

# Public Document Pack

## NOTICE OF MEETING



# AVIATION FORUM

will meet on

**TUESDAY, 15TH MARCH, 2016**

**At 7.00 pm**

in the

**CONFERENCE ROOM - YORK HOUSE,**

TO: MEMBERS OF THE AVIATION FORUM

COUNCILLORS MALCOLM BEER, JOHN BOWDEN (CHAIRMAN), SIMON DUDLEY,  
DAVID HILTON AND JOHN LENTON

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS JESSE GREY, LYNNE JONES, GEORGE BATHURST, CARWYN COX,  
DR LILLY EVANS AND SIMON WERNER

Karen Shepherd - Democratic Services Manager - Issued: Date Not Specified

Members of the Press and Public are welcome to attend Part I of this meeting. The agenda is available on the Council's web site at [www.rbwm.gov.uk](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk) or contact the Panel Administrator

**Fire Alarm** - In the event of the fire alarm sounding or other emergency, please leave the building quickly and calmly by the nearest exit. Do not stop to collect personal belongings and do not use the lifts. Congregate in the Town Hall Car Park, Park Street, Maidenhead (immediately adjacent to the Town Hall) and do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

**Recording of Meetings** – The Council allows the filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings. This may be undertaken by the Council itself, or any person attending the meeting. By entering the meeting room you are acknowledging that you may be audio or video recorded and that this recording will be available for public viewing on the RBWM website. If you have any questions regarding the council's policy, please speak to the Democratic Services or Legal representative at the meeting.

## AGENDA

### PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
1.	<u>WELCOME</u>	
2.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u>  To receive any apologies for absence.	
3.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u>  To receive any declarations of interest.	5 - 6
4.	<u>MINUTES</u>  To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2015.	7 - 10
5.	<u>MATTERS ARISING</u>  To consider any matters arising.	
6.	<u>FLIGHT PATH ISSUES</u>  To receive a verbal update from resident Andrew Hall concerning the routing of flights over the Ascot / Burnham path.  To receive a verbal update from Cllr David Hilton following ongoing correspondence with NATS concerning the Compton Gate.	
7.	<u>RBWM/2M SUBMISSION TO GOVERNMENT</u>  To receive a verbal update from Chris Nash on the response submitted to Government together with the London Borough's of Hillingdon, Wandsworth & Richmond upon Thames – setting out the legal implications of sanctioning a 3 <sup>rd</sup> runway at Heathrow.	
8.	<u>FULL RUNWAY ALTERATION ('CRANFORD APPEAL')</u>  To receive an update from Chris Nash on the RBWM submission to the Secretaries of State for Communities and Local Government, and for Transport.	11 - 12
9.	<u>PARTNERSHIP BODIES</u>  To receive an update regarding key developments from Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group (SASIG), Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HAAC) and Local Authority Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC).	
10.	<u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u>	

To note dates of future meetings:

- Tuesday 10 May 2016
- Tuesday 6 August 2016
- Thursday 3 November 2016
- Monday 27 February 2017
- Monday 8 May 2017



## MEMBERS' GUIDANCE NOTE

### DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

#### **DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS (DPIs)**

DPIs include:

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit made in respect of any expenses occurred in carrying out member duties or election expenses.
- Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.
- Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the relevant authority.
- Any license to occupy land in the area of the relevant authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where the landlord is the relevant authority, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where
  - a) that body has a piece of business or land in the area of the relevant authority, and
  - b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body **or** (ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

#### **PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS**

This is an interest which a reasonable fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs your ability to judge the public interest. That is, your decision making is influenced by your interest that you are not able to impartially consider only relevant issues.

#### **DECLARING INTERESTS**

If you have not disclosed your interest in the register, you **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as you are aware that you have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If you have already disclosed the interest in your Register of Interests you are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed. A member with a DPI or Prejudicial Interest **may make representations at the start of the item but must not take part in discussion or vote at a meeting.** The term 'discussion' has been taken to mean a discussion by the members of the committee or other body determining the issue. You should notify Democratic Services before the meeting of your intention to speak. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, you must move to the public area, having made your representations.

If you have any queries then you should obtain advice from the Legal or Democratic Services Officer before participating in the meeting.

If the interest declared has not been entered on to your Register of Interests, you must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 4

## AVIATION FORUM

MONDAY, 9 NOVEMBER 2015

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

Also in attendance:

Officers: Shilpa Manek and Chris Nash

### WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the Forum.

The Chairman informed the Forum that the meeting would be audio recorded and of fire drill procedures.

