

Airspace and Noise Engagement Group – 09 December 2020

Attendees:	
Harvey Anderson- DfT (Secretary)	Charles Lloyd- Community groups
Ian Elston- DfT (Chair)	John Stewart- Community groups
Tim May- DfT	Martin Peachey- Community Groups
Ian Greene- DfT	Kay Jones- CAA
Matt Million- DfT	Andy Kershaw- BA
Meera Sharma- DfT	Benjamin Fenech- PHE
Gary Marshall- DfT	Ian Jopson- NATS
Wayne Gasson- DfT	Jeremy Pine- SASIG
Henry Bookham- DfT	Ben Hodgson- AICES
Dharmender Tathgur- DfT	Christopher Snelling - AOA
Teni Akinajo- DfT	Apologies:
Amal Said- DfT	Sam Hartley- ICCAN
Rupert Basham- ICCAN	Tim Johnson- AEF
Keith Bushell – Airbus	
Paula Street- UKACCs	
Andy Jefferson- Sustainable Aviation	
Laura Boccadamo- LGW	
Andy Sinclair- LGW	
Richard Norman- LHR	
Neil Robinson- MAG	

Agenda item 1: Welcome and Introductions

Introductions were made as well as acknowledging apologies from those not in attendance. Ian Elston (IE) chaired the meeting. IE wished farewell to John Stewart (JS) who is leaving the group as he is stepping down from his role at HACAN.

Agenda item 2: Minutes of last meeting and matters arising

IE Introduced the topic and noted that the draft minutes from our previous meeting in July had been reissued prior to the meeting and that members had been giving the opportunity to suggest any amendments. Martin Peachy (MP) had made a request for an amendment which DfT were happy to accept and finalise the minutes. Keith Bushell (KB) Subsequently requested a further amendment which was also accepted

IE then proceeded to address the actions from the previous meeting.

1. DfT to update on work being carried out by DEFRA: Ian Greene (IG) addressed the work being done by DEFRA on the Interdepartmental Group on Costs and Benefits Noise Subject Group (IGCB(N)). Work through the Defra-led IGCB(N) had inevitably slowed at this present time. Defra was adapting its planning and considering any necessary changes to the timeline, in particular focusing on necessary changes to the reporting approach. Next steps consisted of progressing work on the health effects reports. This would be followed by longer term plans to look at the valuation aspects of effects where sufficient evidence is available to robustly do so.

MP suggested inviting DEFRA to a future ANEG to provide a briefing on the work they had carried out. IG agreed this would be a useful exercise. **Action** : Invite Defra to next meeting.

2. CAA to Update on engagement activities: Barbara Perata-Smith was unable to attend the meeting but did provide the following comment 'The procedure for the CAA to review the classification of airspace (CAP 1991) was published 30 November for effect 1 December along with a response document to comments received (CAP 1990). We did the usual email to our 'airspace' list which includes community reps etc, plus we did a 'Skywise' release and a Press Release. A new team in SARG to run the procedure is taking shape. We've been clear that even if we do decide to propose an amendment to classification, that would only be if we expected no significant environmental impacts. By 'significant' we mean that the procedure would not be used for any change that affects published or predictable aircraft tracks inside controlled airspace, such as changes to departure and arrival routes at aerodromes. Any change with a significant environmental impact would need to go through the usual CAP 1616 airspace change process.

More relevant to communities is the AMS listening sessions that were run with a range of stakeholders including one with communities on 3 December and that was designed:

- To gather the views of lower airspace user groups on the content of the current AMS, such as which of the 15 initiatives remain important and which could be improved.
- To identify any gaps in the AMS (including issues not originally addressed in the current AMS, and issues that have arisen in the wake of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic).
- To invite ideas on how these could be included in a revised AMS.'

3. CAA to update on work relating to noise and health: Due to the full agenda we did not have time for Kay Jones to provide further update. However, the CAA had recently published an update on this issue in October. CAP1971: Aircraft Noise and Health Effects – a six monthly update (March 2020 – September 2020).

4. DfT on update on airspace modernisation at next meeting: IE provided update on this later on in the agenda.

Agenda item 3: DfT policy updates

IE noted that there was a new Aviation Minister. Robert Courts has been in the role since the start of September and had already met with several ANEG members and looked forward to further engagement.

Nathan Phillips would shortly be leaving his role as Director of Airports, Infrastructure & Commercial Interventions, after one year in the role and would be replaced by David Silk who was coming from HM Treasury. Nathan would be moving on to another role in DfT.

IE updated on the work DfT was carrying out on airspace modernisation. IE explained that despite COVID-19 and its impact on the aviation industry, the need to modernise the UK's airspace design still remains a priority to the Department. DfT and CAA had accepted three of the recommendations from ACOG's Remobilising Airspace Change report and had committed to reviewing the other seven and would update on this shortly. DfT were continuing to review the funding for the programme, considering our existing DfT budgets and commitments.

