

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel

Agenda Item

Date: 6th June 2013

7

Title: Airports Commission Guidance Document
02: Long Term Capacity Options: Sift
Criteria

Author: Jeremy Pine, Planning Policy /
Development Management Liaison Officer
(01799 510460)

Key decision: No

SUMMARY

1. This report is about the criteria that the Airports Commission will apply to determine which options for additional long term airport capacity submitted by scheme proposers should be taken forward for more detailed development, should the Commission identify in its interim report that more capacity is required.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2. That the Panel notes this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3. There are no financial implications associated with this report and its recommendation.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

4. None

IMPACT

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	The Airports Commission is currently engaging extensively with all interested parties via its series of discussion papers. Further consultation will take place as long term options emerge.
----------------------------	--

Community Safety	None.
Equalities	None.
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None.
Sustainability	None.
Ward-specific impacts	The Commission's recommendations could have implications for all parts of the district.
Workforce/Workplace	Officer and Member time in preparing the responses to the Commission's discussion papers and the submissions made to it.

THE LONG TERM OPTIONS SIFT CRITERIA

6. Table 1.1 of Guidance Document 02 sets out the sift criteria that the Commission will apply. Table 1.1 is attached at the end of this report. The Commission has set a deadline of 19/07/13 for outline proposals for long term options to be submitted. The Commission has said of these outline (Phase 1) proposals that:

"The objective of Phase 1 of the Commission's work programme is to identify a shortlist of credible proposals to be taken forward for further detailed development in 2014. It is in this second phase that full business cases, including cost benefit analysis and associated value for money assessment, will be developed. Therefore, in this phase we only require information on costs and benefits at a high level, and do not require scheme developers to carry out detailed modelling or to submit cost benefit analysis. We also do not require detailed designs for new runways and terminals at this stage, although these may be included if it is felt they are fundamental to the analysis within the proposal". (Guidance Document 02 – Paragraph 4.3)

7. The Commission says that the sift criteria have been produced taking into account national indicators and guidance, including the Aviation Policy Framework. They have also been informed by suggestions and submissions provided by stakeholders. The common recurring themes raised included:
- The importance of taking account of climate change impacts;
 - The need for proposers to develop effective plans for community engagement;
 - Surface access availability and costs as an important factor in identifying

credible proposals;

- The importance of considering financing issues (including the deliverability of private and/or public funding for proposals); and
- Identifying the local economic impacts of proposals.

8. The Commission intends to publish the outline proposals that it receives on its website later in the summer. Scheme promoters are also being urged to publish the proposals themselves (including summaries) and to promote an open dialogue with local and industry stakeholders on any potential plans.
9. The Commission says that more detailed public engagement will be carried out on any of the outline proposals that are taken forward for detailed development and consideration. This would include a fuller public consultation process, as well as engagement with local authorities and communities in relevant areas and with industry and business representatives.
- 10.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
The Commission recommends that Stansted Airport be expanded beyond 35mppa either by increasing capacity on the existing runway or by the construction of a further runway or runways.	2. There is some risk because the Commission may consider that any economic case for further SE airport capacity outweighs the environmental considerations.	3. Any increase in the capacity of Stansted Airport beyond 35mppa would have a major effect on the district and beyond, including the quality of life of local residents.	The Council has the opportunity to respond to the Commission's discussion papers and to any outline and/or detailed submissions made to it which favour expansion at Stansted Airport.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

Table 1.1 Long term options sift criteria

STRATEGIC FIT

- What is the nature, scale and timing of the aviation capacity and connectivity delivered by the proposal? How will the proposal support or enhance the UK's status as Europe's most important aviation hub?
- Does the proposal support the Government's wider objectives and legal requirements (for example, support of national and regional economic growth, re-balancing of the economy or alignment with national climate change commitments and global targets)?

ECONOMY

- What are the potential national economic impacts of the proposal?
- What are the likely impacts of the proposal on the regional/local economies surrounding a) the proposed site for new or enhanced capacity and b) other airports affected by the proposal?
- What is the likely impact of the proposal on the UK aviation industry? How will other airports be affected by the proposals and what will the impacts of this be for air passengers and other users, airlines and the wider economy?

SURFACE ACCESS

- What estimate has been made of the surface access requirements of the proposal in relation to existing and new infrastructure?
- Does the proposal provide effective surface access for passengers, businesses and relevant freight traffic?
 - *Will surface access plans provide the capacity needed for expected future demand?*
 - *How does the proposal impact upon local traffic and congestion?*
 - *What is the expected surface access split between public and private transport?*
- How will the proposal change journey times from major business and population centres for users of aviation services?

ENVIRONMENT

AIR QUALITY:

- What are the air quality implications of the proposal (including impacts due to aircraft, airside operation and local surface transport links)? Are these consistent with the legal frameworks for air quality? What mitigation plans are proposed?

NOISE:

- What are the noise implications of the proposal?
 - *How will the proposal alter current and predicted patterns of noise in the surrounding area?*
 - *What changes to noise profiles would be seen at other airports as a result of the proposal?*
 - *What measures are envisaged to limit or reduce the number of people affected by noise?*

DESIGNATED SITES:

- Does the proposal affect any designated sites (for example Sites of Scientific Interest or Special Protection Areas) and if so how might any effects be managed?

CLIMATE CHANGE:

- How might the proposal compare, in terms of its impact on greenhouse gas emissions, with alternative options for providing a similar amount of additional capacity? What are the proposals plans for continuous improvement and reduction of carbon emissions over time?

OTHER:

- Are there other significant local environmental impacts which should be taken into account?

PEOPLE

- How will the proposal impact upon the passenger experience (eg. choice, cost, accessibility, etc.)?
- What are the likely local social impacts of the proposal, including impacts around the proposed location for new capacity and around any other airports which would be affected, for example on:
 - *employment*
 - *housing and local communities*
 - *vulnerable groups*
 - *quality of life*
 - *health*
- Are there other significant wider social impacts of the proposal which should be taken into account?
- How does the proposer plan to engage with local communities in taking forward their plans?

COST

- What is the estimated cost of the proposal, including surface access, land purchase, compensation and any other associated infrastructure? What are the associated cost assumptions and risks?
- Is it likely that the cost can be met entirely by the private sector?
 - *If not, what is the likely split between public and private sector funding and how has this been calculated?*
 - *How would the proposal be financed?*
 - *What are the associated assumptions and risks?*

OPERATIONAL VIABILITY

- Is the proposal consistent with relevant safety requirements? What operational, safety and/or resilience risks are associated with the proposal? What measures are proposed to mitigate these?
- Is the proposal deliverable within relevant airspace constraints? What assumptions underpin this assessment?

DELIVERY

- What are the main delivery risks in the proposal?