

NOTICE
OF
MEETING

AVIATION FORUM

will meet on

THURSDAY, 22ND AUGUST, 2019

At 7.00 pm

in the

GREY ROOM - YORK HOUSE

TO: MEMBERS OF THE AVIATION FORUM

COUNCILLORS JOHN BOWDEN (CHAIRMAN), DAVID HILTON (VICE-CHAIRMAN),
KAREN DAVIES, ANDREW JOHNSON AND NEIL KNOWLES

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

COUNCILLORS DAVID CANNON, GARY MUIR, SHAMSUL SHELMIM, HELEN TAYLOR
AND AMY TISI

Karen Shepherd – Service Lead – Law and Governance - Issued: August 14th 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**

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>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> To receive any apologies for absence.	-
2.	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> To receive any declarations of interest.	3 - 4
3.	<u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on February 14 th 2019.	5 - 12
4.	<u>DRAFT HEATHROW CONSULTATION RESPONSE</u> To receive a verbal update from Chris Nash and Chris Joyce on the draft Heathrow Consultation Response.	-
5.	<u>NOISE MONITORING OPTIONS</u> To receive a verbal brief on noise monitoring options.	-
6.	<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.	-
7.	<u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u> To note the dates of future meetings as follows: November 14 th 2019 February 13 th 2020 May 14 th 2020 All meetings to take place at 7pm at York House, Windsor.	-

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 3

AVIATION FORUM

THURSDAY, 14 FEBRUARY 2019

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

Also in attendance: Councillor Mohammed Ilyas and Stephen Clark of TAG and No 3rd Runway Coalition.

Officers: Chris Nash

WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed members of the public and Forum Members to the meeting.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2019 be approved subject to the following amendments:

Independent Parallel Approaches

The Community Protection Principal explained to Members that Heathrow Airport *daily* needed to operate Tactically Enhanced Measures when incoming aircraft arrived late.

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 (*ANARSE*).

Partnership Bodies

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

MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising to discuss.

HEATHROW STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP UPDATE

Chris Nash, Community Protection Principal stated there were no planning representatives available that could go through the details of the HSPG. However, much of the last meetings' work continued with methods used in assessing health impacts and there would be a follow up

session in March 2019. He added that work on land mass use and how it occurred, such as borrow pits, had been postponed; the river rerouting work was ongoing; and a discussion on climate change workshop was occurring on field discussions around construction impacts.

Councillor Hilton stated the impacts of the third runway were so far reaching. He attended a Heathrow engagement meeting and had a conversation with the Director of Coln Park who had been invited on to the Engagement Board. He became very cynical in a very short space of time and it was interesting that at such an early stage some significant players were to walk away.

The Chairman stated he went to the HSPG meeting and there were over 60 attendees from South Herts, St Albans, Newham and South Bucks; and they were discussing the use of air space and runways and he was surprised they were there asking questions on air space. They were asking for night flights to begin after 5.30am. The Chairman asked where the flights would go between 4.30am and 5.30am and the answer was that the airlines would need to reschedule them; however, he imagined they would still have a quota of landing aircraft. The Chairman commented when he was at West London University, there was a question of trust with Heathrow so he stood up and asked how can we trust Heathrow when they reneged over the Cranford Agreement. He was told they changed their mind and that they had £10m of work to do and they did not want to do it. The Community Protection Principal stated when discussing night flights, the Airport Commission recommended there should be no flights between 11pm to 6am but, that had been ignored and lost on Heathrow. The Chairman stated the aircraft showed the path flew over RBWM and taxis and that was how they operated so aircraft were landing much earlier. Councillor D. Wilson said he was pleased the Chairman and Councillor Hilton had attended the HSPG but, he was concerned about how attendees were chosen. He added with a third runway, the effects over Maidenhead would be quite great. In 2018, disruption also increased for the Ascot area; he asked if Councillor Coppinger attended as Lead Member for Health. The Chairman stated it appeared Councillor Coppinger and the Head of Planning should be attending the HSPG meetings but, there were there only as observers because RBWM were not considered to be one of the five Boroughs of interest; no Borough's to the west of Heathrow were on the Community Engagement Boards.

The Community Protection Principal stated the HSPG had evolved but, there was an executive board and a summit. Councillor Coppinger attended the executive board and that had also been attended by officers. A further workshop had been attended by Robert Paddison and the Community Protection Principal made sure relevant officers were aware of the meetings. Councillor Hilton explained there were layers of meetings with some overlap. The invitation to the meetings was always sent to the Leader and he then passed on invitations to the Chairman and himself.

