

# Public Document Pack

## Notice of Meeting

### Aviation Forum

Councillors Richard Coe (Chair), Neil Knowles (Vice-Chair), Julian Tisi, Karen Davies and Julian Sharpe

Tuesday 23 April 2024 7.00 pm

Grey Room - York House - Windsor & on [RBWM YouTube](#)

www.rbwm.gov.uk



### Agenda

Item	Description	Page
1	<b>Apologies for Absence</b> To receive any apologies for absence.	-
2	<b>Declarations of Interest</b> To receive any declarations of interest.	3 - 4
3	<b>Minutes</b> To consider the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 14 October 2021.	5 - 8
4	<b>Proposed approach of the Aviation Forum</b> To Discuss a) Purpose and Terms of Reference b) Managing input to CISHA and subgroups c) Developing a council policy position	-
5	<b>Current Consultations</b> To discuss current consultations a) <a href="#">Night flight restrictions: Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted airports from October 2025 - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</a>	-
6	<b>Any Other Business</b> To discuss any other business.	9 - 10

By attending this meeting, participants are consenting to the audio & visual recording being permitted and acknowledge that this shall remain accessible in the public domain permanently.

Please contact Mikey Lloyd, [Mikey.lloyd@rbwm.gov.uk](mailto:Mikey.lloyd@rbwm.gov.uk), with any special requests that you may have when attending this meeting.

Published: Monday 15 April 2024



This page is intentionally left blank

## MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS AT 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 Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or Other Registerable 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.

Any Member with concerns about the nature of their interest should consult the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

### Non-participation in case of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to one of your DPIs (summary below, further details set out in Table 1 of the Members' Code of Conduct) you must disclose the interest, **not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room** unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that you have an interest. Dispensation may be granted by the Monitoring Officer in limited circumstances, to enable you to participate and vote on a matter in which you have a DPI.

Where you have a DPI on a matter to be considered or is being considered by you as a Cabinet Member in exercise of your executive function, you must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest and must not take any steps or further steps in the matter apart from arranging for someone else to deal with it.

*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 (other than from the council) made to the councillor during the previous 12-month period for expenses incurred by him/her in carrying out his/her duties as a councillor, or towards his/her 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 council.*
- *Any licence to occupy land in the area of the council for a month or longer.*
- *Any tenancy where the landlord is the council, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest in the securities of.*
- *Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:*
  - a) *that body has a place of business or land in the area of the council, 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.

### Disclosure of Other Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to one of your Other Registerable Interests (summary below and as set out in Table 2 of the Members Code of Conduct), you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

*Other Registerable Interests (relating to the Member or their partner):*

*You have an interest in any business of your authority where it relates to or is likely to affect:*

- a) any body of which you are in general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority*
- b) any body*
  - (i) exercising functions of a public nature*
  - (ii) directed to charitable purposes or*

*one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)*

### **Disclosure of Non- Registerable Interests**

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **directly relates** to your financial interest or well-being (and is not a DPI) or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer) you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Where a matter arises at a meeting which **affects** –

- a. your own financial interest or well-being;
- b. a financial interest or well-being of a friend, relative, close associate; or
- c. a body included in those you need to disclose under DPIs as set out in Table 1 of the Members' code of Conduct

you must disclose the interest. In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied.

Where a matter **affects** your financial interest or well-being:

- a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
- b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest

**You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer, you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

### **Other declarations**

Members may wish to declare at the beginning of the meeting any other information they feel should be in the public domain in relation to an item on the agenda; such Member statements will be included in the minutes for transparency.

# Agenda Item 3

## AVIATION FORUM

THURSDAY, 14 OCTOBER 2021

PRESENT: Councillors John Bowden (Chairman) and Karen Davies

Also in attendance: Nigel Davies, Andrew Hall and Geoff Paxton

Officers: Andy Carswell

### APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Hilton and Chris Joyce, who were both required to attend a meeting of the Leaders Board.

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Geoff Paxton stated he was a pension recipient, shareholder and former employee of British Airways.

### MINUTES

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the minutes of the meeting held on February 11<sup>th</sup> 2021 be approved as an accurate record.**

### HEATHROW UPDATE

The Forum clerk, Andy Carswell, read out the contents of an email sent by Vic Chetty, Senior Stakeholder Engagement Manager at Heathrow, to Chris Joyce, Head of Infrastructure, Sustainability and Economic Growth, as neither were available to attend the meeting. The message stated that Heathrow would soon be contacting the Royal Borough regarding the current Airspace Modernisation proposal, in particular the level of detail of the current activity of engagement on design principles for the proposed airspace change. It was hoped that RBWM would respond to the email message and be able to take part in the next engagement workshop, on a date to be confirmed.

