and on operational and aircraft handling processes.
51. Exhaustless - This submission outlines the proposal for an 'exhaustless takeoff system' (ExTS): combining existing technologies using the power from the electric grid to accelerate unmodified commercial airplanes, thereby reducing the amount of jet fuel burned, and noise generated, from takeoff. The submission does not suggest any airports at which the system should be developed.
52. Private individual - This submission describes various planned layouts of an airport which it is suggested would provide a more rational approach to use of the infrastructure. No particular airport is named.

### **Better use of existing capacity by changing policy**

53. Imperial College, London - This submission is an assessment of how existing capacity might be more rationally used, e.g. re-allocating slots across individual private airports and airline operators. The submission suggests that a dispersed hub system, incorporating a number of two runway airports would be adequate to meet the UK's aviation needs.



Annex B

**Airports Commission - Indicative Phase 2 Timeline (subject to the conclusions of the Interim Report)**

Date		Commission Milestone or Activity	Consultation	Potential Sponsor Activities	
2013	Dec	Phase 2 appraisal framework published alongside interim report	Commission invites comments on the Phase 2 appraisal framework	Comment on Phase 2 appraisal framework	
2014	Jan	Work collaboratively with sponsors in enhancing and refining details of schemes	Appraisal framework finalised	Work collaboratively with the Commission in compiling assessments	Enhance and refine details of schemes
	Feb				
	Mar				
	Apr	Conduct Phase 2 assessments, compile assessment results and construct detailed business case and sustainability assessment for each option			
	May				
	Jun				
	Jul				
	Aug				
	Sept				
	Oct				
Nov					
Dec			Public consultation on the compiled assessments	Engage with the Commission's public consultation	
2015		Formulate recommendation and undertake any further assessments to support the Government in accelerating any future planning applications			



**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS FOR LONG-TERM OPTIONS PUBLISHED BY THE AIRPORTS COMMISSION (7 AUGUST 2013)**

Location	Proposer	At new or existing airport?	Number of runways		Capacity		Runway length (metres)
			Proposed new	Total	mppa ²⁰	ATMs ²⁰	
Heathrow Airport	Aras Global	Existing	Up to 2	Up to 4	Up to 130 per hour	Up to 702,000	3,660
Heathrow Airport	Centre for Policy Studies	Existing	0 (extending existing runways)	2 extended and divided	Not given	Up to 900,000	Each developed up to 7,000 and then divided
Heathrow Airport	Heathrow Airport Ltd	Existing	Up to 2	Up to 4	Up to 130	Up to 740,000	3,500
Heathrow Airport	Policy Exchange	Existing	2	4	Up to 140	Up to 605,000	Up to 3,000
Heathrow Airport	Private individual ¹	Existing	2	4	Not given	Not given	2,438
Heathrow Airport	Private individual ²	Existing	Up to 5	Up to 7	Not given	Not given	Not given
Stansted Airport	First Class Partnership	Existing	Up to 3	Up to 4	Up to 160	Not given	Not given
Stansted Airport	MAKE Architects	Existing	3	4	120	Not given	Not given
Stansted Airport	Manchester Airports Grp	Existing	Up to 2	Up to 3	Up to 160	Up to 264,000	Not given

²⁰ 1,000's unless stated otherwise; mppa = million passengers per annum; ATMs = air transport movements.

Location	Proposer	At new or existing airport?	Number of runways		Capacity		Runway length (metres)
			Proposed new	Total	mppa ²⁰	ATMs ²⁰	
Stansted Airport	MSP Solutions	Existing	3	4	Not given	Not given	Not given
Stansted Airport	Transport for London	Existing	4	4	Up to 180	1 million	4,000
Luton Airport	Weston Williamson	Existing	Up to 3	Up to 4	Not given	Not given	Not given
Luton Airport	Private individual	Existing	3	4	Not given	Not given	Not given
Birmingham Airport	Birmingham Airport Ltd.	Existing	1	2	70	500	Not given
Cardiff Airport	Western Gateway	Existing	0	1	Up to 20	Not given	2,743
Fairoaks Airport	Fairoaks Operations Ltd.	Existing	0 (extending existing runway)	1	Not given	Not given	1,200
Gatwick Airport	Gatwick Airport Ltd.	Existing	1	2	Up to 87	Not given	Not given
Manston Airport	Infratil Airports Ltd	Existing	0 (extending existing runway)	1	Up to 18	Up to 160	2,700
Gatwick and Lydd Airports	Private individual	Existing	1 at Gatwick, 2 at Lydd	2 at Gatwick, 3 at Lydd	Not given	Not given	Not given



Location	Proposer	At new or existing airport?	Number of runways		Capacity		Runway length (metres)
			Proposed new	Total	mppa ²⁰	ATMs ²⁰	
Heathrow and Stansted Airports	Private individual	Existing	Up to 2 at Heathrow, up to 4 at Stansted	Up to 4 at Heathrow, up to 6 at Stansted	Not given	Up to 160 ²¹ per hour at Heathrow, not given at Stansted	Up to 4,000
Isle of Grain, 'Thames Hub Airport'	Foster and Partners	New	Up to 4	Up to 4	Up to 150	800	Not given
Isle of Grain, 'Thames Reach Airport'	Metrotidal Tunnel and Thames Reach	New	Up to 4	Up to 4	Not given	Not given	9,250
Isle of Grain	Transport for London	New	4	4	Up to 180	1 million	4,000
Cliffe, 'London Gateway Airport'	International Aviation Advisory Group	New	Not given	Not given	Not given	Not given	Not given
Cliffe, 'London Medway Airport'	London Medway Ltd.	New	4	Not given	Up to 140	Not given	Not given
Thurrock, 'London Thames Global Airport'	Private individual	New	1	1	35	Not given	Not given

²¹ Approximately 140 movements per hour estimated to achieve 600,000 mppa.

Location	Proposer	At new or existing airport?	Number of runways		Capacity		Runway length (metres)
			Proposed new	Total	mppa ²⁰	ATMs ²⁰	
Outer Thames Estuary, Goodwin Sands	Beckett Rankine	New	Up to 6	Up to 6	90	Not given	4,000
Outer Thames Estuary, Maplin Sands	Private individual	New	4	4	Not given	Not given	4,426
Outer Thames Estuary, 'Britannia Airport'	Thames Estuary Research and Development Company	New	Up to 6	Up to 6	Up to 172	Up to 1,134	Not given
Outer Thames Estuary	Transport for London	New	4	4	Up to 180	1 million	4,000
Oxfordshire, Abingdon	Pleiade Associates	New	4	4	Up to 125	Up to 720	4,000
Oxfordshire, Twyford	Private individual	New	Not given	Not given	Not given	Not given	Not given
RAF Croughton and Stevenon, 'London Gateway Airport'	Progressive Aviation Group	New	4 at either option	4 at either option	Not given	Not given	4,000
River Severn Estuary, 'Sevenside'	MSP Solutions	New	1	1	Up to 45.5	Not given	4,000

Location	Proposer	At new or existing airport?	Number of runways		Capacity		Runway length (metres)
			Proposed new	Total	mppa ²⁰	ATMs ²⁰	
River Severn Estuary, 'Severn 24'	Private individual	New	2	2	Up to 60	Not given	4,000
Kent, 'London East Airport'	Private individual	New	2	2	Not given	Not given	Not given
Kent and Sussex, Walland Marsh	Private individual	New	Not given	Not given	Not given	Not given	Not given
Essex, Foulness	Flagship Concepts	New	4	4	Up to 200	Not given	Not given



## ITEM 7: NATIONAL AVIATION POLICY UPDATE

### Recommendation

To note the current focus of debate around national aviation policy.

