

## Airspace and Noise Engagement Group – 22 July 2021

| Attendees:                                  |  |
|---|--|
| Oliwia Chrzanowska - DfT (Secretary)        | Richard Norman- LHR                                    |
| Ian Elston- DfT (Chair)                     | Tom Redfern – Birmingham Airport, Sustainable Aviation |
| Tim May- DfT                                | Ed Weston - CAA  |
| Ian Greene- DfT                             | Kay Jones- CAA   |
| Matt Million- DfT                           | Benjamin Fenech- PHE                                   |
| David Silk - DfT                            | Ben Hodgson- AICES                                     |
| Gary Marshall- DfT                          | Tim Johnson - AEF                                      |
| Henry Bookham- DfT                          | Sam Hartley - ICCAN                                    |
| Amal Said- DfT                              | Paul Beckford - HACAN                                  |
| Jack Millar -DfT                            |  |
| Robert Smail - DEFRA                        | <b>Apologies:</b>                                      |
| Joseph Duggan - MHCLG                       | Andy Jefferson- Sustainable Aviation                   |
| Mari Williams – Welsh Government            | Andy Kershaw- BA                                       |
| David Courtenay – Northern Irish Government | Colin Flack- UKACC – Chair of the UKACC                |
| Chris Cain - SASIG                          | Darren Rhodes - CAA                                    |
| Jeremy Pine- SASIG                          | Ian Jopson – NATS                                      |
| Vicki Hughes - ANS                          | Amanda Francis - AICES                                 |
| Robin Clarke - NATS                         | Steve Richardson – Virgin Atlantic                     |
| Charles Lloyd- Community groups             | Chris Carter - BA                                      |
| Martin Peachey- Community Groups            | Meera Sharma- DfT                                      |
| Frank Evans- UKACC                          | Keith Bushell – Airbus                                 |
| Elizabeth Crowhurst - CBI                   | Rhian Thomas – DEFRA                                   |
| Cheryl Monk – ACOG                          | Neil Robinson- MAG                                     |
| Matt Ross - ACOG                            | Rebecca Christie - DfT                                 |

### Agenda item 1: Introductions

Ian Elston (IE) chaired the meeting. Introductions were made as well as acknowledging apologies from those not in attendance. IE introduced the new joiners and those standing in for people who are unable to attend. IE highlighted that David Silk, Director of Airports, Infrastructure and Commercial at DfT would be joining the first half of the meeting.

IE noted that an agenda and papers were shared prior to the meeting and the group confirmed they had received them.

### Agenda item 2: Minutes of last meeting and matters arising

Tim May (TM) then proceeded to list actions arising from the previous meeting and progress on these. All actions were either completed or would be covered in July's meeting.

- IE to respond to Jeremy Pine's (JP) query in writing: "The net zero aviation strategy is separate to the transport decarbonisation plan. Which one comes first and what degree of overlap will there be between them?" – Completed, response was sent to all members on 11 May, a decarbonisation update was also being provided in the DfT policy updates agenda item.
- DfT to decide whether any action is needed regarding the night flights consultation as a result of the SoNA report delay – Completed, part two of night flights consultation was extended to 3 September, an update on the SoNA report was also being provided in a later agenda item.

- IE to provide feedback on Charles Lloyd's (CL) proposal for an expert body formal commissioning process – Ongoing, decision pending based on future of the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN), this would also be covered later in the meeting under either the community slot or AOB by Ben Fenech (BF).
- TM to consider focus groups to take stock of what has changed – Completed, item on agenda to discuss this.
- IE to pick up with Paul Beckford (PB) offline regarding: "Promised noise reductions from the introduction of new aircraft or new engines are not always delivered in reality. As an example, at Luton new engines were supposed to deliver a 3dB decrease in noise and this did not happen because of the way the aircraft were flown." - Completed, PB to present further information on this in the communities slot.
- Sam Hartley (SH) and Keith Bushell (KB) to discuss what sort of input and engagement ICCAN would like from manufacturers – Completed, discussion has taken place.
- Circulation of Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) slides from previous ANEG – Completed shortly after April's meeting
- DfT to consider Devolved Administration attendance at ANEG – Completed, both Welsh and Northern Irish representatives in attendance, we are awaiting a response from Scottish Government.
- Decision made at previous meeting that we should not allow observers at ANEG, ToR's amended and distributed to reflect this
- DfT to check attendee availability and send selection of dates out – completed, Oliwia Chrzanowska (OC) has received a forward look of Sustainable Aviation (SA) council meetings to avoid clashes for attendees in future

### **Agenda item 3: DfT Policy Updates**

IE began this item by welcoming David Silk (DS) to the meeting.

DS introduced himself as DfT's Director of Airports, he has been in his post for roughly 6 months. DS apologised for missing the last meeting in April. DS noted that he would be leaving at the break, and that he is happy to be contacted directly by ANEG members.