The Air Traffic Management and Unmanned Aircraft (ATMUA) Bill was currently going through Parliament and completed Committee stage on 12 February 2020.

JS enquired about where funding for future work on airspace modernisation would come from as it would be required to ensure the process moved forward. MP endorsed JS's comment and encouraged DfT to press ahead with the work as it would bring benefits to both communities and industry. IE stated that Government funding may be available but the Government's role in this would then need to be decided upon. IE added that the Government was not looking through a single lens but seeing the multiple benefits airspace modernisation can bring.

IE provided update on the work carried out by the Global Travel Taskforce and the support being provided to the aviation industry as well as discussing the new measures in place for travellers returning to the UK from abroad.

IE explained that we would be standing-up response teams over the Christmas period to ensure we can respond to any disruptions caused by the end of the Transition Period on 31 December. This was a cross Departmental / Govt response and would take up significant resources.

Whilst understanding the need for the Department to do this, CL wanted to know when the Department would be fully focused on noise again. IE replied saying spring was the most likely time as the Department is prepared to be carrying out this work until the end of March, however an element of staff had been ring-fenced to continue noise related work.

Agenda item 4: ICCAN update

Rupert Basham (RB) ICCANs Engagement Lead gave an update on ICCAN's recent activities and presented to the group.

Presentation focused on the work that ICCAN had carried throughout the year and the impact COVID had on their work programme. RB gave an overview on studies carried out on Noise Metrics and a Health review. ICCAN's work on a Summer attitudes survey and engagement best practice was also discussed. ICCAN was currently engaging with stakeholders on their emerging views on aviation noise management.

KB asked about the make-up of the current focus groups and enquired whether any manufacturers had been invited to these groups. RB wasn't able to confirm this but informed the group that invites were sent out via usual channels, email, social media etc and stated he was happy to reach out to manufacturers in the future.

Neil Robinson (NR) noted there were a few areas where ICCAN and the CAA were carrying out similar work such as health and noise. RB said CAA had been supportive of the work which they had recently carried out. IE agreed it would be helpful to talk to CAA about this.

Richard Norman (RN) asked how ICCAN plan to measure 'being a world leader in noise management'? RB stated the commissioners feel there is some really good practice in the UK but we can learn lessons from abroad. Conversation on how we measure this still needs to be had.

MP requested an update on a new noise attitudes survey. RB stated that recommendation was to look at a new development study. ICCAN were looking to publish what that would look like next year.

MP felt that with airports still pushing for expansion, a new survey would be useful now when discussing this. IE questioned whether pressing ahead with a new survey this year would be right given where industry was, as there were less flights and this could distort the views in a survey.

ACTION- DfT to discuss with CAA about relationship with ICCAN.

Agenda item 5: Industry updates

Ian Jopson (IJ) introduced this item. Sustainable Aviation was trying to progress trials looking at landing gear deployment, arrivals and departures noise, however, lack of resource had taken these off the agenda for the time being. Noise workshops planned for next year to consider inputs into a possible update to the Sustainable Aviation Noise Road Map in 2022.

Laura Boccadamo (LB) and Andy Sinclair (AS) from LGW provided a presentation regarding the Low Noise Arrivals Metric. This involved a background on continuous descent operations and the proposed low noise arrival metric.

CL said noise groups around LGW were supportive of the work being carried out. Charles then asked

1. Can the metric be applied to different flight paths and planes- LB Yes
2. Is the metric specific to LGW or could we see it used at different airports- LB The metric is not specific to LGW. NATS have provided data to test the metric, through the roll out we will learn more about the effectiveness.
3. If the metric works and is a success how do we roll it out to other airports? AS stated that if it works then it would be in the interests of industry best practice to roll it out across other airports.

MP was very supportive of the work being carried out by LGW and stated that noise issues were solved by continuous improvement and a lot of small actions being done successfully over time.

Agenda item 6: Community updates

CL lead on updates from the community groups.

CL stated that in relation to local activities the greatest amount of community group effort was going into campaigning against airport expansion. CL wished the Government to accept the CCC's advice that there should be no more increase to aviation capacity.

IE responded to this comment by noting that the CCC recommendation on expansion said that there should be no net expansion of UK airport capacity unless the sector is on track to sufficiently outperform its net emissions trajectory and can accommodate the additional demand.

Groups at LGW and Edinburgh Airport were dealing with new noise management boards. Both groups questioned how well airports could self-regulate themselves noise wise. LGW group were reviewing the noise action plan and assessing how much has this been delivered and was progress being measured correctly.