The email from Vic Chetty also included a business update on operations at Heathrow. It stated that the Covid 19 pandemic was continuing to have a very large impact on the aviation industry. Passenger numbers remained at just under 40 per cent of pre-pandemic levels in September, whilst EU rivals enjoyed stronger resurgence over the summer. North American traffic was only 25 per cent of 2019 levels. Cargo, which was carried in the hold of passenger planes, was close to eight per cent down by volume on 2019, which reflected the way in which travel restrictions had been damaging UK exports and supply chains. Heathrow had welcomed the easing of testing requirements and red-list reduction, which it stated would make international travel simpler, cheaper, and less stressful for all passengers.

The message went on to say that the removal of PCR tests for vaccinated travellers in October and the opening up in the US should mean that passengers can book with confidence for Half Term and Christmas travel, and put Heathrow on track for recover. However Heathrow had three issues it had raised with the government. The airport was still waiting for the date for when the move from PCR to Lateral Flow tests would commence; it had hoped for this to be done before the October half term. It was also hoped there would be an eventual move away from costs of tests altogether, as some European countries did not require payment for Lateral Flow tests. Additionally it was hoped the reopening of US borders to vaccinated passengers could take place before Thanksgiving. Discussions were still ongoing regarding Business Rates, with lobbying for Heathrow as a business to receive appropriate remuneration of costs,

in proportion to the financial losses incurred. The Bill legislating out of MCC claims was currently progressing through the House of Lords.

Nigel Davies told the Forum that Councillor Hilton had attended a Zoom workshop on October 1<sup>st</sup> on the airspace modernisation proposals, which impacted on Windsor due to the north runway being used for take offs. He suggested an update from Councillor Hilton would be useful. Councillor Bowden said he had been critical of Heathrow as he considered the appropriate work had been done on taxi ways and for using the north runway for departures during Covid lockdowns. Nigel Davies said the airspace consultation focused on a redesign of the Compton departure route, an easterly alternative route for take offs, and a parallel approach to landings; however all three of these proposals would impact negatively on Windsor. He stated that Heathrow had acknowledged they would require planning permission for the proposals from Hillingdon Council. Councillor Bowden said he had attempted to raise this point in the past but had not been able to speak to anyone at Heathrow with the appropriate level of knowledge on aircraft operations.

### NOISE CONSULTATION

Andrew Hall told the Forum that the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise was in the process of being wound down. It had been useful in preparing reports and recommendations relating to aircraft noise, including recommending the implementation of an additional recording metric. Councillor Bowden said noise issues were not currently being considered as widely as previously as Heathrow was operating at a reduced capacity. Councillor Davies said RBWM residents had been encouraged to take part in the noise consultation, with information being circulated on social media to inform residents how Heathrow operations impacted on the Borough.

### PLANE SEWAGE DISCHARGE

Councillor Davies introduced the item as she had been contacted by a Windsor resident whose garden had had sewage from a plane discharged into it. This had been followed up with the Council's environmental health team and Heathrow, who were able to put them in contact with the relevant airline and Civil Aviation Authority. A summary of the exchange between the parties involved had been circulated to members via email. Councillor Davies asked the Forum if members were aware of anything similar happening before. She stated she was aware of reports of frozen sewage being discharged from planes but not of raw sewage such as this situation. Geoff Paxton said modern toilets on planes were vacuum secured and were very reliable as they relied on pressure suction to work, so a situation such as this could only result from aircraft failure or a failure to adequately service it. Councillor Bowden noted the incident happened in July and suggested warmer weather could have been a contributory factor. Members recalled rare instances of when similar incidents involving frozen waste had been discharged onto properties.

Andrew Hall stated that utility companies could be fined if they discharged sewage into water supplies and asked if airlines could also be fined for failing to properly discharge of waste. Councillor Bowden said this would come from a statutory instrument from the Civil Aviation Authority or from an MP proposing a bill; however it was likely that the proposal would be argued down due to the isolated nature of such events. Councillor Davies said an air safety list had recently been established to govern British airspace. She added that the resident had been advised to contact their home insurance broker in relation to the incident but they had decided not to pursue this as it would increase their insurance premium. It was suggested that raising it with the press would be a more suitable avenue.

### PARTNERSHIP BODIES

Councillor Bowden informed the Forum that the Heathrow Community Engagement Board was being wound down. The chairman had indicated their intention to stand down and in any

case no meetings had taken place during the previous 18 months. The Board was funded by Heathrow itself, and the airport was looking to reduce its costs. News releases were published in other formats and members were informed of examples of the news that was being released. The Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council was still in existence but was currently mothballed as meetings could not take place face to face.

