

## AVIATION FORUM

TUESDAY, 10 MAY 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Malcolm Beer, John Bowden (Chairman), David Hilton and John Lenton

Officers: Shilpa Manek and Chris Nash

### WELCOME

The Chairman welcomes everyone to the meeting.

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence received from Councillor Simon Dudley and Duncan Reed.

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest noted.

### MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed after the following amendments:

- Page 8, paragraph 4, point 2 should read 'The final analysis was three weeks ago, assessment had been written which had not been published yet. It had not been agreed with Heathrow. Currently the assessment was being reviewed and amended before publishing.
- Page 8, paragraph 4, point 3 should read A380's were flown over the 3km gate, more than half flew below 4000ft and many outside the noise proliferation. This was checked by the community representatives and all results would be published.
- Page 8, paragraph 4, point 4, bullet 3 should read Reduce impact of Heathrow's night flight operation.
- Page 11, point 14 should read The Airports Commission recommendation that an independent aviation body be established had commenced.

### MATTERS ARISING

Chris Nash, Community Protection Principal, informed Forum Members that the agenda for the meeting was very light as we were expecting three decisions but these have been postponed due to the EU Referendum and other elections. Decisions should be made after June 2016. The next meeting would have a full agenda.

### RBWM RESPONSE TO THE CAA CONSULTATION ON AMENDMENTS TO THE AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSALS PROCESS

Chris Nash, Community Protection Principal, informed the Forum Members that the consultation document circulated concerns a two-step process, by which the CAA is reviewing the way in which airspace is managed.

Chris Nash explained the following points:

- It follows an independent review of CAA process by Helios in 2015 which identified some key improvement themes, including:
  - The need to adopt a more hands-on approach to regulation
  - Greater need for transparency
  - Better rationale behind decision making (including safety)
  - Greater community engagement
- The first round before us sets out the principles the CAA believe will address these themes, with the more detailed info to be consulted upon next year.
- For those not too familiar with airspace and how it is managed – we are talking here of ‘controlled airspace’ – that between 4,000 and 7,000 ft as set out in the governments previous white paper and Aviation Policy Framework. These documents set out that the CAA and airspace users need to balance noise, air quality and safety at these altitudes when designing traffic movements.
- It is also worth noting that the outcome of this consultation will also be heavily influenced by the potential future role of an independent aviation noise authority (IANA), as set out by Sir Howard Davies Airports Commission. It is expected that further details regarding this will come to light post-decision.
- Another important consideration is the role of the Aviation Policy Framework (last revised in 2013) – which it is understood that the DfT will be reviewing at some stage this year, probably post-decision. This is important due to this document setting out the way in which air traffic should be managed above 7,000ft – which is of great importance to residents who it can be argued have become much more attuned to ATMs above this altitude.
- Finally – it is also important to note that this consultation does not relate to the NPRs, which are set out by the Secretary of State.
- The consultation itself has a closing date of 15<sup>th</sup> June via the CAA’s citizens portal. It is structured by way of 40 questions, by which comments can be applied.
- Cllr Hilton has produced a very detail personal response that covers many of the aspects fundamental to the Ascot and Sunnings communities & I would be keen for this forum to respond to the CAA incorporating both this response and other positions under a RBWM banner.
- Essentially the principles proposed are to change from a 7 stage current process, with what can be an indefinite period of further consultation & appeal following this - to an expanded 7 stage process with the inclusion of 4 decision making gateways, during which consultation and a decision should occur. The idea behind this broadly is to add more certainty into the process, whilst abiding by the key themes for improvement as identified by Helios.
- After reading the detail within the consultation document, the proposals do appear to make sense and can (if used correctly) bring about a positive benefit to the airspace change process.
- This is however dependent on both the level and form of public engagement permitted – whether in the form of an independently chaired meeting or by written consultation.
- A key factor is also how the airspace change sponsor actually considers representations made and the manner in which they respond to any queries and concerns raised. Furthermore, perhaps most importantly, is that the issue of appeal is

not properly addressed from what I can see – with most of the language seemingly based around appeal of process rather than consideration of a schemes merits.

**ACTION: Chris Nash to produce a draft response, taking on board any comments (such as Cllr Hilton's personal response made) from the Aviation Forum in the next two weeks. This will then be circulated to elected members for approval prior to submission to the CAA within two/three weeks..**

**ACTION: Chris Nash to draft a letter to the DfT setting out the shortcomings of the CAA consultation in isolation & that primarily there needs to be a revision of the APF prior to such a consultation going ahead. Chris Nash to circulate this to elected members by end of June for approval.**

## PARTNERSHIP BODIES

### **HAAC**

Councillors Beer and Bowden attended the meeting. Items discussed at the HAAC meeting included:

- Presentation from CAA.
- Parking for staff.
- Misbehaviour of taxi drivers, Heathrow are going to make spaces available for taxi's to wait for their fares. They will be charged. This was related to antisocial behaviour in Cranford and Longford.
- Volume of noise complaints in areas, there has been clusters of noise complaints. These have been accepted but ignored by Heathrow.
- Representative from Slough highlighted that there were no noise complaints from the slough area. Other attendees of the meeting were puzzled as Slough is surrounded by Windsor and South Bucks, where there have been many complaints.
- Good detailed discussion from British Airways representative, discussing reduction of noisy planes and landing times.
- Other complaints - Windsor and Maidenhead was the most complained authority, 900 in a short time. Greater London authorities, other than those in the vicinity of Heathrow Airport, had grouped together to complain. Few complaints were received from Colnbrook and Burnham had many complaints too.

Councillor Lenton informed the Forum that clusters were not representative so not to consider. Colnbrook residents did not complain as most of them worked at the airport.

Nigel Davies, was concerned that Heathrow were as ignorant as us as they were unaware of all the new issues coming up.

Cllr Lilly Evans asked about the regulations of our airspace, the capacity and our knowledge about the airspace. These issues were not addressed in the legal framework for the users of airspace and should be addressed.

Chris Nash suggested reading, as background information, the Environmental Aviation Committee and Sustainable Aviation report.

The Chairman did take an airside tour of Heathrow but declined dinner.

### **LAANC**

Councillor Beer had attended the meeting. A very long presentation from Department for Transport – the technical officers asked many questions. It seems like there are going to be many consultations taking place which will be very time consuming, using officer and Member time.

### **SASIG**

Chris Nash had attended the meeting. It was highlighted that SASIG had changed its direction. It used to be a nationwide group and was now facilitated into three focus groups. Chris Nash had put himself forward for the environmental and strategic one. Mr Sullivan advised that the government had deferred the decision and nothing was being published. No consideration had been given to the Noise Action Plan, this had lasted five years and had 30-40 targets. There had been no report of reaching the targets. The Noise Action Plan is mandatory. Councillor Beer informed Members that the Noise Action Plan was on the HAAC agenda but had slipped off. Councillor Beer would highlight at the next meeting.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chairman highlighted a report he had recently read about Heathrow being a hub. The Chairman advised that the 2014 figures published were that 73.4 million people travelled through Heathrow, of which:

- 93% were international passengers.
- 7% were domestic passengers.
- 30% were business passengers.
- 70% were leisure passengers
- 36% were transfer passengers.

The Chairman asked the question: How can Heathrow be a Hub?

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Dates of future meetings noted by Members.

The meeting, which began at 7.15 pm, finished at 9.00 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....