### Glossary

AC	Airports Commission
ACI	Airports Council International
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
ARC	Airport Regions Conference ( <a href="http://www.airportregions.org">www.airportregions.org</a> )
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority
CEMR(CCRE)	Council of European Municipalities and Regions ( <a href="http://www.ccre.org">www.ccre.org</a> )
Defra	Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs
ERAA	European Regions Airlines Association
LAQM	Local Air Quality Management
LGA	Local Government Association
mppa	million passengers per annum
NEWP	Natural Environment White Paper
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PHOF	Public Health Outcomes Framework
SGEI	Services of General Economic Interest
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union



## Executive Summary

- 1 The UK **Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)** was given **new information provision duties** in the Civil Aviation Act 2012: to make information about services and facilities available for aviation consumers; and to make information about the environmental performance of the aviation sector publicly available. The CAA was also given new powers to obtain the information to meet the duties.
- 2 The CAA consulted on its new information powers between 31 May and 31 August 2013. SASIG was represented at a stakeholder event as part of that consultation, at which the main points of discussion were:
  - evidence is missing that shows provision of environmental impact information – particularly noise information – is an important factor in people’s purchasing decisions;
  - the CAA’s information requirements must not conflict with the information requirements of aviation regulators in other jurisdictions;
  - the CAA’s information requirements must not conflict with other national and international regulations and legislation;
  - the disproportionate focus on provision of information to consumers for the purpose of comparing purchases means there is a risk the duty to provide information about aviation’s environmental impact might get overlooked;
  - the CAA needs to be clear whether they are trying to incentivise particular behaviour changes or just inform the public;
  - research to date might be skewed towards the experiences of residents close to the major London airports and may not reflect the experiences of people living close to smaller regional airports; and
  - the CAA should consider whether or not its information requirements could put UK-based companies at a competitive disadvantage because companies operating under other regulatory regimes may not face mandatory disclosure requirements.
- 3 The European Commission published a **draft of revised State Aid rules** for the public funding of airports and start-up aid to airlines earlier this year. The main provisions of the proposed guidelines were: State Aid for investment in airport infrastructure is allowed if there is a genuine transport need and the public support is necessary to ensure the accessibility of a region; operating aid to airports will be allowed for a transitional period of 10 years under certain conditions; and start-up aid to airlines to launch a new air route is permitted provided it remains limited in time. The Commission invited comments on these revisions between 3 July 2013 and 25 September 2013.
- 4 In response, the UK Local Government Association drafted a submission for the Council of European Municipalities and Regions ([www.ccre.org](http://www.ccre.org)), stating:
  - the Commission’s guidelines should be much more strategic, much less detailed, and much more ‘light touch’, only focusing on those large-scale aid cases that truly distort competition;
  - the transitional period after which operating aid to airports must cease is too short;  
.....continues.....

- insufficient weight is given to the economic growth and job creation benefits of aviation as pursued in line with the Europe 2020 goals; and
- all airports with less than 1 million passengers per annum should be exempt from the guidelines as a whole (achieved via a de minimis provision or a block exemption).

- 5 The **Air Quality Management regime is under review** by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (Defra), on the basis that focus should be directed towards compliance with EU limit values, due to the considerable financial penalties incurred through non-compliance. Defra considers that in order to achieve, this, Local Authority resource should no longer be applied to regular reviews and assessments of air quality in their area.
- 6 Such monitoring is however statutory, Councils have argued in response, on the basis that reviews and assessments are a statutory duty, and these cannot be completed without monitoring.
- 7 Defra proposed that reliance be placed a strategic air quality model, which respondents have highlighted as deficient due to not picking up local 'hotspots', such as existing Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs).

#### **Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) information powers**

- 8 On 19 December 2012 the Civil Aviation Act 2012 became law. As part of the new Act, the UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) was given two new duties to make publicly available information about: services and facilities for aviation consumers, and the environmental performance of the aviation sector. Along with these powers, the CAA was also given new powers to obtain the information to meet the duties.
- 9 The relevant parts of the Act are sections 83 to 93, the provisions of which are discussed below; Section 84 refers to information about the environmental performance of the aviation sector. (The full Act is available online: Civil Aviation Act 2012, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/19/enacted>)

#### **Information for the benefit of users of air transport services**

- 10 For consumers, the CAA must publish, or arrange for others to publish, such information as it feels is appropriate to assist users of air transport (passengers and those with a right in property carried by air) to compare services and facilities. The CAA may also publish guidance with a view to improving standards.

#### **Environmental information**

- 11 On the environment, the CAA must publish, or arrange for others to publish, such information as it feels is appropriate relating to the environmental effects of civil aviation in the UK. Again, the CAA may publish guidance with a view to mitigating adverse environmental effects.



- 12 In both cases, the CAA may specify the form and manner of publication by others and may conduct or fund related research; there is an enforcement regime, including powers to obtain information; and in addition, the Act states that the CAA must publish a Statement of Policy for carrying out these functions and in doing so must have regard to the principle that the benefits of carrying out the functions should outweigh any adverse effects.
- 13 As part of the preparation to deliver these powers, the CAA has followed a variety of work streams looking at what is considered to be of most importance with regard to airport and airline environmental performance.

### Stakeholder engagement

- 14 The CAA consulted on its proposed Statement of Policy for the use of its information powers between 31 May 2013 and 31 August 2013¹.
- 15 As part of this consultation, the CAA held a stakeholder event on 22 July 2013², with the aim of: updating current thinking on the use of the CAA's information powers; giving stakeholders the opportunity to informally discuss the CAA's approach; and ensuring that the CAA understands any concerns of stakeholders.
- 16 SASIG was kindly represented at the stakeholder event by Rob Gibson, Environmental Strategy Manager, London Borough of Hounslow, and Wendy Rousell, Airport Planning Officer, Luton Borough Council.
- 17 The CAA outlined their proposals for the provision of information about noise; carbon emissions; flight reliability; Passengers with Reduced Mobility (PRMs); and airline and airport price supplements. The CAA has also held bilateral meetings with stakeholders who were unable to attend the stakeholder event.
- 18 The main points arising were:
- Clarity was needed about why the CAA was proposing to provide consumers with environmental impact information – particularly noise information – when it was felt that evidence is missing that shows this is an important factor in people's purchasing decisions.
  - The CAA needed to set out in fuller detail how it will ensure it adheres to 'better regulation' principles when discharging its duties under the Act, particularly in light of the new Accountability for Regulator Impact (ARI) initiative³. Furthermore, the CAA should ensure the benefits of information provision are not undermined by providing people with too much information as this could confuse them and lead to suboptimal outcomes. ....continues.....

¹ 'Better information about UK aviation: Consultation on the CAA's new publication duties' (CAP 1037), [www.caa.co.uk/default.aspx?catid=2608&pageid=14772](http://www.caa.co.uk/default.aspx?catid=2608&pageid=14772)

² Stakeholder event – 'Consultation on the CAA's new publication powers (CAP 1037)', 22 July 2013, CAA summary of key points made by stakeholders, [www.caa.co.uk/default.aspx?catid=2608&pageid=15056](http://www.caa.co.uk/default.aspx?catid=2608&pageid=15056)

³ Department for Business, Innovation & Skills and Intellectual Property Office, 'Expectations for engagement by national non-economic regulators about the impact on business of changes in regulatory policy and practice', published 19 July 2013, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/regulator-impact-accountability-guidance>

- Due to aviation being a global business, the CAA needed to consider the interplay between national and international regulations and legislation, and how this might affect companies and consumers. Some delegates pointed out that there was already extensive European regulation covering the display of prices and businesses. Similarly, there is a risk that CAA's information requirements could conflict with the information requirements of aviation regulators in other jurisdictions and this could result in consumers being confused. For example, the UK is not the only aviation regulator engaged with the provision of environmental information to passengers – France also requires this.
- The consultation seemed disproportionately focused on the provision of information to consumers to help them compare products and services, meaning there was a risk that the duty to provide information about aviation's environmental impact might get lost.
- There were questions about the appropriate role of the regulator – that the consultation presented a confused picture where the CAA was proposing to directly provide information, drive best practice and/or facilitate information provision at a local level. Delegates felt that the CAA needed to be clear whether they were trying to incentivise particular behaviour changes or just inform the public.
- Some airline operator representatives said that the consultation lacked a hard-headed analysis of detriment – for each proposal it was felt that the CAA needed to be clearer about the market failure it was trying to address. It was further felt that clarity was also needed on what type of behaviours the CAA was trying to influence through its proposals, and whether or not a lack of information in different areas was potentially harmful to consumers' interests.
- An airport operator representative raised concern about the research carried out by MVA Consultancy on the information needs of people living near airports. They said that findings might be skewed towards the experiences of residents close to the major London airports and may not reflect the experiences of people living close to smaller regional airports.
- Some representatives expressed concern that the CAA should consider whether or not its information requirements could put UK-based companies at a competitive disadvantage because companies operating under other regulatory regimes may not face mandatory disclosure requirements.