Regarding the Heathrow Community Noise Forum, Nigel Davies told the Forum that a meeting was scheduled for the following week. The agenda had not yet been published and this was due to happen on Monday. Nigel Davies was critical of the short timeframe between the agenda publication and the meeting itself, as it did not allow attendees much time to provide their responses at the meeting. He stated he was unable to give an update on the most recent meeting as he had not attended, but reiterated his earlier point that Councillor Hilton had attended and contributed to the discussions.

### MATTERS ARISING

Councillor Bowden informed members that Network Rail would not be progressing plans to connect the Great Western line to Terminal 5 through a tunnel, due to post-Covid financial constraints.

Members noted that more freight traffic was using Heathrow, which meant more elderly aircraft were being used and therefore more noise was being generated. Nigel Davies noted a DHL flight had recently taken off at around midnight using a plane that was 32 years old.

Nigel Davies told the Forum that as part of the airspace change, pilots were being requested to use a faster and steeper take off in order to reduce noise. However research suggested that when offset against the greater carbon dioxide emissions there was minimal overall benefit in terms of noise reduction.

It was suggested that the next Forum meeting could take place in February. Nigel Davies said a workshop programme that Councillor Hilton was planning to attend was scheduled for January, and he suggested the next Aviation Forum should take place after this. Councillor Bowden agreed, although he said if any major issues emerged in the meantime then another Forum could be arranged.

The meeting, which began at 7.05 pm, finished at 7.58 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....

This page is intentionally left blank



## Health impacts of aviation noise

Note for Heathrow's Noise and Airspace Community Forum

21 March 2024

---

The Independent Chair of Heathrow's Noise and Airspace Community Forum (NACF) has commissioned Frontier Economics to undertake a short economic scoping study, considering the health impacts of aviation noise. Frontier attended the NACF meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2024 to provide an overview of the project and invite input from Members. This note to NACF Members provides some additional detail on the scope and timing of the project, and how Members can provide input.

### About Frontier Economics

Frontier Economics is one of Europe's largest economic consultancy firms. Frontier provides **independent and objective advice** to clients across a range of sectors and issues. This piece of work is being **undertaken by our Public Policy practice, operating independently from our Aviation practice**, which has worked for Heathrow on topics including regulatory, commercial and public policy issues (but not on noise specifically). This will ensure that our analysis is **completely objective and independent**, giving equal weight to the perspectives and inputs from all stakeholders involved.

### Background and objectives

An important area of discussion within the NACF is the **appropriate measurement of harms created due to noise, particularly due to night flights**.

The government's Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) sets out the current approach to measuring and valuing these harms. TAG Unit A3 provides the relevant guidance on environmental impact appraisal, including noise. There is concern that this guidance is too narrow, and leads to the exclusion of some relevant harms to local residents' health.

This **scoping study for the Independent Chair of the NACF will assesses the case for considering a wider set of harms from aviation noise**.

We note that the TAG guidance is based on high-quality published evidence, and that any proposed changes to the guidance would need to be supported by new evidence of this kind. We also note that any assessment of specific changes to aviation policy or regulation, or to Heathrow operations, would involve a full assessment of a wide set of costs and benefits.

## Scope

This is a short project with limited scope. It is focused on:

- the existing TAG guidance for quantifying health impacts of aviation noise; and
- whether this guidance could potentially be improved by considering additional health impacts, or updating the treatment of those impacts which are already considered.

The following are therefore out-of-scope for this project:

- applying the TAG guidance to undertake any assessment or analysis of actual impacts;
- non-health impacts, including annoyance, although we note that to the extent annoyance leads to mental or physical health impacts, these are within scope;
- impacts of aviation which are not due to noise;
- measurement of aviation noise or measurement of populations affected by noise; and
- assessment of any other aspects of the TAG guidance or its application e.g. to inform policy and regulatory decisions.

## Timing

We are aiming to complete this project by the end of April 2024.

## Possible conclusions

We expect that the conclusions from this project will be recommendations to the Department for Transport (as owner of the TAG guidance) and relevant stakeholders, to consider reviewing elements of the TAG guidance.

In particular, we may identify health impacts which are not currently included but we believe could be included, and/or health impacts which are currently included but where new evidence suggests the level of impact may be higher or lower than previously thought.

## Input from Members

We would be very pleased to receive input from NACF Members to inform this project. We are keen to be directed to all high-quality, relevant published evidence. We have so far focused on English-language evidence from the last 10 years, but are happy to consider wider evidence. We note that unpublished or anecdotal evidence would almost certainly not be considered by DfT or other stakeholders to be sufficiently robust to justify changes to TAG.

Please contact Nick Woolley ([nicholas.woolley@frontier-economics.com](mailto:nicholas.woolley@frontier-economics.com)) and Matt Parry ([matthew.parry@frontier-economics.com](mailto:matthew.parry@frontier-economics.com)).