A local resident, John Holstock stated that as a resident he wanted a better understanding of the HSPG. The word Planning seemed to be linked to land but, he had never heard about that, they always discussed air space. He asked who the Aviation Forum reported to and how did parties resolve issues. The Community Protection Principal explained the HSPG was another mechanism to get the best deal from a bad situation. There were 11 local authorities that were members that put forward comments and the airport took them into account, although it might not act on those comments. Air space was linked to air quality and the HSPG looked at methodology on how that was measured. The Secretary of State said the HSPG could hear everything on methodology at DCO level. The Community Protection Principal added the Borough would submit comments on methodology and the HSPG would consider them. The response to the air space matter needed to be received by 4 March 2019 and the ground surface consultation would be in the summer before going to the DCO.

Councillor D Wilson stated Heathrow was the strategic planning group and when producing the Borough Local Plan (BLP) for submission, the Borough needed to submit a Housing Needs Assessment; however, the expansion at Heathrow meant the Borough then needed to add a further 5,000 dwellings to the assessment but the Council were already struggling to meet the Borough's housing needs so, to increase the amount of dwellings by 5,000 caused

problems trying to find where those houses would be built. He added if the HSPG was looking at the ground and potential jobs being created if they were allowed to go ahead with the third runway, how did Heathrow come to the conclusion that 5,000 new extra homes would be needed. Councillor Hilton stated that the figure did appear but, it was potentially contentious so Heathrow said there was unemployment in the surrounding areas and so the third runway would use those unemployed people and no new homes would be required. The Community Protection Principal commented that the Forum needed to see what the DCO said as the Council could not rely on the figure of 5,000 new dwellings. Officers were looking into the matter. Councillor Beer said the figure was part of the Davis Airport Commission findings. It went against every bit of fair competition. Heathrow thought they would need an extra 70,000 employees and so would need 70,000 new dwellings spread across 14 Borough's but, Heathrow never said which Boroughs they would be. There was no evidence for it with over 100 pages of documentation from the Davis Commission but only one page on housing. The HSPG was set up to facilitate the third runway; the HSPG said it was not there to promote a third runway but there were so many contradictions.

UPDATE ON JUDICIAL REVIEW LEGAL PROCESS

The Community Protection Principal said the Council had complied with the judges direction to slim down the skeleton arguments and the Council had done that. The argument remained intact and was ready for court on 11 March 2019. The Chairman said it was fortunate that Brexit was occupying the news as otherwise Heathrow would be in the news instead.

UPDATE ON HEATHROW AIRSPACE CONSULTATION

This item was also covered under the Teddington Action Group Presentation item.

TEDDINGTON ACTION GROUP PRESENTATION

Stephen Clark from TAG and No 3rd Runway Coalition gave a brief presentation on the Heathrow Consultation and the main key points were as follows:

- Air Navigation Guidance 2017 set out the government's key environmental objectives for aviation. They were:
 - Limit and where possible reduce the number of people in the UK significantly affected by adverse impacts from aircraft noise.
 - Ensure aviation sector made a significant and cost effective contribution towards reducing global emissions.
 - Minimise local air quality emissions and in particular ensure that the UK complies with its international obligations on air quality.
- Noise minimisation had to be prioritised up to 4,000ft (unqualified) and 7,000ft (balanced with carbon).
- What did 'significant adverse impacts' mean? ANG states:
 - Total adverse impacts should be limited/reduced, not numbers of people in any particular noise contour.
 - Adverse impacts were health and quality of life costs.
 - Adverse impacts grow as noise levels increase.
- Health impact costs were not nebulous – the fell back on quality of life, created urban blight and were a cost to the UK's economy, falling back on the NHS and social services.
- How did the UK compare internationally?
 - UK policy was based on the CAA's Survey of Noise Attitudes SoNA (2017).
 - WHO 2018 advise was for far lower levels of noise
 - The WHO day threshold was 45 dBLden, roughly the equivalent to circa 43 dBLAeq.
 - That was a vast difference to DfT's 51 (LOEL) or 54 (significantly annoyed) dBLAeq.