## Revision of European State Aid guidelines for aviation

- 19 European Union Member States' public funding of airport and airline operators is currently assessed under the 1994 and 2005 Aviation Guidelines. The 1994 Aviation Guidelines were adopted in the context of the liberalisation of the market for air transport services and contain provisions for assessing social and restructuring aid to airline operators in order to provide a level playing field for air carriers. They were complemented in 2005 by guidelines on the public financing of airports and on the start-up of airline services from regional airports.
- 20 Neither set of guidelines has an expiry clause, but in view of the significant market changes that have taken place in the last decade, the Commission has initiated a review.
- 21 A first public consultation in 2011 aimed to determine whether or not a revision would be necessary. The main conclusions were:
- The existing guidelines need to be reviewed to take account of market developments.
  - Stakeholders emphasised the need for more clarity and active enforcement of the applicable rules.
  - In particular, the rules for the financing of airports need to become more transparent.
  - Stakeholders sought more guidance on the application of State Aid rules to rebates or other advantages granted by regional airport operators to certain airline operators and considered that rules concerning start-up aid should be simplified.
- 22 The European Commission published a draft of revised State Aid rules for the public funding of airport operations and start-up aid to airline operators earlier this year⁴. The main provisions of the proposed guidelines were:
- State Aid for investment in airport infrastructure is allowed if there is a genuine transport need and the public support is necessary to ensure the accessibility of a region. Whereas the current guidelines leave open the issue of investment aid intensities, the revised draft rules define maximum permissible aid intensities depending on the size of an airport, in order to ensure the right mix between public and private investment. The possibilities to grant aid are therefore higher for smaller airports than for larger airports.
  - For operating aid to airport operators, which is not allowed under the current guidelines, the Commission proposes to allow such aid for a transitional period of 10 years under certain conditions, in order to give airport operators time to adjust their business model. Operating aid will decrease during this period. The path will depend on the financial situation of each airport operator.
  - Start-up aid to airline operators to launch a new air route is permitted provided it remains limited in time. In the draft new guidelines, the compatibility conditions for start-up aid to airline operators have been streamlined and adapted to recent market developments.

---

⁴ [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-639_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-639_en.htm)

- 23 The draft of revised State Aid rules reflect the principles of the Commission's agenda for State Aid Modernisation⁵ - State Aid policy should focus on facilitating well-designed aid aimed at boosting economic growth and furthering other objectives of common European interest, while discouraging harmful aid that either does not bring real value added and/or creates distortions to competition in the Single Market.
- 24 The guidelines take stock of the new legal and economic situation concerning the public financing of airport operators and airline operators and specify the conditions under which such public financing may constitute State Aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ('TFEU'), and when it does constitute State Aid, the conditions under which such aid can be declared compatible with the internal market.

### Consultation

- 25 The Commission invited comments on these revisions between 3 July 2013 and 25 September 2013.
- 26 A draft response from the Council of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR)⁶ was circulated to SASIG in August by Dominic Rowles at the Local Government Association (LGA) in Brussels, for comment from the SASIG membership.
- 27 The LGA held discussions with the European Commission in Brussels and Department for Transport leads. Meetings were also held with the Airports Council International (ACI), European Regions Airlines Association (ERAA), and the Airport Regions Conference (ARC) who were critical of the proposals.
- 28 The final CEMR response indicated:
- the Commission's proposal for a ban on operating aid after a transitional period is unrealistic, as many airports will require an element of public support, even beyond the proposed transitional period, in order to continue contributing to their local economy;
  - the Commission's approach to state aid assessment does not appear to give sufficient weight to the economic growth and job creation benefits of aviation as pursued in line with the Europe 2020 goals;
  - to avoid their closure, and to allow a more flexible regime for smaller airports, all airports with less than 1 million passengers per annum should be exempt from the guidelines as a whole (achieved via a de minimis provision or a block exemption);

.....continues.....

---

⁵ [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-458_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-458_en.htm)

⁶ The Council of European Municipalities and Regions is the largest organisation of local and regional Governments in Europe. Its members are national associations of towns, municipalities and regions from 39 countries. Together these associations represent about 100,000 local and regional Authorities. CEMR brings together the LGA with similar associations representing local and regional Government across the EU. The UK LGA was nominated to produce the first draft consultation response on behalf of the CEMR ([www.ccre.org](http://www.ccre.org)).

- it is vital that local and regional Authorities maintain the right to organise airports of all sizes as Services of General Economic Interest (SGEI) (in line with Article 106.2 & Protocol 26 TFEU) bringing vital connectivity to local communities and businesses; SGEI designation is especially justified in remote or peripheral regions;
- democratically elected local and regional Governments are best placed to decide on the use of their own taxpayers' funds in their own regions; in many cases the wider regional development benefits will far outweigh the cost of the public contribution to the airport – and will also contribute to an extended market; and
- the Commission's guidelines should therefore be much more strategic, much less detailed, and much more 'light touch', only focusing on those large-scale aid cases that truly distort competition.

### **Defra Local Air Quality Management Review and review of The Clean Air Act (1993)**

- 29 The law relating to air quality is continually evolving and is produced with the aim of ensuring that emissions released into the atmosphere remain at a level that does not damage health.
- 30 The main controls on air pollution are established in the Environmental Protection Act 1990. This aims to prevent pollution from emissions to air, land and water and is further emphasised in the Environment Act 1995, under Part IV sections 80-91. The introduction of European legislation in the form of Directives, Regulations and Decisions has further strengthened the legislation on air pollution.
- 31 The Clean Air Act 1993 regulates the release of smoke from industrial, commercial premises and chimneys. This Act gives Local Authorities the power to designate smoke controlled areas. Failure to comply with the provisions of the Act is an offence.
- 32 The Environment Act 1995 and associated regulations established the Local Air Quality Monitoring (LAQM), under which all Local Authorities in England, Wales and Scotland are required to regularly review and assess air quality in their areas against objectives for several pollutants of particular concern for human health. If this work indicates that any objective will not be achieved by the required date, the authority concerned must declare an air quality management area and produce an action plan outlining how it intends to tackle the issues identified. Local Authorities carry out reviews and assessments of air quality in their area every three years. This is done against standards and objectives in the national Air Quality Strategy which have been prescribed in regulations for the purpose of LAQM.
- 33 During the intermediate years, the Local Authority is required to submit an Annual Progress Report. This evaluation was introduced to maintain continuity in the LAQM process. They fill the gaps between the three-yearly requirement to undertake an Updating and Screening Assessment. If a sufficient risk of an exceedance of an air quality objective has been highlighted, a Detailed Assessment for this location(s) is required and not relayed until the next round of Review and Assessment.

