

AVIATION FORUM

27 August 2013

PRESENT: Councillors John Lenton (Chairman), George Bathurst, Malcolm Beer and Alan Mellins.

Regular Attendees: Peter Hooper, M Jamieson and Mike Sullivan.

Also Present: Andrew Davies (Chairman, Wraysbury Parish Council)

Officers: Wayne Coles, Terry Gould, Liz Hornby, Cathryn James and Chris Nash

PART I

ITEM 1 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None were received.

ITEM 2 - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was recorded that all Members and regular attendees of the Panel had an interest in Item 7 due to the proximity of their homes to the Heathrow Airport proposals.

ITEM 3 - MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Forum held on 16 May 2013 be approved subject to the following –

- **Item 5 – that the penultimate sentence reads “...that evidencing an 80% transfer passenger availability by using the Hyderabad route....”**
- **Item 13 – that the paragraph be amended to read “...had spent a long time discussing a comprehensive Night Flights response to the Airports Commission. Other activity included consideration of the other Aviation Commission items,...”**

ITEM 4 – MATTERS ARISING

Councillor Lenton reported that he had not yet been in touch with Adam Afriyie MP to ask him to a future meeting. He had, however, contacted Nigel Milton, Director of Policy and Heathrow and believed that an invitation for both the aforementioned be invited to the same meeting. The Forum agreed.

Item 12, final paragraph. It was confirmed that the Early Morning Respite Trial had finished with items being reviewed annually. It was noted that Mike Sullivan had forwarded some suggestions to Councillor Beer.

CRANFORD APPLICATION

The Forum noted that this was still ongoing. Operational freedoms had been discussed and should have been delivered its conclusions; however this had been delayed.

ITEM 5 – AIRPORTS COMMISSION REPORT

The Forum noted the Airports Commission Report and noted that this had been duly signed and dispatched. Terry Gould thanked everyone who had provided input. It was a balanced response and confirmation had been received back from the Airports Commission that it had been received and was in the system. Terry Gould suggested that some points which were raised in the response needed to be repeated.

Councillor Lenton thanked Terry Gould for all his hard work on the response.

Mike Sullivan stated a comparison between apples and oranges. Assuming a one third easterly operation, roughly 22-23% reduction would be achieved in overall movements over Datchet resulting in the 2-3Db reduction. If only easterly operations were considered, as had been shown for Old Windsor, there would be approximately a 45% reduction in movements and, therefore, a much larger reduction in noise than that shown. Considering only easterly operations for Old Windsor, the number of movements would increase about seven times, and hence the large increase in Db value, but if the comparison was overall, then the increase in movements would be nearer 40%.

ITEM 6 – CRANFORD AGREEMENT

Councillor Beer reported that he had responded to the noise topic and planning application and made the point that there would be opposition from Longford, despite them having acoustic baffles. Terry Gould stated that there would be two sets of acoustic baffles, the second being at the end of the runway. These baffles work on the same principle as motorway barriers to muffle sound.

ITEM 7 – HEATHROW RUNWAY 3 / 4 PROPOSALS

The Forum noted the report on Heathrow Runway 3 / 4 Proposals. Councillor Lenton welcomed Wraysbury Parish Councillor Andrew Davies who circulated a document 'Submission to the Davies Commission'. Andrew Davies explained that the document was Wraysbury Parish Council's response to the proposals, and although only in draft form, he was confident that the Parish Council would approve them at their next meeting. Andrew Davies explained that they had not answered purely from the Parish Council's point of view, but took a more overall view of the proposals and giving reasons why there should be no more expansion of Heathrow Airport. The report points out the shortage of capacity to the South East of London where additional provision should be provided. It recognised that Stansted, if expanded, would need much improved communication networks such as better rail and road links into London. The report also suggested that for the short-term

solution, either Stansted or Gatwick be expanded. It was noted particularly that the local County Council would welcome expansions at Gatwick where there were already good communications in place, good motorway and rail links.

The report points out that one of the proposals would destroy a vital part of British history, even the birth of democracy, as it was were the Magna Carta was signed. There were other areas of historical and environmental significance in Wraysbury which would deem the scheme completely unsuitable. The scheme which would destroy most of Wraysbury was ambitious and costly as it was proposed to build over two reservoirs. As the walls of those reservoirs were very high, this meant that the runways would have to be built over them, and the cost of cranes etc., would mean frustration for passengers in the time it would take to taxi from the runway to terminal. The Parish Council did not believe this to be a practical option.

During the discussion, the following points were raised –

- If this scheme went ahead, were would be people be rehoused? If building additional housing, this was bound to encroach on Green Belt land within the Royal Borough.
- That Heathrow should not be closed and not expanded any further.
- That the Transport Committee of London did not agree with creating an airport in the Thames Estuary and that expanding Stansted was a favoured option.
- It was believed that the Legal Agreement between West Sussex County Council and Gatwick, which prevented any further building / expansion before 2019 had now been waived by the Council. It was agreed that Terry Gould would investigate this.
- The issue of alliances was raised, particularly as it had been tried to take an appliance out of Heathrow to another airport, but that failed due to lack of passengers. It was generally agreed that passengers wanted to fly in and out of Heathrow, probably due to the good links to London and that it was a well known airport world-wide.
- It was noted that once T2 had been phased in completely, it was estimated that over one hundred million people would use Heathrow.
- Councillor Beer explained that where it stated in the report about seventeen miles of new railways would be needed linking to the South West rail system and included Staines to Clapham Junction / Waterloo, this scheme had been abandoned and was therefore out of date information.
- That Richmond had already submitted a substantial response and that this could be used as a guidance when completing the Royal Borough's response.
- It was agreed to combine the noise response with this response.

The Forum agreed that a technical group be formed to discuss and formulate a suitable response which was due by 26 September 2013.

ITEM 8 – AIRPORT COMMISSION DISCUSSION PAPER 5* 'AVIATION NOISE'

Terry Gould reported that this was latest report by the Airports Commission which most Local Authorities were waiting for as it was the objective for Heathrow Airport.

Terry Gould explained that he had read the paper and his first reaction was that it was comprehensive and a fair treatment of noise, setting out the facts and history of various studies, coming across as responding to some criticisms. The report set out in logical format how noise affects people, impact assessment methodology and mitigation etc. He also stated there were eleven questions that needed answering. Terry Gould proposed that a technical group be set up to take suggestions from this Forum and prepare answers to the questions. He stated that responses needed to be submitted by the 6 September 2013, although he believed there could be some flexibility and agreed to double check. He also explained that there was to be a meeting of LANCC on Friday 30 August 2013 and points could be picked up then as well.

During the ensuing discussion the following points were raised –

- Councillor Bathurst suggested issues such as planes dropping their wheels over Windsor could be considered as, particularly during nice weather, sound travelled further and the noise was more noticeable at those times.
- That landing noise actual measurements and penalties should be applied.
- The issue of tranquillity spaces be raised; it was noted this would be discussed at the forthcoming LANCC meeting.
- That the rate of improvement in relation to movements of aircraft was slowing. There was an assumption that as aircraft got quieter, more flights would be scheduled.

The Forum agreed that a technical group be formed to discuss and formulate a suitable response.

ITEM 9 – WIDENOISE UPDATE

Chris Nash reported that the report set out a six month analysis on the WideNoise project. Members noted a ‘spike’ in the number of residents using the app – 129. A set of community days had been held during this time, after which 4,500 recordings were made by residents - which provided the present set of figures. Work with the University College London (UCL) was ongoing to assess these figures and a potential comparison would be made with Heathrow’s figures collected for noise. It was also noted that a demonstration of the app had been given to SASIG who were impressed.

Councillor Beer stated he was disappointed that the London Borough’s were standing back from using this scheme although he believed it was due to fear of costs. It was noted that there was virtually no cost involved.

Terry Gould commented that twelve months ago, when it was first suggested, the project was in line with the Royal Borough’s Big Society aspirations, and that that it had now exceeded expectations with regard to these. Further work is being undertaken with UCL into how to plot the experience of residents onto a map.

Preliminary discussions have also taken place with UCL with regard to a ‘phase 2’ of the project, which may include static noise monitors & biometric sensors; involving

the collection of evidence in relation to the real-time stress experienced by residents in relation to noise experienced.

Councillor Beer stated that Heathrow had three mobile monitoring boxes which were stationed wherever they were requested. He had requested one at Ham Island the results of which were now available on the relevant website. It was noted that Terry Gould was investigating the possibility of a longer term monitoring station, or one shared between Boroughs. Terry Gould & Chris Nash have approached some London and neighbouring Boroughs but have only received a lukewarm response.

ITEM 10 – HACCC UPDATE

Councillor Beer reported that as he had been swamped with work recently, he had missed the last HACCC meeting. He was particularly disappointed as a presentation was being held, although believed it would have been more a sales pitch than informative. The report mentioned that there could be serious effects to Planning Policy as safety zones at the end of runways meant that no-one could live within the safety zone and building could not take place either.

ITEM 11 – LANCC UPDATE

Councillor Beer reported that a meeting of LANCC was due to take place on Friday 30 August 2013 to discuss the noise question. He was disappointed that the technical director had not circulated his thoughts prior to the meeting.

ITEM 12 – SASIG UPDATE

Councillor Beer reported that he and Terry Gould had attended a meeting but that other members were pulling out. SAISG was seen as a good 'collecting house' to report back to government.

ITEM 15 – ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There were no items.

ITEM 16 – DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

It was noted that future meetings were scheduled as follows:

12 November 2013
19 February 2014
14 May 2014

All meetings to be held at the Guildhall, Windsor commencing at 7.00pm.

MEETING

The meeting, which began at 7.09pm ended at 9.06pm.