- 3dBLAeq was equivalent to roughly doubling the number of noise events.
- Why did the UK have much poorer standards? The CAA was responsible for promoting aviation growth in the UK. It was funded by aviation and the DfT (it was not impartial). Yet it was given responsibility for undertaking the UK's aviation noise survey. TAG's criticisms of SoNA included:
 - Unrepresentative sampling.
 - Defensive approach having regard to unsustainable legacy noise policies
 - Failure to recognise the importance of changes in the use of airspace on community annoyance.
 - The above were fatal flaws as SoNA and webTAG (based around SoNA) were used to evaluate the impact of new runways and airspace changes in the UK.
- Heathrow's Airspace Consultation – Q6. Factors for designing 3rd runway flightpaths:
 - The noise envelopes were too low.
 - Overflight – there would be insufficient space between many routes to achieve effective noise separation.
 - Some areas suffer arrivals and departures
 - They all relied on PBN for which there were no successful precedents in the world over densely populated areas.
- The presentation gave visual examples of international experience of concentrated flight paths.
- Heathrow's Airspace Consultation – Q7. Better use of existing 2 runways:
 - Affected areas will suffer both arrivals and departures with IPAs.
 - IPAs will be at their busiest between 6 and 7am – 25 arrivals in the hour
 - Due to be introduced in 2022 – if Heathrow doesn't proceed IPAs could become permanent
 - IPAs are based entirely on PBN – which would make areas unfit for human habitation.
- Heathrow said about PBN in 2016, in response to a European airspace modernisation consultation:
 - Whilst Heathrow Airport Limited fully supports airspace modernisation, this document does not support current UK CAA guidance and is not in line with current UK airspace projects such as LAMP. The timescale suggested here is unrealistic and could jeopardise these projects. In addition, as subsequent comments highlight, we have the following comments:
 - The Social Impact of PBN trials in the UK has been enormous, therefore this should be considered and not dismissed in one sentence.
 - There does not appear to be an environmental assessment of this prolonged change in terms of noise.
 - The Benefit Section takes no account of the cost of airspace consultation which results in an incomplete assessment.
 - Mixed conventional and PBN operations are not supported by the UK CAA.
 - Consequently, this NPA is not supported by Heathrow Airport Limited.
- Heathrow's Airspace Consultation – Q1. Local Noise Objective:
 - Unacceptable – seeks to qualify noise limitation against commercial considerations.
 - This is counter to established UK Policy in ANG 2017.
 - The acceptability of the respite proposals is unproven.
 - Generally no health impact due diligence had been undertaken on the acceptability of any of Heathrow's proposals – surely that should be an essential prerequisite to any airspace change (including development a 3rd runway).
- Heathrow's Airspace Consultation – Q2. Respite:
 - Heathrow's proposals are unacceptable.
 - Proposed respite is far less than today – only 4-5 hours break is offered a day.
 - No research findings had been published on what level of respite was needed for health and wellbeing.

- No research had been published on whether sufficient separation between routes could be achieved technically.
- Heathrow's Airspace Consultation – Q3. Operational Preference:
 - This question is divisive – communities around Heathrow must stand together.
 - Any change to operational preference should only be contemplated if Heathrow completely changes its approach to noise management.
 - Heathrow should commit to using 'best endeavours' to minimise all significant adverse environmental impacts and to making all areas in its catchment properly fit for human habitation.
 - The airport should also commit to fair and equitable noise sharing between all communities and work towards WHO standards.
- Heathrow's Airspace Consultation – Q4. Morning Operations:
 - Neither Heathrow proposal in the binary question is acceptable.
 - Alternation from day to day or week to week will in any event lead to broken sleep patterns.
 - Medical advice for adults is 8 hours uninterrupted sleep; children need much more.
 - Not acceptable to embed a 5.30am 'wakeup call' for all local communities effectively forever.
 - Heathrow's proposals even seek to erode the government's 6.5 hour proposal by nit-picking on time in the air and 'scheduled' timings.
- Heathrow's Airspace Consultation – Q5. Quieter aircraft at night:
 - A night flight ban should mean a complete ban.
 - Heathrow's scheduling encourages concentration of departures late at night and consequently late running.
 - There should be heavy financial penalties imposed on the airport for all flying at antisocial hours – these should relate to its health and wellbeing impacts under the 'polluter pays' principle.
 - Heathrow's charges to airlines on late evening and early morning flights should be based on the noise created, not charges per passenger.
- Final Thoughts:
 - Heathrow's consultation material is complex and potentially highly confusing.
 - It asks the public to respond to inappropriate yes/no binary questions some of which are set to divide communities.
 - Heathrow's airspace design is based on PBN which is unacceptable over densely populated areas and its respite proposals are at best unproven.
 - Due to this – and non-adherence to agreed Government adopted ANG policy the current airspace consultation should be called in from the CAA by the DfT and abandoned.
 - IPA is being used to seek 25,000 additional flights before expansion. This was not included in the NPS nor subject to any previous consultation nor put to Parliament. This proposal should be dismissed by the Government.