## Policy review and consultation

- 34 LAQM has been in operation since 1997 but has not been comprehensively reviewed during that time. The Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) feel that there such a review is overdue and that the system could be improved in a number of ways to increase its effectiveness in the context of present challenges. On this basis DEFRA launched 'an options consultation' - the first stage of what the Department describe as a two part exercise on the best way to address shortcomings identified in Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) delivery in England, between 12 July and 30 August 2013.
- 35 Defra feels that it has proven difficult to quantify the impacts and effectiveness of measures introduced to improve air quality and very few Authorities have been able to revoke any Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) as a result of their interventions.
- 36 Furthermore, Defra believes that LAQM is very administrative, driven by report and diagnosis requirements, and that the focus should be shifted from local assessment and reporting on to compliance with EU limit values.
- 37 Meeting health based EU limits for air quality involves significant challenges and there is a considerable financial risk associated with infraction.
- 38 Defra believes there is a need to reinvigorate and refocus LAQM on action to help the UK meet EU air quality standards; to clarify its role alongside other actions to improve air quality (by national Government, etc.); and to highlight what Local Authorities can do through working together to improve air quality.

## Next steps

- 39 Defra is currently analysing feedback to the local air quality management (LAQM) review and will compile a summary of responses which will be published at a later date.
- 40 Subsequent to this, Defra will undertake a second-stage consultation and impact assessment to determine any costs to businesses and others, subject to which option or variation of options the Government proposes to implement.

## Review of the Clean Air Act 1993

- 41 Under the same work stream, Defra is currently undertaking a policy review of the Clean Air Act 1993 in England⁷, in accordance with their commitments under the Red Tape Challenge⁸, and is calling for evidence to support the review. The purpose is to seek views on the evidence base and for submitters to provide additional evidence based on experience and knowledge of the Act.
- 42 There are three main objectives of the review: (i) reducing burdens on business and Local Authorities; (ii) making environmental rules and regulations more user friendly; and (iii) maintaining the quality of environmental regulations. The consultation is currently open and runs from 3 September to 29 October 2013.

---

⁷ <https://consult.Defra.gov.uk/atmosphere-local-environment-team/clean-air-act-review>

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/red-tape-challenge-environment-theme-proposals>



## Relevant policies

- The Natural Environment White Paper⁹ (2011; NEWP) sets out the UK Government vision for the natural environment over the next 50 years, including for air quality and noise and nuisance.
- The National Planning Policy Framework¹⁰ (2012; NPPF) explains the social and environmental roles the planning system must play, including helping to minimise pollution and improve biodiversity.
- The new Public Health Outcomes Framework¹¹ (PHOF) published by the Department of Health in 2012, includes air quality and noise among the main determinants of public health.

## Conclusions

### Civil Aviation Authority – new information powers

- 43 The feedback from the CAA stakeholder event reflected the fact that the CAA is currently considering the best and most appropriate way to implement and use the new powers.
- 44 The CAA has stated they are aware that the powers have to be applied proportionately to comply with other guidelines and regulations. They are also aware of the need to avoid duplicating interventions and initiatives that airport and airline operators are already undertaking. The CAA is also aware that they are trying to implement these powers against competing priorities within the aviation industry.
- 45 It is unclear whether or not the CAA is seeking to change the behaviour of aviation consumers, or simply provide them with information. The opportunity to progress the noise management and reduction regime through the CAA's environmental information provision powers is not being grasped.

### EU revision of aviation State Aid guidelines

- 46 The European Local Authority group, Council of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR), through which the Local Government Association (LGA) works in Europe, believes that the EU revised State Aid rules for the funding of airport operations (investment, start-up, and operating aid) are too strict, and that the guidelines incorrectly assume that operators of smaller airports can easily reach profitability without public support (even beyond the transitional period proposed).
- 47 The CEMR has stressed that Local Authorities should be allowed flexibility to decide on local expenditure of public funds, taking account of the connectivity and economic development benefits airports bring locally.

---

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/natural-environment-white-paper-implementation-updates>

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

¹¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/healthy-lives-healthy-people-improving-outcomes-and-supporting-transparency>

- 48 The CEMR has proposed that airports operating below 1 million passengers per annum (mppa) should be exempt from the guidelines as a whole.
- 49 The right to organise airports of all sizes as Services of General Economic Interest (SGEI) should be maintained by local and regional Authorities (in line with the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), Article 106.2 & Protocol 26).
- 50 Ultimately, the CEMR recommended that the Commission's guidelines should be directed only at large-scale aid cases that truly distort competition.

### **Defra Review of Local Air Quality Management (LAQM)**

- 51 Defra feels that it has proven difficult to quantify the impacts and effectiveness of measures introduced to improve air quality and very few Authorities have been able to revoke any Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) as a result of their interventions.
- 52 Furthermore, Defra believes that LAQM is very administrative, driven by report and diagnosis requirements, and that the focus should be shifted from local assessment and reporting on to compliance with EU limit values.
- 53 Meeting health based EU limits for air quality involves significant challenges and there is a considerable financial risk associated with infraction.
- 54 Defra believes there is a need to reinvigorate and refocus LAQM on action to help the UK meet EU air quality standards; to clarify its role alongside other actions to improve air quality (by national Government, etc.); and to highlight what Local Authorities can do through working together to improve air quality.
- 55 However, abandonment of the routine assessment of local air quality undermines action being taken to improve air quality, meaning data collection, review and monitoring must continue, not cease as proposed by Defra.

Contact Officers: Anna Mahoney, SASIG Director; Mark Mason, SASIG Information Officer  
Tel.: (020) 8541 9459 / 07968 832 687 Email: [sasig@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:sasig@surreycc.gov.uk)  
Web: [www.sasig.org.uk](http://www.sasig.org.uk) Date: 14 October 2013



## ITEM 8: AIRPORTS COMMISSION DISCUSSION PAPER - 'NOISE'

**(RESPONSE SUBMITTED - 16 SEPTEMBER 2013)**

### Recommendation

That this response to the Airports Commission be used by the SASIG membership in local conversations to progress and improve noise management and reduction, for instance, through Airport Consultative Committees (ACCs).

### Introduction

- 1 This report supplies the Group's response to the Airports Commission Discussion Paper (No. 5) – 'Noise'.

### Discussion

- 2 In this response to their Discussion Paper, SASIG recommended that the Commission consider aviation noise impacts an integral element of looking at the UK aviation industry. It believes that a greater understanding of the community response to aviation noise is an essential prerequisite for an improved aviation noise management and reduction regime.
- 3 The metrics used to describe noise impacts on which noise management policy is founded must more accurately cover the affected populations, and illustrate the burden of aircraft noise. Additional metrics and means of illustration should be applied in policy-making. SASIG's response considers these issues in detail.
- 4 Alongside improving description and presentation of aviation noise, incentives and disincentives must be improved and applied in the form of higher landing charges, and more generous mitigation and compensation schemes.
- 5 SASIG also highlighted important omissions from the Discussion Paper requiring the attention of the Commission, i.e. ground noise and noise from helicopters.