National level - fundamental points for ANEG were what we needed to do to have an effective noise policy and effective regulation. Given the focus on airspace modernisation, communities had concerns about the foundations on which this was being built.

Also wished to cover compensation for increased noise and the funding provided to industry from the government.

MP wished to differentiate between noise metrics which could be misleading and actual noise heard by public. JS endorsed these comments as there is confusion in the community regarding noise. Clearer explanation needed on what the expected decibel level heard on the ground would be helpful.

Agenda Item 7: Break

Agenda Item 8: Night flights consultation

Gary Marshall (GM) gave a presentation on the recently published night flights consultation.

KB asked about the potential new QC value, to be lower than 0.125? GM explained this could mean introducing a new band 0.0625. KB asked whether this would apply just to conventional aircraft or new types of aircraft such as electric? IG said that we were going back to basics looking for input on all types of aircraft.

RN felt the consultation had a challenging timeline. He asked whether DfT had considered wider community interest? E.g, did they value the interventions already in place such as noise insulation and what effectiveness did they have? GM noted how engagement plans had been impacted due to COVID. IG said that this consultation was opening-up the debate, acknowledging there was still a lot to do with 18 months prior to stage two of the consultation.

CL asked was the proposal to ban QC4 aircraft just at the designated airports? CL thought there were a few flying into East Midlands. IG noted that the Department does not have power to ban these aircraft at non-designated airports. IE added that local authorities would consider the lead we have taken.

CL asked if the decision to extend the existing restrictions for 2 more years had already been made? GM replied that given the impact of COVID 19 on industry and the current uncertainty, there was not time to do a robust cost and benefit analysis to make a decision on changes to come in from October 2022. However, it was a consultation and we would analyse those responses, and put a recommendation to Ministers and the SofS, who will make a decision.

NR noted the consultation had two distinct halves. He thought there would be little problem to respond on that. Concerns were over the 2nd half of the consultation – he didn't think they could give it proper consideration due to staffing and resource issues.

MP asked if DfT had a view whether there should be a nationwide night flights regime or to maintain the status quo with local decisions at other airports? MP felt it should come under one umbrella. IG said this is an open question, but noise policy had to date favoured towards working at a local level.

IE noted CL met with the aviation minister recently and had discussed national v local decision making.

Agenda item 9: DfT aviation Noise Dashboard tool

Henry Bookham (HB) and Dharmender Tathgur (DT) provided a presentation on the development of a DfT Aviation Noise dashboard tool. The presentation provided an overview of the dashboard that had been developed internally and showcased the dashboard's capability. They also sought feedback from the group on what outputs would be most valuable

MP reaffirmed a view that QC values were more valuable to communities as they gave a clearer measure of aircraft noise. It was a simple metric to understand.

KB agreed it was a good piece of work. Questioned why the dashboard went for highest QC value for any aircraft type as opposed to the actual value? DT said the allocation based on the data with the CAA was based

on a generic aircraft type and did not have specific engine type data. DfT was looking to acquire fleet data which allowed for more precise data on the engine. In the absence of that data, the dashboard assumed a worst noise scenario.

Agenda item 10: Review of ANEG

TM led discussions on the Review of ANEG paper which had been circulated to members prior to the meeting.

ANEG was coming up to its fourth anniversary in January. The paper set out some high-level questions regarding the group's functionality. Should we be making changes? Could we be more diverse in our representation in terms of geography?

JS noted engagement had been constructive amongst stakeholders. Questioned whether it was necessary to have 'ANEG looks for common solutions' in its ToR. JS felt groups outside London would benefit from attending ANEG due to their lack of access to airports etc. It would be beneficial for ANEG as it would give us a rounder picture. JS felt 3 meetings per year was a good number.

JP noted that ANEG was very London airports based and that the hybrid format type of meeting may work if the group looks to reach out to groups across the country.

MP felt ANEG had been successful and felt conflicting views were dealt with respectfully by members. MP felt that the group's focus should remain on noise and airspace and shouldn't include climate change.

Christopher Snelling (CS) praised the forum and agreed with what had already been said. He was keen to make use of the virtual meeting.

IE noted DfT now had offices in Leeds and Birmingham which might make attendance easier from outside London if we had hybrid meetings.

KB asked what consultative committees wanted from industry. Paula Street (PS) advised that given the broad range of matters that fell within the remit of ACCs, they would welcome the opportunity to hear updates from the industry on progress being made not only on noise reduction and green initiatives but also other projects such as improvements on airfield efficiency which benefit airports, the industry, passengers as well as the environment and communities.

Action- Members to send further comments in writing and DfT to consider a subgroup where thoughts are brought together.

Agenda item 11: AOB

Next meeting in April.

CL was keen to have further discussion on how much the taxpayer was subsidising aviation industry.