

NOTICE
OF
MEETING

AVIATION FORUM

will meet on

THURSDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY, 2019

At 7.00 pm

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER - GUILDHALL

TO: MEMBERS OF THE AVIATION FORUM

COUNCILLORS JOHN BOWDEN (CHAIRMAN), DAVID HILTON, JOHN LENTON,
MALCOLM BEER AND DEREK WILSON

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS DR LILLY EVANS, CARWYN COX, WISDOM DA COSTA,
MICHAEL AIREY AND JULIAN SHARPE

Karen Shepherd – Service Lead - Governance - Issued: March 6th 2019

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 or contact the Panel Administrator **Andy Carswell 01628 796319**

Accessibility - Members of the public wishing to attend this meeting are requested to notify the clerk in advance of any accessibility issues

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. Do not re-enter the building until told to do so by a member of staff.

Recording of Meetings – In line with the council's commitment to transparency the public section of the meeting will be audio recorded, and the audio recording will also be made available on the RBWM website, after the meeting. Filming, recording and photography of public Council meetings may be undertaken by 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 in the public domain. 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.	3 - 4
4.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on November 27 th 2018.	5 - 10
5.	<u>MATTERS ARISING</u> To consider any matters arising.	-
6.	<u>HEATHROW STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP UPDATE</u> To receive an update from Chris Nash/Jenifer Jackson.	-
7.	<u>UPDATE ON JUDICIAL REVIEW LEGAL PROCESS</u> To receive an update from Chris Nash.	-
8.	<u>UPDATE ON HEATHROW AIRSPACE CONSULTATION</u> To receive an update from Chris Nash.	-
9.	<u>TEDDINGTON ACTION GROUP PRESENTATION</u> To receive a presentation from a Teddington Action Group representative.	-
10.	<u>PARTNERSHIP BODIES</u> To receive updates regarding key developments from the Heathrow Community Engagement Board, the Local Authority Aircraft Noise Council, and the Heathrow Community Noise Forum. To include an update on the Question Time event hosted by the Heathrow Community Engagement Board on January 23 rd .	-
11.	<u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u> Future meeting dates will be confirmed at the meeting of Full Council on Tuesday February 26 th .	-

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS IN MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a DPI or Prejudicial Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they 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 the discussion or vote at a meeting.** The speaking time allocated for Members to make representations is at the discretion of the Chairman of the meeting. In order to avoid any accusations of taking part in the discussion or vote, after speaking, Members should move away from the panel table to a public area or, if they wish, leave the room. If the interest declared has not been entered on to a Members' Register of Interests, they must notify the Monitoring Officer in writing within the next 28 days following the meeting.

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) (relating to the Member or their partner) 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 licence 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.

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

A Member with a DPI should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations on the item: 'I declare a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'

Prejudicial Interests

Any interest which a reasonable, fair minded and informed member of the public would reasonably believe is so significant that it harms or impairs the Member's ability to judge the public interest in the item, i.e. a Member's decision making is influenced by their interest so that they are not able to impartially consider relevant issues.

A Member with a Prejudicial interest should state in the meeting: ***'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'***

Or, if making representations in the item: 'I declare a Prejudicial Interest in item x because xxx. As soon as we come to that item, I will make representations, then I will leave the room/ move to the public area for the entire duration of the discussion and not take part in the vote.'

Personal interests

Any other connection or association which a member of the public may reasonably think may influence a Member when making a decision on council matters.

Members with a Personal Interest should state at the meeting: ***'I wish to declare a Personal Interest in item x because xxx'. As this is a Personal Interest only, I will take part in the discussion and vote on the matter.***

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

AVIATION FORUM

TUESDAY, 27 NOVEMBER 2018

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

Also in attendance: Murray Barter, Paul Graves and Andrew Hall

Officers: Andy Carswell, Chris Nash, Jenifer Jackson and Robert Paddison

WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked those present to introduce themselves.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr Dr Evans. Cllr Beer stated that he had notified members of the Englefield Green Action Group of the date of the meeting but none of them had been able to attend. The Chairman stated he had invited John Endacott, Helen Price and Cllr Da Costa to the meeting; Mr Endacott had sent apologies but he had not had a response from the other two.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on August 16th were agreed as an accurate record, subject to some minor amendments in the section on page 7 beginning 'The Forum raised the following points':

- The word government to be added so the first bullet point read 'There was no national airspace strategy and national airspace had not been agreed yet but *government* still agreeing to proceed'
- The figure of 24% per cent in the second bullet point to be amended to 54%
- The third bullet point to be amended to say 'sand and gravel extraction plant' instead of cement yard
- The word Grundig to be amended to Grundon in the fourth bullet point
- The first sentence of the fifth bullet point to be amended to read 'A site on Ham Island in Old Windsor has been identified as an open gravel pit to make the new runways and fill soft spots.'

It was also agreed that the minute for Any Other Business should be amended to say 'Maidenhead Conservative Constituency'.