### Conclusion

- 6 SASIG recommended to the Commission that the Government resource annual surveys on the issue of aviation noise capable of supporting policy-making.
- 7 SASIG also commended that where clear gaps have been identified in the evidence needed to inform policy-making, not only should these gaps be filled, but there should be a presumption in favour of the precautionary approach, applied relevant to each situation, in order to account for this lack of information.

~~~~~

SASIG RESPONSE

AIRPORTS COMMISSION DISCUSSION PAPER - ‘NOISE’

Introduction

- 1 SASIG – the Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group of the Local Government Association – represents its membership of Local Authorities with an interest in strategic aviation issues.
- 2 These Local Authorities neighbour or contain an airport, forming the only major alliance in the country that brings together communities comprising airport users and non-users, airport and airline staff, and encompassing all political parties. This gives SASIG an authoritative voice on airport policy that no other group can claim.
- 3 SASIG welcomes this opportunity to respond to the Airports Commission’s Discussion Paper (No. 5) – ‘Noise’. This submission follows the headings used in the Discussion Paper; the questions posed by the Commission are detailed at **Annex A (pg.99)** where those that are addressed in this response are indicated.

Executive Summary

- 4 As set out in submissions SASIG has already supplied to the Commission, assessment of existing, and any new, aviation capacity must be predicated on an improved economic assessment such that a comprehensive, agreed methodology for calculating the economic value – in its fullest context, yields robust output for capturing the assessed economic gain.
- 5 In the context of aviation noise, such an improved economic methodology would inform the extent to which economic benefits can be maximised as it would have taken account of:
 - compulsory purchase of properties, along with the associated loss of community;
 - opportunity costs of sterilised land, i.e. reduced or zero development potential due to noise impacts;
 - mitigation & compensation payments for noise impacts; and
 - social cost of noise-induced health and welfare impacts.
- 6 This makes aviation noise impacts an integral element of looking at the UK aviation industry – not an after-thought to simply be dealt with through mitigation and compensation.
- 7 A greater understanding of the community response to aviation noise is an essential prerequisite for an improved aviation noise management and reduction regime. We recommend that the Government resource annual studies in order to inform, educate, advise and report this relationship, supplying robust annual surveys capable of supporting policy-making.

- 8 In this context, the 'Government' should at least include the Department for Transport (DfT), Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (Defra), Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and Department of Health (DoH). In addition, an appropriate way in which to involve the Research Councils and academic institutions should be considered.
- 9 At minimum, liaison with other Government Departments – Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS), Department of Work & Pensions (DWP) and HM Treasury (HMT) - is needed on the social and economic costs of aviation noise.
- 10 The metrics used to describe noise impacts on which noise management policy is founded must more accurately cover the affected populations, and illustrate the burden of aircraft noise. SASIG welcomes acceptance by the Government and the Commission that more people are annoyed by lower levels of aircraft noise than was previously understood to be the case.<sup>1</sup>
- 11 Noise representation and analysis must be based on use of the ‘worst mode’ operations, as people hear each individual event and reply when questioned about their response to noise on the basis of the most disturbing, intrusive, disruptive events. Beneficial features such as regular, predictable periods of respite, operational techniques such as alternation of runway usage, etc. are valuable; however, they do not adequately address the negative impacts on people of aviation noise exposure.
- 12 Additional research is supplied for the Commission that shows the way in which levels of aircraft noise annoyance are underestimated by the current assessment process for airspace change processes; and the aims of the Government’s social response project, ANASE, that remain unaddressed.
- 13 Additional research is also supplied in the form of a recently published paper that may be valuable for progressing the debate about the monetisation of noise impacts, as well as showing how the ANASE study assists with this.
- 14 The advantage of LAeq noise contours in terms of the ability to make historical comparisons should not be lost, i.e. data for LAeq contours should continue to be collected and presented.
- 15 However, the 57dB LAeq metric should have reduced prominence in policy-making on the basis of the acceptance that more people are annoyed by aviation noise at lower noise levels than was previously understood<sup>1</sup>, and the fact that people do not experience noise in an averaged manner.
- 16 Additional metrics and means of illustration should be applied in policy-making. For instance, ‘number above’, ‘frequency’ and ‘location specific’ measurements are useful as they reflect the fact that the number of flights is a factor in the annoyance response of the population affected adversely by aviation noise, along with a means of illustrating the aviation noise burden at given locations.

<sup>1</sup> ‘Draft Aviation Policy Framework’ (DAPF), July 2012, Annex D - par.s D.5 & D.6, pg. 91 & 92.
‘Aviation Policy Framework’ (APF), March 2013, par. 3.14, pg.57, par.s 3.17 & 3.19, pg.58.
Airports Commission Discussion Paper – ‘Noise’, July 2013, par. 3.47, pg. 27, par.4.16, pg.33.

- 17 Alongside improving description and presentation of aviation noise, incentives and disincentives must be improved and applied in the form of higher landing charges, and more generous mitigation and compensation schemes.
- 18 ‘Noise efficiency’ scores should not be used in the noise debate. These scores could be used to compare activity at different airports, however, they do not inform comparisons of noise burden because: (i) they are based on the flawed 57dB LAeq metric; (ii) they incorporate numbers of passengers, which varies with load factor and type of aircraft but does not accurately represent numbers of flights, which is the vital element; and (iii) they do not take into account either the population spread, nor the ambient noise levels, around an airport – both important considerations when assessing aviation noise.
- 19 Although omitted from the Discussion Paper, ground noise – i.e. on-airport noise such as engine testing, is a specific element of aviation noise requiring appropriate measures to reduce its burden.
- 20 Flightpaths should not be moved from the existing noise preferential routes (NPRs) without full consultation of the communities affected. Whether concentration on specific paths within NPRs or dispersal routes across NPRs is preferable will vary between airport locations and between NPRs. These operational measures should be determined locally, for each airport, in accordance with the communities affected. It must be recognised that different policies will be needed at different airports.
- 21 Where there is local preference for any particular system, the providers of air traffic control and airspace management should be required to facilitate implementation.
- 22 An effective ‘noise envelope’ is one that reduces actual noise impacts, thus any application of this concept must be in a manner that reduces the actual noise burden experienced by communities, not simply in a manner that tracks upwards with increasing activity in the absence of a meaningful improvement in the noise climate.
- 23 Another issue omitted from the Discussion Paper is that of noise from helicopters, despite the need for tailored regulation and policy: statutory noise controls; bespoke modelling, covering the affected populations; UK-wide monitoring; incentives to phase out ‘noisier’ helicopters; and local regulations to be established through heliport consultative groups to reduce impacts on communities.
- 24 Ultimately, where clear gaps have been identified in the evidence needed to inform policy-making, not only should these gaps be filled, but in the meantime there should be a presumption in favour of the precautionary approach, applied relevant to each situation, in order to account for this lack of information.

Glossary

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| dB(A) | ‘A’ weighted decibel – decibel being a measure of sound pressure. The weighting is a system of adjustment applied to sound of different frequencies to take account of the way the sensitivity of the human ear varies with sound frequency. |
| L <sub>Aeq, 16h</sub> | A measure of long-term, average noise exposure, shorthand for ‘equivalent continuous noise level’; measured during a 16-hour ‘day’, 07:00 to 23:00. In relation to aircraft noise, it is the level of a steady sound which, if heard continuously over a particular period of time, would contain the same total sound energy as all the aircraft noise events over that same time period. |
| L <sub>Amax</sub> | The simplest measure of a noise event such as the over-flight of an aircraft is the maximum sound level that occurred during the event, measured in decibels (dB(A)). As the name implies, it is the highest sound level that occurred during the over-flight. The greater the value, the greater the risk of disturbance or intrusion. |
| L <sub>den</sub> | A weighted average of sound levels during the day, evening and night (defined in European Directive 2002/49/EC - ‘Environmental Noise Directive’ (END)). |

Further research

- 25 In response to the Commission’s invitation for additional evidence or research that should be taken account of, SASIG recommends use of
- ‘New evidence on aircraft noise annoyance’<sup>2</sup>;
- and draws the Commission’s attention to a recently published paper:
- ‘A comparison of hedonic price and stated preference methods to derive monetary values for aircraft noise disturbance and annoyance’<sup>3</sup>;
- ‘New evidence on aircraft noise annoyance’**
- 26 “This paper presents evidence that there is a useful correlation between the aircraft annoyance studies reported in ... European Environment Agency (EEA) report and the UK Government’s ANASE study. Both sets of studies have found a significant shift in that aircraft noise now causes annoyance at lower levels than it did previously.”<sup>1</sup> (pg.1)
- 27 It is encouraging to see the Commission’s acceptance<sup>1</sup> of this finding, however, more needs to be done to embed this in aviation policy.

<sup>2</sup> ‘New evidence on aircraft noise annoyance’, Oct. 2011, Mike Rickaby, Environmental Protection Officer, Hillingdon LB.

European Environment Agency (2010) ‘Good practice guide on noise exposure and potential health effects’, EEA Technical Report No11/2010.

ANASE: ‘Attitudes to Noise from Aviation Sources in England’, Department for Transport (DfT), 2007.

<sup>3</sup> ‘A comparison of hedonic price and stated preference methods to derive monetary values for aircraft noise disturbance and annoyance’, Blanco Matos, Joan Carles; Flindell, Ian; Le Masurier, Paul; and Pownall, Chris (2013), Transportation Research Part D Transport and Environment, vol. 20, pg.40-47.

- 28 Up to date social response data relating to aviation noise annoyance is needed in order to reflect current public attitudes; aircraft fleet mixes; aircraft noise characteristics; and quantity, time of day - and night, altitude, predictability and frequency of flights.
- 29 The analysis in this additional paper makes use of the European Environment Agency's 'Good practice guide on noise exposure and potential health effects'<sup>2</sup> – a technical report produced to assist policy makers and competent authorities understand and fulfil the action planning requirements of the 'Environmental Noise Directive' (END; 2002/49/EC).
- 30 EU and UK aircraft noise annoyance models are compared, using the L<sub>DEN</sub> metric. This comparison illustrates:
- the way in which levels of aircraft noise annoyance are underestimated by the current assessment process for airspace change proposals (CAP 725)<sup>4</sup>; and
 - the similarity in conclusion of studies carried out in Europe since 1990 and ANASE<sup>2</sup> – that more people are more annoyed by lower levels of aircraft noise than previously.
- 31 ANASE, along with the post-1990 European studies covered in the EEA Good Practice Guide, support policy-making on the basis that the onset of community annoyance is at lower noise levels than currently applied in policy.
- 32 The paper also concludes that further objectives of the ANASE<sup>2</sup> study remain to be addressed: the suitability of LAeq, 16h as an indicator of community annoyance; the importance of the quantity of flights; the relative importance of different times of day; and determining willingness to pay to reduce annoyance from aircraft noise.

'A comparison of hedonic price and stated preference methods to derive monetary values for aircraft noise disturbance and annoyance'

- 33 The Commission is also alerted to this paper that may well have been published since the Commission's 'Noise' Discussion Paper, for consideration to determine its value in terms of monetising aircraft noise disturbance and annoyance.

Description/abstract: "This paper compares the hedonic prices and stated preference methods for determining monetary values of aircraft noise disturbance and annoyance used in cost-benefit analyses of proposed development. The data suggests that neither method is entirely satisfactory on its own, but there are strong positive correlations between the two methods suggesting sufficient underlying similarities to justify the use of combined methods in the future. These findings are important because the two methods normally yield different results in absolute terms and economists have consequently and un-necessarily been constrained to choose between them."

.....continues.....

<sup>4</sup> CAP725: Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) 'Guidance on the application of the airspace change process', 2007.

- 34 Due to this paper having been recently published, it has not yet been fully appraised. However, we understand this paper sets out how ‘stated preference’ valuations derived in ANASE are of use in the context within which the study questions were asked, and proposes areas for further research to continue to move the debate forward.

Monetising noise impacts

- 35 In support of moving the debate forward, SASIG commends the monetisation of noise impacts as this is necessary for a comprehensive, robust analysis of aviation developments, to capture the greatest economic gain in light of having fully evaluated the associated costs and benefits.
- 36 Greater use of social-cost benefit analysis (SCBA) and social return on investment (SROI) evaluations will help development in the field of monetising noise impacts.
- 37 SASIG calls upon the Airports Commission to embed an improved economic assessment of aviation that incorporates the community costs – social, economic, and environmental - of aviation noise impacts.

Developing application of noise metrics in policy-making

- 38 The Commission has recognised the need to address uncertainties in the relationship between annoyance and exposure to aircraft noise; our comments on the measures set out in the Discussion Paper are supplied below.

Alternative measures for noise exposure

Equivalent Continuous Sound Level - LAeq

- 39 Although the Government stated in its Aviation Policy Framework that the flawed 57 dB LAeq, 16h will be retained for the purpose of marking the daytime onset of significant community annoyance, SASIG considers this flawed metric should only be retained for the purpose of historical comparisons, and that we move actively away from this policy approach.
- 40 It is disingenuous to use this flawed metric in comparisons suggesting that affected populations are experiencing an adequately improved noise climate on the basis that over time the ground areas covered by the contour, and thus the numbers of people in those areas, have decreased. Since the affected populations are not wholly represented by the area enclosed in the 57 dB LAeq, 16h contour, the affected populations are cannot be said to be experiencing an adequately improved noise climate.
- 41 It is no wonder that the technical nature of these averaged contours means they do not necessarily help a person considering buying a house near an airport to understand the typical noise that would be experienced. This is notwithstanding the fact that averaged contours do not relate to, nor illustrate, the way in which noise impacts are experienced.

Number Above (N), or Frequency, contours

- 42 Incorporation of frequency contours into routine assessments is supported by SASIG, as the quantity of flights has a direct influence on the way in which aircraft noise exposure negatively impacts on people.
- 43 SASIG supports the Commission’s recognition that averaged contours can consist of any combination of flights between a small quantity of very loud events, and a large quantity of less noisy events. This reiterates the value of Number Above or Frequency contours as additional metrics to illustrate noise impacts.
- 44 As discussed in ‘New evidence on aircraft noise annoyance’,<sup>2</sup> the ANASE results suggest that under-prediction of annoyance is likely where the quantity of aircraft is increasing significantly.
- 45 Although frequency contours do not describe the duration of a noise event, information about the quantity of noise events, exceeding specified noise levels, which will be experienced in each location is valuable. This is a form of information that is likely to be more easily understood by communities.
- 46 The positive experience of supplying frequency contours, in the form of N70 values (the number of events that have a maximum external level of 70dB(A) or more), for the purpose of communicating and discussing the aviation noise impacts produced at Sydney Airport shows this metric can add value.
- 47 However, use of such frequency contours should not focus on any one upper noise limit alone, as this would mask the cumulative effects of all flights. Hence a range of frequency data need be supplied, starting, for instance, at 50dB LA<sub>max</sub>, clearly illustrating the number of events in each banding, and thus revealing the overall cumulative impact.

‘Noise efficiency’

- 48 SASIG does not support application of the efficiency metric for noise burden assessment.
- 49 We agree these measures show the productivity of an airport but they do not inform or describe the associated noise climate.
- 50 Nor does the 57dB LAeq contour.
- 51 The suggested efficiency measures are of use when looking at levels of activity across the aviation industry without increasing the population within the flawed 57dB LAeq contour. However that does not improve the noise burden.
- 52 To a large degree this is due to incorporation of the flawed 57dB LAeq contour, but is also due to use of ‘numbers of passengers’; ‘numbers of flights’ is more meaningful for the assessment of noise impacts.
- 53 The desired value of comparing airports with similar efficiency scores is undermined by the fact that the spread of population around an airport is not accurately included in the efficiency score.

- 54 Also, the ambient noise levels of areas around airports will vary; quieter more rural areas are likely to be more affected by aircraft noise than noisier more urban areas.
- 55 The ‘noise efficiency’ measure is suitable for describing change as the aviation industry grows but is not suitable for describing the noise burden. A measure showing the number of flights in relation to people adversely affected by aviation noise could be a descriptor to develop, but this must not be based on the flawed 57dB LAeq contour, and must be accompanied by other factors to drive improvements in the noise climate, not simply describe it.
- 56 The noise burden remains the same in situations of lower passenger throughput where the number of flights remains the same, and worsens where the numbers of flights increases.
- 57 Using passenger numbers provides a description of airport/airline efficiency but cannot be extrapolated to illustrate the noise burden.
- 58 A change in the ranking obscures what the change is: size of contour, number of flights or passenger throughput.
- 59 Ultimately, the suggested ‘noise efficiency’ measure yields illogical comparisons and should not be used to inform consideration of aviation noise.

Location specific measurement

- 60 In order for there to be value in the use of LA<sub>MAX</sub> histograms to support illustration of noise exposure at a given location, such illustrations must be supplied with comprehensive, and comprehensible, explanation and discussion. In cases of missing, incomplete, non-interpreted and erroneous information, this value will not be realised.

Mitigation – significant improvements needed

- 61 Variable landing charges are not set at a sufficiently high level to be effective incentives for the use of less noisy aircraft, and this situation must be remedied.

Planning policy

- 62 It remains to be seen what the effect will be of the removal of stand-alone planning policy guidance on noise<sup>5</sup>, used to guide location selection in terms of the noise-sensitive nature of development proposals. As Local Plans are finalised and applied to development proposals, their application and strength will be tested in terms of whether or not the process is sufficient for securing appropriate locations for noise-sensitive development.

<sup>5</sup> Planning Policy Guidance Note 24: Noise (PPG24) – removed as part of planning reform from which the ‘National Planning Policy Framework’ (NPPF) resulted. Some Local Plans now incorporate PPG24.

Ground noise

63 The Commission does not discuss the matter of ground noise, however, it is a particular form of aviation's noise burden that requires specific measures be put in place to reduce its impacts. Good practice should be shared for the building of noise bunds and physical screening on-airport, around areas where engine-testing is carried out, for instance.

Concentration and dispersal

64 SASIG recommends that airport operators actively involve the communities around their airports to determine community preferences for 'concentrated' or 'dispersed' models of operation. This should cover use of runways, approach and departure flight characteristics/techniques, flightpaths, altitudes, and stacks. As the Commission states, this requires a judgement about concentration of aviation noise over fewer people, or dispersal of operations covering more people.<sup>6</sup>

'Noise envelope'

65 The main considerations for deriving a 'noise envelope' are:

- the definition and extent of the 'envelope';
- the need for the 'envelope' to provide an improving noise climate, resulting in an actual reduction of the noise burden experienced by overflown communities;
- greater understanding of the community response to noise and application of this in policy;
- the incorporation of a range of metrics: for instance, Lden (used in the European Environmental Noise Directive (END)); L<sub>MAX</sub> (maximum noise of each flight); L<sub>90</sub> (background noise); and 'n' (number of flights);
- recognition that the quantity and frequency of events is as important a feature as sound levels resulting from aviation activity;
- inclusion of on-airport activities resulting in 'ground noise';
- effective monitoring and enforcement;
- the need for the Government to have challenged and verified the projected technological and operational improvements in advance of basing any 'envelope' on such projections; and
- once verified, technological and operational improvements must be embedded and accepted as normal practice prior to growth being sanctioned, in order that the noise burden is not increased.

<sup>6</sup> Airports Commission Discussion Paper – 'Noise, July 2013, par. 5.17, pg.44.

- 66 For any ‘noise envelope’ to be effective in terms of minimising and reducing noise impacts from aviation, it must be accepted that a less noisy aircraft remains a noisy aircraft and each audible experience of an aircraft can be the cause of disturbance, annoyance and stress. The gains achieved within the aviation industry from the production of less noisy aircraft over the past few decades have been overwhelmed by the increase in the number of flights over the same time period. This reinforces the need for meaningful movement limits to be a feature of any ‘noise envelope’.
- 67 In order to develop an effective ‘noise envelope’, more resource must be put into social survey research in order to assess the community response to aviation noise. The conditions at, and communities around, each airport must be considered on a case-by-case basis. The different noise characteristics and sound levels from different aircraft and helicopters must also be considered.
- 68 If appropriately developed and applied, an advantageous role of a ‘noise envelope’ could be the setting of the maximum noise levels a community would expect to experience. A ‘noise envelope’ could also be a route through which to achieve the progressive reduction and potential phase-out of night flights where residents are overflown at night.
- 69 A ‘noise envelope’ relating to an increased level of activity at a point in the future should be supplemented with interim ‘envelopes’ to indicate how activity and noise levels will be limited in the intervening period.

Compensation

- 70 In light of the acceptance that people are more annoyed at lower noise thresholds than was previously the case, UK aviation noise compensation schemes must urgently be improved.
- 71 The inadequacy of the UK schemes is highlighted by comparison with others around the world being more generous in terms of the threshold applied, the area covered, and the percentage of costs covered.
- 72 The ‘polluter pays principle’ should be applied in the form of a tax included in ticket purchases; should airline operators wish to pay this or pass it on to consumers is for their determination.
- 73 Financial compensation should be forthcoming from airport and/or airline operators to account for the extra costs being absorbed at present by building companies, and property purchasers, due to the need for provision of sound insulation and ventilation.
- 74 The current process for parties to claim compensation for the physical development of airports is the Land Compensation Act, through which payments are made when the development is brought into use. This has worked well for road and rail developments, however, in relation to airports, there can be a long delay between land being taken for development and that development coming into use. The compensation process must be improved to address this unreasonable delay.

- 75 It must be embedded as common practice that compensation is tied to activity levels at airports not physical infrastructure. The experience at Stansted Airport where payment has not be forthcoming despite activity levels having increased illustrates the inappropriateness of setting infrastructure as the trigger for compensation, as opposed to activity levels.
- 76 Compensation claims must be settled and payment supplied in advance of the noise-producing activity becoming operational. The experience of claimants around Manchester Airport waiting 9-10 years before receiving payment for noise compensation claims must not be repeated (the second runway at Manchester Airport opened in February 2001; compensation payment settlement was eventually reached in July 2010, with payments then following).

Helicopters

- 77 It is a matter of some concern that the Commission's Discussion Paper does not make any reference at all to noise from helicopters. The insubstantial regulation of helicopter noise at the present time does not negate the need to address the impact produced by use of such craft.
- 78 Management of noise from helicopters needs to be developed to cover both single-engine and multi-engine craft, using licensed heliports, airports and private, unlicensed sites.
- 79 The issues associated with helicopter noise are set out below, including the need for tailored regulation and policy.

Statutory noise controls are needed for helicopters

- 80 There are noise and safety issues associated with helicopter flights; regulations are in place regarding safety, however, there are few controls over noise.
- 81 The main safety regulations regarding helicopters are incorporated within the Rules of the Air Regulations (2007), which form part of the Air Navigation Orders (2009).
- 82 Within controlled airspace around airports, helicopters are required to comply with Air Traffic Control (ATC). There are specific restrictions for helicopters flying in the London and London City Control Zones. Single-engine helicopters are required to fly along designated routes; multi-engine helicopters can travel on more direct routes.
- 83 Helicopters flown according to the 'Rules of the Air' are given immunity from controls in relation to noise under the Civil Aviation Act 1982, the Air Navigation Regulations and the Environmental Protection Act 1990.
- 84 All civilian helicopters are required to meet international noise certification standards (ICAO). However there are no statutory instruments that restrict the operational noise limit of helicopters.

Bespoke modelling is required covering the affected populations

- 85 The characteristics of helicopter noise include unpredictability, and the difficulty of modelling due to the rotation and waves created by the helicopter blades.
- 86 The CAA Aviation Related Environmental Enquiries (AREE) department provides a focal point for receiving and responding to aviation related noise & environmental issues. Complaints received by the CAA are broadly concerned with noise from helicopters over-flying, taking off and landing. Complaints are received not only from residents near heliports, but also from residents further away.

UK-wide monitoring of helicopters is required

- 87 Currently, the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) only monitors helicopter movements in London. In order to understand and quantify the impacts of helicopters in the UK, it is necessary to undertake more effective monitoring of helicopter movements across the UK and not just in the London Control Zone.

The Government should use incentives to phase out 'noisier' helicopters

- 88 In order to encourage newer and less noisy types of helicopters it is necessary to reduce the noise standard from 81 dB(A). In general, in seeking to reduce the number of older and noisier helicopters, the Government could use incentive/disincentive schemes to encourage phasing out of these helicopters.
- 89 The Battersea Heliport is subject to restrictions on the number of helicopter movements per day and per year; and for movements of helicopters that do not meet a local noise standard of 81dB(A) at a distance of 150 metres from the take-off position. These restrictions are, however, ineffective for addressing current and future noise issues, due to the fact that most commercial helicopters using Battersea already fall within an approved list.
- 90 Given that helicopter noise has different characteristics and can affect a wide range of communities, close to heliports and further away, the Government should address helicopter noise through specific policies rather than within the general context of reducing noise from aviation.

Heliport consultative groups can establish local regulations to reduce impacts on communities

- 91 The London Helicopter Consultative Group (LHCG) was established to address residents' concerns about helicopter activity over London. This provided an opportunity for residents to voice concerns with the heliport operator. The outcomes from these groups included a local flying policy for Battersea Heliport.
- 92 In the absence of national noise regulations for helicopters, local policies, developed in consultation with communities, can be one way of establishing regulations for heliports that reduce the noise impacts from helicopter activity.
- 93 The Department for Transport (DfT) should seek to use evidence from various groups, including the London Helicopter Consultative Group (LHCG), in the development of national guidance to address helicopter noise.



Contact Officer: Anna Mahoney, SASIG Director
Email: sasig@surreycc.gov.uk
Tel.: (020) 8541 9459 / 07968 832 687

Web: www.sasig.org.uk
Date: 13.09.2013

Airports Commission Discussion Paper – ‘Noise’: questions posed & answered

Sections in underlined, italicised text indicate topics covered in the SASIG response.

Chapter 2 – How does noise affect people? (par.2.37 & 2.38, pg. 16)

Recent research has led to a better understanding of the impacts of noise pollution from various sources, though further research in some areas is still needed. A number of causal links between noise exposure and health effects, such as hypertension, have been fairly well established. Studies have also shown noise to lead to cognitive impairment in children, and reduced productivity. These impacts can result from noise in workplaces and schools, and sleep disturbance.

The Commission is interested in views on these issues.\* In particular we would like to invite submissions which shed light on any other relevant evidence or research that the Commission should be aware of. Chapter 4 considers further the techniques which can be used to quantify the impacts

\* What is noise? How many people are affected by transport noise? How many people are affected by aviation noise? What are the effects of noise? Annoyance. Sleep disturbance. Hypertension. Hearing loss. Mental health. Cognitive impairment in children. Productivity. Areas of tranquillity.

Chapter 3 - Measuring aviation noise (par. 3.55, pg. 28)

In responding to the issues\* raised in this chapter, submissions may wish to consider the following questions:

- What is the most appropriate methodology to assess and compare different airport noise footprints?

For example:

- What metrics or assessment methods would an appropriate ‘scorecard’ be based on?
- To what extent is it appropriate to use multiple metrics, and would there be any issues of contradiction if this were to occur?
- Are there additional relevant metrics to those discussed in this chapter which the Commission should be aware of?
- What baseline should any noise assessment be based on? Should an assessment be based on absolute noise levels, or on changes relative to the existing noise environment?
- How should we characterise a noise environment currently unaffected by aircraft noise?

\* The science of sound. Quantifying the noise from a single aircraft event. Longer period noise exposure: Equivalent Continuous Sound Level; Number Above (N), or Frequency, Contours; Person Events Index and Average Exposure Indicator; Relevant ‘noise efficiency’ of airports; location-specific measurement. Choosing between long-term noise exposure metrics.

Chapter 4 – Quantifying noise effects (par.4.40, pg. 38)

The Commission is interested in receiving views on all the issues\* raised in this chapter, but in particular on whether the approaches here summarised are a fair representation of the current evidence base on the quantification of noise impacts and effects. In addition the Commission is also keen to receive views on the following questions:

- How could the methods described in this chapter be improved to better reflect noise impacts and effects?
- Is monetising noise impacts and effects a sensible approach? If so, which monetisation methods described here hold the most credibility, or are most pertinent to noise and its various effects?
- Are there any specific thresholds that significantly alter the nature of noise assessment, e.g. a level or intermittency of noise beyond which the impact or effect significantly changes in nature? Quantifying noise effects
- To what extent does introducing noise at a previously unaffected area represent more or less of an impact than increasing noise in already affected areas?

\* How noise is assessed: Day-time noise: early studies – The Wilson Committee and the Noise and Number Index; Schultz Curve, Day-time noise: current measures. Night noise. Monetising noise impacts. Revealed preference valuation. Monetising health impacts. Monetising sleep impacts. Productivity and learning impacts.

Chapter 5 – Mitigation (par.5.44, pg. 50)

This chapter has described various methods and possible options for the mitigation of noise\*, as well as the regulatory regimes which operate at the international, European and UK levels. The Commission would be interested to receive views on additional mitigation methods that may be effective or worth consideration, but in particular responses that focus on the following questions:

- To what extent is the use of a noise envelope approach appropriate, and which metrics could be used effectively in this regard?
- To what extent should noise concentration and noise dispersal (as described in paragraph 5.17) be used in the UK? Where and how could these techniques be deployed most effectively?
- What constitutes best practice for noise compensation schemes abroad and how do these compare to current UK practice? What noise assessments could be effectively utilised when designing compensation arrangements?

\* The Noise Mitigation Framework – The International Civil Aviation Organisation’s (ICAO) ‘Balanced Approach’. Reduction of noise at source through technological improvements. Mitigation through land use planning. Mitigation through operational procedures. Mitigation through operational restrictions. Landing charges. Operating restrictions. Noise envelopes. Independent Noise Regulator. Compensation

~~~~~





# LGA location map

## Local Government Association

Local Government House  
Smith Square  
London SW1P 3HZ

Tel: 020 7664 3131

Fax: 020 7664 3030

Email: [info@local.gov.uk](mailto:info@local.gov.uk)

Website: [www.local.gov.uk](http://www.local.gov.uk)

## Public transport

Local Government House is well served by public transport. The nearest mainline stations are: Victoria and Waterloo: the local underground stations are

**St James's Park** (Circle and District Lines), **Westminster** (Circle, District and Jubilee Lines), and **Pimlico** (Victoria Line) - all about 10 minutes walk away.

Buses 3 and 87 travel along Millbank, and the 507 between Victoria and Waterloo stops in Horseferry Road close to Dean Bradley Street.

## Bus routes – Horseferry Road

**507** Waterloo - Victoria

**C10** Canada Water - Pimlico - Victoria

**88** Camden Town - Whitehall - Westminster - Pimlico - Clapham Common

## Bus routes – Millbank

**87** Wandsworth - Aldwych

**3** Crystal Palace - Brixton - Oxford Circus

For further information, visit the Transport for London website at [www.tfl.gov.uk](http://www.tfl.gov.uk)

## Cycling facilities

The nearest Barclays cycle hire racks are in Smith Square. Cycle racks are also available at Local Government House. Please telephone the LGA on 020 7664 3131.

## Central London Congestion Charging Zone

Local Government House is located within the congestion charging zone.

For further details, please call 0845 900 1234 or visit the website at [www.cclondon.com](http://www.cclondon.com)

## Car parks

Abingdon Street Car Park (off Great College Street)

Horseferry Road Car Park  
Horseferry Road/Arneway Street. Visit the website at [www.westminster.gov.uk/parking](http://www.westminster.gov.uk/parking)