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Craig Miller, Community Protection & Enforcement Service Lead and Duncan Reed, Eton Town Councillor.

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

### MINUTES

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting of the Forum held on 20 August 2015 be approved. This was proposed by Councillor Hilton and seconded by Councillor Beer.**

### MATTERS ARISING

#### ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT COMMITTEE

Chris Nash, Team Leader - Environmental Protection and Councillor Dudley, both attended the House of Commons meeting. Members from 2M and Richmond, Hillingdon and Wandsworth representatives were also present. The top ten points discussed included:

1. AEF (Aviation Environment Federation) highlighted that there is a trade-off between engine performance and carbon emissions – put simply Heathrow cannot claim (under existing technology) to be able to achieve both reduction targets.
2. AEF continued to state that it was an unacceptable interpretation of air quality (AQ) guidance – for Heathrow to state that with a new runway AQ “will be no worse than locations in the Greater London Zone”.
3. Lord True (who spoke on behalf of ‘like minded 2M authorities’: RBWM, Hillingdon, Richmond & Wandsworth) stated that HAL’s assessment area for AQ was restrictive with key areas omitted – including the AQMA we declared at J13 of M25.
4. The environmental impact of upwards of 72,000 extra staff cannot be overlooked.
5. A noise envelope needs to be properly defined so that impact and mitigation can be properly assessed.
6. Any noise envelope should be based on a sound study into community annoyance (similar to ANASE study)

7. The Chief Executive of HAL (John Holland-Kaye [JHK]) stated in the second session on 04/11/15 that he was not prepared at this stage to comment on the Airport Commission's (AC) recommendation regarding night flights
8. JHK continued to state that HAL's contribution to infrastructure should be closer to £1bn – rather than the £6bn “wish list” put forward by Gov/TFL
9. JHK stated that HAL was able to achieve their modal share target of 50%, thus reducing the AQ risk associated with surface access / car travel.
10. JHK stated that AQ would be a part of a ‘triple lock’ – whereby new slots would only be released upon HAL hitting defined AQ targets.

Other points discussed included:

- Ongoing trade off of noise and air quality/carbon emissions.
- Runway 4 not ruled out.
- Infrastructure closer to £1 billion not £20million.
- Labour councils working with BAA, including Slough, Ealing and Hounslow. Very clear separation from Conservative councils.
- Colnbrook was against the Slough decision.
- Councillor Hilton asked about the submissions that had been made and if any feedback had been received. It was explained the format was very similar to the Aviation Forum, mainly Q and A session on the key messages.
- Zac Goldsmith was representing the local community.
- True cost not calculated, overall will not benefit the community as no real assessment carried out. Highly congested area, enormous housing problem and infrastructure overloaded as no further ground to expand.
- Commission changing their story that there will be 70,000 extra housing. The workforce will be able to travel in on public transport, the extension of route 702 bus service, Southern Rail, but this cannot be expanded because of level crossings and closure would cause chaos on roads, Heathrow's argument is that CrossRail will be functioning, sheer disruption on M25 and M4 and some functions will be moved offsite.
- Four local authorities have to now make the decision of what to do next, after Christmas and decide the next appropriate actions.

**ACTION: The transcript of the meeting to be sent to everyone present at Aviation Forum.**

## CONSIDERATION OF THE TEDDINGTON & TWICKENHAM FLIGHT ANALYSIS

Chris Nash, Team Leader – Environmental Protection, updated the Forum, advising that there was a local community action plan and we had had input. The group requested looking at the impacts of the three pre trials, report attached. Chris Nash went through some of the results in the report. A similar report has been commissioned for our areas.

Councillor Hilton informed the Forum that nothing had been discussed at the meeting he attended even though they had a collective responsibility to discuss. NATS and CAA sit on the committee too but sitting very quiet. A similar analysis to the Teddington one was taking place around Heathrow. The four gates were Compton, Staines, Sunningdale and Lightwater.

Members of the Community Noise Forum would be happy to take any questions from the Aviation Forum at the meeting on the 7 December.

The Forum discussed Webtrack and it being the most reliable tracking system for flights from Heathrow.

## COMPTON GATE PROCEDURE / FLIGHT PATHS - UPDATE



Councillor Hilton updated the Forum. He advised the we were in communication with NATS and all authorities have a corporate social responsibility. NATS have a responsibility too. Councillor Hilton had written to the Chief Executive of NATS asking how does it comply between corporate social responsibility and NATS guidance. The response received is the attached document. NATS justified the changes, however there was a fundamental flaw in NATS arguments. Councillor Hilton will be writing to NATS again.