MATTERS ARISING

The Community Protection Principal reminded Members that a rebuttal against the need for a third runway would be heard by the High Court. However the Council had also taken the decision to join the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group in order to allow input into discussions around providing the best possible mitigation for the Royal Borough in the event of the third runway being built at Heathrow.

The Head of Planning reminded the Forum that the HSPG had been set up in 2015 to provide a single contact point for local authorities and enterprise partnerships in the area surrounding Heathrow Airport. It was accepted that attitudes towards the proposed expansion varied amongst the local authorities, but there was a shared vision towards securing effective mitigation against the impact of expansion through the Masterplan Principles. A set of position papers had been produced, which had been developed on a without prejudice basis to enable each Council to make their individual comments and representations on the Heathrow expansion proposals.

Members were informed that a Heathrow expansion-related Transport Strategy was being worked on and refined, and an infrastructure study produced jointly with Heathrow Airport was close to being completed. An HSPG sub group had asked for a holistic approach to tackling the issues of access, air quality and lower emissions. An overarching Economic Strategy - which took into account the displacement of businesses and commercial premises during any construction work; workforce accommodation; the socioeconomic effect on low income groups living in the vicinity of the airport; and apprenticeship requirements for any construction - was also being developed over the coming months. A community compensation fund has already been set up by Heathrow Airport Limited. The Principal Planning Policy Officer stated his belief that the various strategies had not been advanced as far as Heathrow Airport would have wanted. Paul Graves stated that the only displaced residents lived in Hillingdon. He stated that 700 homes were planned for demolition in the event of expansion of the airport and a further 375 would no longer be habitable, with homeowners having the option of selling their homes to Heathrow Airport Limited. Paul Graves stated he had seen a recent press article which said the CAA were seeking clarification on how Heathrow Airport Limited intended to fund this, and there had been a very limited response. The Principal Planning Policy Officer said that Council officers shared those concerns about the lack of information on funding. The Chairman stated that Heathrow Airport Limited had recently taken on an estimated £1 billion of debt.

The Forum was told that the Stage 5 Infrastructure Study had been published earlier in the day. The Head of Planning confirmed that the study had been partially funded by Heathrow Airport Limited as part of the priority work for the Development Consent Order; however they had no say in the outcome of what was contained within the report. The Chairman informed Members that he had attended a recent HSPG event, and the subject of infrastructure had not been mentioned.

Cllr Beer stated that the HSPG had been set up for some time prior to the Council being made aware of its existence. Five priority councils had been identified at the time of HSPG's inception; Cllr Beer stated his belief that this had been a PR exercise. He stated that the Council had not been selected as the Royal Borough was a prosperous area in comparison to the priority councils. The Chairman informed the Forum that he had complained about the Royal Borough being considered as a council area that would not be affected by Heathrow expansion. The Chairman stated that he had been informed he was not entitled to take part in the strategic discussions at HSPG as he was not a Cabinet member. He stated that he had discussed this with the Council Leader and he may be elevated to a Cabinet position in order to represent the Council's views at HSPG. If this were done, there would be no additional financial cost to the Council. Cllr Beer stated his belief that it was undemocratic for Heathrow Airport Limited to dictate who could and couldn't be represented at the HSPG meetings. He also said it was perverse that the Royal Borough had been deemed as not being affected by any expansion work when it was the closest council area geographically to the airport. The Chairman added that the Royal Borough would also be impacted by work to reroute the M25. Cllr Beer highlighted that the London Borough of Ealing was much further away but had been selected as one of the HSPG's five priority councils. Cllr Beer stated his biggest concern related to housing needs that would be created by any expansion work. The Head of Planning reiterated that participation at the HSPG would enable the Council's views to be put forward, and allow for input into securing the best mitigation for the impact of expansion work.

INDEPENDENT PARALLEL APPROACHES

The Community Protection Principal explained to Members that Heathrow Airport occasionally needed to operate Tactically Enhanced Arrival Measures when incoming aircraft arrived late, which meant landing on the departures runway. However with the rise in Performance Based Navigation, consideration was now being given to the implementation of Independent Parallel Approaches. This would lead to delayed aircraft following set flight paths so as not to interfere with incoming air traffic that was running on time, and reduce stacking. A consultation on the proposed implementation of IPA had been carried out. A copy of a letter outlining the Council's response to the proposals was circulated to Members. The Community Protection Principal explained that although the Council's position was that it was challenging any proposed expansion of the airport, it agreed with the four basic principles relating to IPA that had been identified. However the response letter also noted that noise burdens were not equal for all communities, and no health impact study had been undertaken as part of the report proposing IPA. Members were informed that the topic of airspace change would be considered later during the Development Consent Order process, and this would have to go through the HSPG.

The Chairman explained that a Time Based Separation could also be in operation, which when combined with IPA would enable an even higher number of aircraft to land when strong headwinds and inclement weather was taken into consideration. An Enhanced Time Based Separation system had also been suggested. This system would mean greater overflying of the Royal Borough on easterly landings at lower heights. However both the implementation of IPA and TBS would need to be agreed by the Department for Transport.

Andrew Hall stated that there was evidence that not all aircraft were sticking to the set flight paths, and that this had been noticed by residents who lived under the flight paths. Cllr Hilton said that the concentration of aircraft noise at ground level in Ascot during trials in 2014 had caused anger to residents. The Community Protection Principal said that the topic of expectations of noise levels at ground level had been raised during the High Court legal challenge.

The Chairman informed the Forum of two recent examples of aircraft coming in to land at Heathrow that had not followed the flight paths. The most serious of these involved an aircraft that failed to land and passed in close proximity over central London to another aircraft, which had been forced to take evasive action. The Chairman stated that at one point the two aircraft were just 500 feet apart. He stated that he would be following up to see what the outcome of this incident would be.

Cllr Hilton then gave Members a presentation on his personal experience of the Heathrow Community Noise Forum, which had initially been set up as a consequence of the 2014 Performance Based Navigation trials. Since its first meeting in 2015 the number of attendees had more than doubled. The Forum had verified the use of HAL's noise and track keeping systems, but had also learnt that its modelling system had underestimated the process of how recording noise levels worked. Cllr Hilton stated that the Forum had learnt that HAL had little understanding of how aircraft were flown, how airlines change climb rates, where they fly within the SIDs, and the gradual process of concentration. The number of noise monitors deployed by the group had been increased to 45, and a standardised local reporting format for noise, track keeping and aircraft movements had been established. Members were told that the Forum had initiated a 5 per cent climb rate trial on the Detling SID, and the final report on this was due in early 2019. Cllr Hilton said the Forum had helped all of the individual community noise groups to have a collective voice.

Cllr Hilton said that HAL had agreed to fund an Independent Technical Advisor. The position would be advertised prior to an interview process, with the community representatives drawing up a shortlist before the HCNF made the final selection.

The first independent project proposed by the HCNF would be a comparison of noise levels, comparing World Health Organisation guidelines against the results of the Survey of Noise Attitudes. Cllr Hilton stated that the WHO guidelines matched the results of a different study that had been discredited.

With regards to Performance Based Navigation, Cllr Hilton informed Members that there had been much resistance to it from communities that had been affected by its introduction. It was perceived that the only beneficiaries to its use were the airlines. Cllr Hilton highlighted cases in the USA and Canada where legal challenges against the use of Performance Based Navigation had been launched.

Regarding the Future Airspace Strategy, Cllr Hilton said that eight high priority risks had been identified, the most significant of which related to the redistribution of aircraft noise. Cllr Hilton said the redistribution of noise impacts risks deterring the re-design of SIDs and arrival procedures or aircraft at low altitudes. He said that if local consultative groups were effective in blocking the proposals, sponsors could become unwilling or unable to incur the costs associated with deploying the changes required to realise sufficient benefits from some FAS initiatives.

Cllr Hilton informed the Forum that Heathrow Airport's Sustainability Director Matt Gorman had recently accepted that the airport may not be able to realise the full capacity of a third runway because of the amount of resistance from campaign groups, including the HCNF. He said he hoped the HCNF would continue to work with the CAA and DfT in order to find a solution.

TEDDINGTON ACTION GROUP PRESENTATION

The item was deferred to a future meeting.

PARTNERSHIP BODIES

Regarding the Local Authority Aircraft Noise Council, Cllr Beer informed Members that this had yet to get going again following the recent death of the group's main administrator.

Regarding the Heathrow Community Engagement Board, Cllr Beer said there was dissatisfaction at the way the most recent meeting had been run, with attendees talking amongst themselves before a presentation from a Heathrow Airport representative. Cllr Beer stated his belief that the Chairman of the HCEB did not know anything about the purpose of the meeting and that it had been a waste of time as no progress had been made. Cllr Beer informed the Forum that he had been asked to write to the HCEB Chairman on behalf of LAANC to raise these concerns. The Chairman repeated what he had said earlier about the Royal Borough not having proper representation on the HCEB, and that ways of ensuring this in the future were being investigated. He said he agreed with Cllr Beer's concerns that the latest meeting had been a waste of time. Cllr Hilton also said he did not believe the HCEB had the capability to deliver anything for residents affected by any expansion work.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Andrew Hall asked if there was an update on the legal challenge against Heathrow expansion. The Community Protection Principal said there would be a pre-trial review hearing in the week commencing January 14th, with the main hearing taking place in the week beginning March 11th at the High Court. An update would be provided at the next Aviation Forum. Paul Graves said that campaigners intended to peacefully attend the pre-trial review, and also a climate change march that was due to take place at the weekend.

The Forum discussed Heathrow's use as a hub airport for domestic flights and noted the financial difficulties affecting Flybe, who flew into Heathrow from Newquay. It was suggested

that regional airports were still in favour of expanding Heathrow as a hub airport for the regions. The Chairman said this would be possible if a shorter third runway was approved as it would only be suitable for smaller aircraft, such as those used on domestic flights. A smaller runway would also reduce the cost of building.

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Members noted the date of the next meeting.

The meeting, which began at 7.00 pm, finished at 9.08 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank