

AVIATION FORUM

28 January 2014

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

Regular Attendees: John Holdstock, Peter Hooper, M Jamieson and Paul Jennings.

Officers: Wayne Coles, Rob Cowan, Craig Miller and Chris Nash.

PART I

ITEM 1 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Alan Mellins and Mr Mike Sullivan.

ITEM 2 - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

ITEM 3 - MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Forum held on 12 November 2013 be approved subject to the following –

- **Item 5:** on the fifth paragraph of page ii, the sentence “Councillor Beer suggested the proposed flight plans...” be amended to read “Councillor Beer suggested the proposed flight paths...”.
- **Item 7:** on the final paragraph of page iv, the final sentence be amended to read “...determine the nature of any RBWM policy.”
- **Item 17:** The final paragraph on page ix be amended to read “The Forum noted concern that Heathrow may change policy from a Westerly preference to an Easterly preference. It was confirmed that this would be considered by the Civil Aviation Authority after the Davies Commission made its recommendation.”

ITEM 4 – MATTERS ARISING

Councillor Malcolm Beer gave a number of verbal updates to the Forum:

- A high profile meeting was to take place in Eton regarding the Northern flight plan. However the date and time of the meeting had not been scheduled.
- The Borough was continuing efforts to establish a relationship with Heathrow Airport concerning their apprenticeship scheme. It was noted that RBWM was not considered a high priority as it was not a deprived area with low unemployment. Five boroughs had been identified as high priority including

Spelthorne and Slough. It was noted that high priority boroughs received preferential treatment including publicity and grants. It was noted that though parts of the Borough are wealthy such as Windsor, other areas such as Datchet had high unemployment and would benefit from the opportunities of such a scheme. It was suggested that the Public Health team would have the appropriate information to demonstrate the Borough did qualify as high priority.

- A day-long apprenticeship fair had been organised to take place in February at the Marriot Hotel at Heathrow airport.
- A report was in the process of being written regarding Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HACC) regarding the number of members representing Local Authorities. It was noted that Hillingdon and Hounslow had 3 representatives, Spelthorne had 2 representatives and RBWM had 1. It was noted that HACC membership was imposed by statute.
- It was noted that the Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC) was putting together a response to the Department of Transport's questions set out in 'Night Flying Restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted: Stage 2 Consultation'.

ITEM 5 – NIGHT FLYING RESTRICTIONS

The Forum received a report from Craig Miller, Interim Head of Public Protection, and Chris Nash, Team Leader – Environmental Protection, regarding Night Flying Restrictions. The report was to go to Cabinet on 30 January 2014.

The purpose of the Forum meeting was to consider potential amendments that Cabinet could make to Appendix A of the report which provided RBWM's response to the Department of Transport's questions set out in 'Night Flying Restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted: Stage 2 Consultation'. The deadline for the response was 31 January 2014.

The Forum made the following suggested amendments to the RBWM responses:

- The Forum agreed the responses needed to clearly state the Borough's position.
- It was agreed that a straight forward 'paragraph by paragraph' format was preferable to the 3 column approach previously used. The proposed response was to be formatted in bold so as to differentiate it from the rationale.
- It was noted that acronyms and abbreviations should be spelt out in full. For example, Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC), Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HACC) and University College London (UCL). It was also noted that specific phrases should be given suitable explanations so members of the public could understand the document. For example,

SMART should be described as a 'universally accepted arrangement strategy'.

- In considering the response to question 1, the Forum agreed the first sentence needed to be removed. The Forum requested credible noise studies be included as a footnote or in the rationale if possible to back up the Borough's position.
- In considering the response to question 2, the Forum believed that the 'contradictory reports' should either both be acknowledged, or neither.
- In considering the response to question 3, it was noted that the bullet points in the response would be better placed as part of the rationale.
- In considering the response to question 4, the Forum believed the rationale would be improved by amending the wording "Public mistrust based on broken promises..." to "based upon failure to honour the Terminal 5 pledge to adopt modern and appropriate noise metrics such as recommended by the subsequent ANASE or an alternative".
- In considering the response to question 5, the Forum agreed that dispensations should be allowed in genuine emergencies however the response needed to press for clarification on what circumstances merited a dispensation so the system was not abused.
- In considering the response to question 6, the Forum believed the Borough's response needed to be clearer, beginning with an unequivocal 'no' and reiterate RBWM's position that it maintains its expectations that there should be a reduction of permitted movements and noise quota points allocated.
- In considering the response to question 7, the Forum agreed the response needed rewording to state that the forecasts did not support progressive reduction of night flights and noise.
- In considering the response to question 10, the Forum noted that the response needed to mention consideration of the fact arrivals could be louder than departures, and consideration of revised infringement levels and fines for arrival aircraft.
- In considering the response to question 11, the Forum agreed that the response did not answer the question and it needed rewording to clarify the Borough's position. It was also noted that the response should note a need for guidance relating to the lowering of the landing gear and associated noise impact, as well as the need for community benefits to the east of the airport to also be applied to the west of the airport.
- In considering the response to question 12, the Forum believed the phrase "a greatly enhanced noise insulation package" should be reworded to read "a greatly enhanced statutory noise insulation package".

- In considering the response to question 13 (a), it was noted that the Borough's response needed to be clearer, beginning with an unequivocal 'no'. It was noted that the response also gave rise to the opportunity to note the fact that RBWM can provide assistance in the establishment of additional monitoring locations in suitable locations with the required power and telephone line needed.
- In considering the response to question 13 (b), it was noted that RBWM should reiterate its position rather than provide no response.
- In considering the responses to the impact assessment questions, it was noted by the Forum that the Borough's responses needed to be clearer which would be achieved by beginning the response to each question with 'no'.
- The Forum believed a third point should be added to the 'outstanding areas of concern not addressed by DfT in stage 2 consultation'. The third point should note that proper consideration should be given to the surface access and other associated infrastructure and assessed within the cost-benefit analysis prepared for any future regime.

ITEM 6 – DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

It was decided that the scheduled future meetings be amended as follows:

The meeting to take place on 19 February 2014 at Guildhall, Windsor be cancelled.

The next meetings would take place on 13 March 2014 and 14 May 2014

MEETING

The meeting, which began at 7.00pm ended at 9.15pm.