The Community Protection Principal thanked Stephen Clark for attending the Forum and stated his coalition were in a similar position to that of RBWM so it was good that the two organisations were coming together. The Council echoed the sentiments that the Borough and TAG should revisit the noise envelopes and noise health studies. The current situation was unacceptable and the Cranford Agreement needed to be revisited. It was proportional and cost effective but Heathrow had shelved it. He added it was interesting because the results of the consultation depended on where your postcode was. You could input your postcode and get one set of results, but then put in a postcode of two streets away and get a completely different set of results. It needed to be reworked. Councillor Hilton endorsed the Community Protection Principal's comments as he had noticed the same thing. You could put in the postcode of the Town Hall and get a different answer to that than if he was sitting at home and the Borough needed to make that representation. It should go out to Heathrow with a signature from the Leader on behalf of the Borough. The Community Protection Principal confirmed that action had been delegated to the Chairman of the Aviation Forum.

Councillor Hilton asked if the whole premise of the consultation was flawed, how can any individual respond and what was the factual truth. The Community Protection Principal confirmed it was the divide and conquer strategy so, Heathrow divided Windsor into three zones and coded the highest impact in green and the lowest in red. The postcode specific system did not show the holistic picture. The impacts would be shown differently to different areas that were just a couple of streets away. John Holstock stated he took part in a phone in on BBC Berkshire and it was evident the whole trial of Heathrow was to deceive the public. The benefits were that residents would get longer periods of respite and there was no mention of an additional 25,000 flights and no mention of pollution which caused 40,000 unnecessary deaths per year. The public had been told when Heathrow built Terminal 5 that it would be the last thing they constructed so it was evident, they could not trust anything Heathrow said.

Residents told the Forum that whenever anyone complained about noise, the government said to contact Heathrow. With this consultation, if complaining, complaints were to be sent to Heathrow, but there was no way of making those go wider than HR. Councillor Hilton stated he did not believe Heathrow was living up to its responsibility. The DfT was meant to be in charge of airspace but there was a big vacuum which was due to the DfT. Heathrow had said they would give communities technical support so they could challenge the data but, that support hadn't come forward.

The Chairman stated there was a single person responsible for the noise, and that was the pilot as he controlled how the aircraft was flown and how much power was used and which direction the aircraft will be flown in at. Councillor Hilton said he put a post on Facebook about the consultation and it received 7,000 views and it was the highest interaction on social media any post had received. He explained to people how they could submit their comments in response to the consultation.

The Community Protection Principal stated he was taking two actions away from the Forum which were:

1. Draft a response to the consultation.
2. Produce a crib sheet from TAG and the No 3rd Runway Coalition.

PARTNERSHIP BODIES

Councillor Beer stated the Community Engagement Board now had the former Environmental Officer from a London Borough who was a strong pivot on environmental matters and would be the new administrator. The Partnership had a meeting in January 2019 that went into detail on policy.

The Community Engagement Board were very concerned as it was meant to be independent and the Chairman had no knowledge of aviation and the last meeting did not change anything. It was meant to be an independent commission in aircraft noise. Traffic stats for Heathrow were right at the limit at 400,000. A technical director was involved in assisting the legal challenge and he had been appraised on technical issues. A resident stated it was difficult to decipher arrivals and departures with huge graphics on small tables, Heathrow tried to roll statutory functions of one board into the Community Engagement Board. Councillor Beer stated he addressed the meeting held at Langley highlighting those problems with the negatives not being explained. Councillor Hilton said the Chairman of the Community Engagement Board should be holding Heathrow to account; Heathrow would fight as much as they could for the interests of shareholders there had to be an organisation that pushed back.

The Chairman said RBWM was six miles from Heathrow and at that point, the pilot should be lined up with landing gear down. Some aircraft were getting lower due to meteorological events so needed more power to counter that which caused more noise. Cloud also created more noise and it all depended on the size of the aircraft. Councillor Hilton stated residents were told under PBN altitudes could also be set and aircraft could be managed in a different way than today. There could be significant opportunity if used the right way to make the impact less. There would be at least 54% more flights with a third runway.

Councillor Beer stated one thing he had noticed through all documentation was that Heathrow stated everything was subject to economic viability so, they would do things if it did not cost anything but, they would not do things if it did cost money.

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

It was noted that the schedule of meetings for the next municipal year had not yet been released.

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

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank