

Briefing Note

Prepared For :	Cllr Bathurst, Chairman - Aviation Forum		
Contact Officer:	Chris Nash	Extension:	3645
Unit:	Public Protection	Date:	19 th Feb 2015
Subject:	Heathrow R3 Mitigation Proposals 2015		

1.0 **Background**

- 1.1 Members of the Aviation Forum will be aware of the robust response recently submitted to the Airports Commission (AC) on 3rd February 2015, highlighting the Borough's objections over any further expansion of Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL).
- 1.2 The Borough responded owing to many of its villages and towns being cited within HALs current 57dB noise contour, used to assess noise impact from take-off and landings at the airport. These include: Windsor, Eton, Datchet, Wraysbury and Old Windsor. In addition, communities such as Ascot, Sunningdale and Sunninghill have been frequently disturbed by aircraft noise during the recent future airspace trials.
- 1.3 The objections raised to the Commission detailed many areas of concern, including: Planning, Air Quality, Flooding, Surface Access & Noise impact.
- 1.3 A principal concern in relation to noise & noise mitigation (both in the AC response and in previous responses to the airport and statutory bodies), has been the manner in which noise is addressed by the airport.
- 1.5 The Borough stressed that for these communities; introducing a capacity rise at the airport with number of air traffic movements (ATMs) increasing (subject to planning permission) from 480,000 to around 740,000 (+54%) is completely unacceptable.
- 1.6 The Borough also advocated that before effective conclusions can be made by the commission and by respondents, a comprehensive revised study should be conducted into aircraft noise annoyance (such as the ANASE study). This study should underpin any conclusions made as to what constitutes as acceptable & applicable noise metric.

Furthermore, the manner in which the aircraft operates needs to be taken into consideration when assessing which metric to use; such that it may be considered inappropriate to apply a 16hr L_{eq} or L_{den} average noise level to a community that is being subjected to a period of 'intense' noise (due to alternation), thus failing to reflect the difference between quiet and intense periods of noise.

- 1.7 The Borough believes that the results of this revised study should inform a set of mitigation options to be established currently by the promoters – whilst still maintaining our objection to any further expansion at the airport. It is essential that these options address: noise insulation to achieve noise standards determined by the World Health Organisation (WHO), addressing areas affected by night & early morning flights and adequate compensation for loss of predictable respite and amenity (including loss of amenity / ability to enjoy outside spaces).
- 1.8 Further to the response made to the AC, in December 2014, the Borough (together with other neighbouring authorities surrounding the airport) supported the inquiry made by an All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG- <http://www.heathrowappg.com/>) into noise from Heathrow Airport. This advocated a fundamental review into the way in which the airport, government and statutory bodies address the issue of aircraft noise.

2.0 Current HAL Proposals

- 2.1 On 2nd February 2015 Heathrow (<http://your.heathrow.com/heathrow-unveils-new-world-class-insulation-scheme/>) released details of the proposed insulation scheme should they be granted permission to construct a third runway.
- 2.2 A new insulation scheme covering a zone ‘based upon 55 decibel noise contour’. This is assumed to be with reference to the 55LDEN noise metric used by other major EU airports.
- 2.3 Heathrow estimates that over 160 million homes could be eligible with a projected cost of around £700 million could be spent through this insulation package. This would represent an increase of over £450 million from that previously offered by Heathrow in its May 2014 submission to the Airports Commission.
- 2.4 The airport confirms that residents would be eligible regardless of whether they experience noise under existing flight paths or will be newly affected by noise from a new runway.
- 2.5 Under the proposed scheme, homes in the designated zone closest to the airport with higher levels of noise stand to have the full costs of their noise insulation covered by the airport. In addition, up to £3,000 in noise insulation would be offered to homes further away from the airport.
- 2.6 A third party assessment, free of cost to homeowners, would be made to determine the extent of each home’s needs within the eligible insulation zones. Heathrow’s insulation package could include:
- Acoustic double glazing in windows
 - Ceiling overboarding in bedrooms
 - Loft insulation and ventilation

2.7 Initial indication from the airport indicates that all homes within the towns and villages of Wraysbury & Datchet would be covered by the scheme. The precise details of the extent of the proposed eligible area are however currently not available.

3.0 **Borough Considerations**

3.1 It is important to note that a decision will not be made by government until the summer of 2015. This will be informed by the recommendations put forward by the Airports Commission. It may therefore be prudent to discuss the mitigation proposals put forward by HAL in broad terms only, until further detail from both the airport and the AC becomes available.

3.2 It is however important to note the inappropriate manner in which HAL continues to address the current noise climate – with the above proposals only applying on the condition that a 3rd runway is constructed. This factor is highlighted by the comparing the mitigation currently offered by Heathrow and its European competitors (approx. figures):

European Airport	Annual Mitigation Spend (mil) ¹	Population within EU 551den contour ²	Air Traffic Movements ³ (000's)	Passenger Numbers ⁴ (mil)
Amsterdam	31	43,700	437	50
Frankfurt	29	238,700	487	56
Paris CDG	12	170,000	514	61
Madrid	12	43,300	429	50
Heathrow	8	725,000	481	70

<http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/33/CAP%201165%20Managing%20Aviation%20Noise%202.pdf>¹

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/223764/airports-commission-noise.pdf²

<http://www.aci.aero/Data-Centre/Annual-Traffic-Data/Movements/2011-final>³

<http://www.aci.aero/Data-Centre/Annual-Traffic-Data/Passengers/2011-final>⁴

3.3 We can see from table above that the current offer for residents surrounding London Heathrow is extremely poor, in relation to both population overflow and the scale of operation at the airport.

3.4 Whilst it can be argued that the airport's recent proposal goes some way to addressing the deficit in mitigation offered; this should not be dependent on a 3rd runway being granted, with local communities needing this relief now.

4.0 **Further Actions**

4.1 The Borough will continue to communicate to HAL and the AC the pressing need for the current mitigation package to reflect current operational noise impact, regardless of what decision is made with regard to a 3rd runway.

4.2 Furthermore, the Borough will continue to stress to the AC, HAL and statutory bodies that any mitigation package needs to be based on a robust noise metric should reflect a comprehensive study into community aircraft annoyance.