**ACTION: Review of documentation and policy review.**

The Chairman asked what would happen if the northern runway opened up. Councillor Hilton advised that NATS had considered but Heathrow had not. In terms of noise, there was a failure to announce which was a significant flaw.

HEATHROW LOBBYING / COMMUNITY ROADSHOWS

The Forum discussed Heathrow Lobbying and the campaign that was being taken forward by the borough, building a strong, robust case for Heathrow runway 3.

The next steps would be to advertise in local areas, rolling out to public in Windsor, Maidenhead and Ascot, answering questions and making the public fully aware.

This would take place over the next 4-5 weeks and would report back at next meeting.

The Forum advised that it was important to advise people once dates agreed and engage people who were not aware. Some ideas suggested were having few top points, top five messages or some killer facts to get public interest.

The aim was to target Christmas shopping footfall on high street. The plan was also to use social media.

The Chairman suggested informing Parish Councillors too.

PARTNERSHIP BODIES

HAAC – Next meeting 1 January 2016.

SASIG – no update at present.

LAANC – Executive meeting took place, main point of meeting was the report ‘Assessing the work of the airports commission’. Slough is not represented at the meeting as officer on long term sick leave and Slough got a substantial package from Heathrow.

The Chairman read out the letter that Duncan Reed had received from Adam Afriyie.

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Forum noted the following dates for the future meetings of the Aviation Forum:

- 16 February 2016
- 10 May 2016

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 9.00 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....



Please reply to: Cllr John Bowden  
Direct Line: 01753 202690  
Email: [cllr.bowden@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.bowden@rbwm.gov.uk)  
Date: 17<sup>th</sup> February 2016



Mr Julian Pitt  
Department for Communities and Local  
Government

Mr Ian Elston  
Department for Transport

Dear Sirs

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 78  
APPEAL BY LONDON HEATHROW AIRPORT  
ENABLING WORKS TO ALLOW IMPLEMENTATION OF FULL RUNWAY  
ALTERNATION DURING EASTERLY OPERATIONS AT HEATHROW AIRPORT**

Thank you for the correspondence dated 26<sup>th</sup> January 2016, confirming the considerations of Secretaries of State for Communities and Local Government, and for Transport, regarding the above planning inspectorate appeal and in particular the wording of a suggested condition regarding noise mitigation.

The condition seeks to formalise the mitigation and support afforded to properties both 63 and 69dB LAeq 16hrs. On behalf of the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (RBWM), I would like to take the opportunity to formally submit representations to the Planning Inspector. This submission is made, taking into consideration the comments already submitted to the Inspector on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2014 and to the submission made to the London Borough of Hillingdon on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2013.

The Council wishes to reiterate that whilst the two noise thresholds would apply to the properties immediately surrounding the airport; many of the residential properties in the Royal Borough affected by overflights would not be addressed by such thresholds. This is due to the noise contours put forward being a totally inadequate representation of noise impact in real terms.

It should also be noted that a 63 and 69dB noise contour also falls well short of the WHO 55dB target for the onset of serious annoyance. This fact is particularly prevalent owing to the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) which aims for the following:

- Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life;
- Mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life: and
- Where possible, contribute to the improvement of health and quality of life.



**Alison Alexander: Managing Director**  
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead, Town Hall, St Ives Road, Maidenhead, Berkshire, SL6 1RF  
T: 01628 683800 E: [customer.service@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:customer.service@rbwm.gov.uk) [www.rbwm.gov.uk](http://www.rbwm.gov.uk)

With the above aims in mind and owing to the recognised health impacts of noise disturbance, including: sleep disturbance, annoyance, hypertension etc; the establishment of a noise contour significantly over WHO guidelines cannot be deemed appropriate and falls short of the stated aims within the NPSE.

In light of the above noise impact described, the Council would ask that the Inspector consider imposing a package of noise mitigation measures to all communities affected; ensuring such mitigation is fit for purpose and not simply adhering to the 63dB contour as proposed.

The above approach would ensure that communities both in London and the Thames Valley (in both urban and rural settings) are adequately protected against an ongoing unacceptable noise climate, which is likely to be exacerbated for some communities if the above appeal is granted.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Bowden', with a small 'JP' monogram to the left.

Cllr John Bowden  
**Chairman of the Aviation Forum**