DS was conscious that from an aviation noise perspective, the last 16 months had been an artificial period and we were now increasingly approaching a period in which air travel was picking up again. From the perspective of the department and the sector this was a good thing, but DS was aware it would raise concerns on noise, DfT need to engage with these as openly and constructively as possible.

DS mentioned the night flights consultation decision document which had been released earlier that week, this would be covered by Gary Marshall (GM) later in the meeting. DS also covered airspace modernisation, which remains a key priority for the department and has been able to be supported by funding through the difficult pandemic period.

DS was hopeful that overall, these initiatives would have a positive impact on noise, but remained conscious that any changes to flight plans would be challenging, potentially controversial and something we need to work through together. DS reaffirmed that he was happy to be approached outside of this meeting with any points.

IE then summarised DfT's policy updates.

**International travel** – DfT are seeing increased reopening of the aviation sector but must ensure this is done in a way which protects the safety of the population. From 19 July, the government removed the need to self-isolate, for those returning from amber list country who have been fully vaccinated by an NHS administered vaccine. They would still be required to take a test on day 2. People returning from red list countries would still need to undertake mandatory quarantine in a managed hotel. International travel is kept under constant review and rules are subject to change, as seen with the situation in France where arrivals into the UK from amber list France needed to quarantine for 10 days even if fully vaccinated. Traffic light list reviews would continue every three weeks, but the government could take urgent action in between these reviews if needed.

**Decarbonisation** – IE briefly touched on the information in the slide pack, which had been shared prior to the meeting. DfT have published the aviation decarbonisation consultation. IE was happy to take any questions and encouraged attendees to respond to the consultation which lasts for eight weeks, closing on 8 September.

Matt Million (MM) from the Airports & Global Travel Analysis (AGTA) team then provided an update on their noise dashboard work. Meera Sharma (MS) sent her apologies for this meeting. MM noted that several attendees would already be familiar with the dashboard as they'd been taken through it at an earlier meeting. In terms of taking the dashboard forward, in the previous presentation of this piece of work, the AGTA team highlighted that they were trying to improve the accuracy of the data underpinning the dashboard. The dashboard is a tool helping us to understand noise trends at a range of airports. The dashboard helps DfT use the data to understand what is happening at different times of day and times of the year.

One challenge was that certain assumptions had to be made about QC ratings of aircraft. Sometimes the team had to make conservative assumptions of these, assuming a worst-case QC. The AGTA team have been looking at how to improve this with the modelling team, to get improved fleet data which gives more accurate QC ratings. Roughly 85% of movements can now be matched with a more accurate QC rating.

The AGTA team have also been adding around three years' worth of historical aircraft data to see what can be done with this. The team are investigating whether there are any further airports data could be collected from. Next steps now are for a period of quality assuring of analysis to work out how the data can be used. The team are also looking at how dashboard outputs can be more accessible without revealing anything commercially sensitive.

MM then highlighted that his team is in the process of changing their name from Aviation Capacity Economics to Airports & Global Travel Analysis, and that the minutes should reflect this. This name change reflects the changing nature of the team, who now support a wider range of areas than just airport capacity.

MM passed over to Henry Bookham (HB), who had no further comments.

IE then moved on to note that DfT had recently published their response to part one of the night flights restrictions consultation, which GM would cover shortly.

IE asked attendees for any questions on DfT's policy updates.

Tim Johnson (TJ) began by asking about the transport decarbonisation strategy. TJ noted that this was still based on 2017 passenger forecasts, is there any update on when the next iteration of the passenger forecasts will be?

IE responded that it is currently difficult to forecast due to uncertainty around international travel and COVID-19. DfT first need to see what recovery looks like and for this reason the 2017 forecast is still probably the best one to use, while we are in an unprecedented situation. The timetable is being kept under review, but it is currently not possible to say when further forecasts may be produced. If a more settled recovery in aviation is seen, DfT would look to produce forecasts as quickly as possible on the back of this.

MM added that trying to work out when updates can be made to the forecasts is on the AGTA team's agenda, but there continues to be high uncertainty around when levels will return to "normal", or akin to those in 2019 and prior. IE added that some forecasting may be able to be undertaken soon, but this would likely be only on a national level, due to the uncertainty around how recovery will look in different countries.

Jeremy Pine (JP) then asked a question about the transport decarbonisation plan – was there a reference to a consultation on net zero domestic aviation by 2040? Is this something separate to the jet zero consultation?

TM responded by saying that one of the proposals in the jet zero consultation is that there will only be one single consultation, not a separate one on net zero domestic aviation by 2040.

Frank Evans (FE) had a point of clarification for MM – MM mentioned aircraft linking to QC levels, is this the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) certification given to those aircraft, or how those aircraft perform in practice? There have previously been variances between CAA certification and operational performance.

HB responded that DfT are unable to pick up the differential in modelling. On QC values previously, there was no data on the engine series of specific air traffic movements, now this data has been acquired. This enables DfT to assign an engine series to a movement and from that the AGTA team can apply that to the CAA QC series. However, HB clarified that modelling remains based on QC, not actual emittance of noise.

Ian E then handed over to GM for the night flights consultation item.

#### **Agenda item 4: Night Flights Consultation**

GM began by noting that most attendees will have seen the headlines of the night flights decision document, which had been released earlier in the week. GM then proceeded to run through the slide pack, which has been shared with all ANEG attendees for reference, detailing the outcomes of part one of the consultation –

- That the existing night noise objective and existing night flight restrictions at the designated airports would be rolled over for a period of 3 years
- The next night flight regime will therefore run from October 2022 to October 2025.
- DfT will implement a ban on QC4 rated aircraft movements at the designated airports, during the Night Quota period (23:30-06:00) from October 2022
- And that a further consultation on night flight restrictions post-October 2025 would be published during 2023, after responses to part two of the consultation had been analyzed

GM highlighted that part two of the consultation remained open until 3 September 2021 and encouraged attendees to respond. The consultation asks questions on the structure of the government's noise quota count system and DfT's national night flight policy. Responses to the questions on night flight dispensations would be used to revise the guidance to airport operators and this would be published before October 2022.

GM then explained that DfT would continue to develop their evidence base to support the appraisal of future decisions on the design of the night flight regime. This would be done for both the benefits and costs. GM ended by noting that DfT were scoping out a research project to understand how impacts associated with exposure to aviation noise vary by time of night.

GM welcomed questions

CL began by saying that the general view of communities regarding the outcome of the consultation is one of exceptional disappointment. CL highlighted that the government had repeatedly acknowledged that night flights are the most disturbing form of noise, but that no real action had been taken to address this in the last 15 years.

CL continued that it was obvious, following the 2017 consultation, that DfT needed to seriously assess the impacts and benefits of night flights but had not done this. CL stated that decisions taken by the department were in industry's favour and community views had been brushed aside. CL noted that there was a serious concern among communities that their consultation responses had not been properly considered.

CL then proposed several suggestions for how this could be taken forward – CL requested a quantified analysis of the responses to part one of the consultation detailing who was in support/against the various proposals, an explanation of how DfT reconcile their Night Flight Objective with a set of movements that allow industry to significantly increase the number and noisiness of flights and finally a request for communities, councils, consultative committees and other bodies to sit down with the Minister, so that he can understand the strength of feeling around this issue.

IE asked for further comments

Paul Beckford (PB) raised a question about the research steering group – who are the community representatives that were mentioned during the presentation?

Ian Greene (IG) responded to several points –

Firstly, on CL's suggestion for quantified analysis, within the consultation decision document DfT have outlined the views of various groups. IG highlighted that there had, as expected, been a greater number of responses from individuals than from industry so it would not be as simple as providing pure figures on responses.

On CL's point about maintaining the existing benefits of night flights, IG noted that there is a difference between maintaining the existing benefits of night flights and maintaining the benefits of existing night flights, IG believed CL was suggesting the latter. DfT's policy is around the benefits of all night flights as opposed to individual movements. IG suggested this could be a discussion to be had outside of ANEG. IG continued that once the second part of the consultation closed, DfT would be looking to engage with all stakeholders more on these issues.

IG moved onto JP's point about SoNA and extending the consultation because of its delay. IG noted that Ed Weston (EW) from the CAA would be covering SoNA later in the meeting. IG stated that DfT do not intend to extend the consultation any further, it had already been extended twice and while DfT appreciate that the

late publication of SoNA means there is less time to respond, SoNA is just one part of a huge breadth of evidence that can be taken into account.

IG finished by addressing PB's point about representatives on the steering group – DfT have invited the Aviation Environment Federation to represent community views. There are only around 4 or 5 members in the group. HB added that in the interest of balance, there is one representative from industry and one from community.

CL agreed that he and IG would benefit from an offline discussion.

**ACTION – IG and CL to meet offline to discuss the consultation decisions**

CL expressed surprise at IG's comment about existing benefits of night flights – CL felt that this had always meant there should be no more night flights and they should be no noisier, but to find out that government is content for there to be increased numbers and noisiness of flights is an unacceptable revelation which needs to be addressed. CL felt that DfT were benefitting industry disproportionately at the expense of communities. IE restated that DfT were happy to discuss this offline.

Frank Evans (FE) queried the composition of the steering group and expressed disappointment that airport consultative committees were not invited to be involved, given their representation of airports. FE noted that GM's earlier reference to the group had been the first he had heard of it. FE agreed with CL that more information on benefits needs to be released in order to allow groups to form a considered response. FE highlighted that something which had become clear during the pandemic was the increased need for cargo flights at night.

IE closed the agenda item.

**Agenda item 5: Community Updates**

CL began by restating community groups' increasing frustration and anger regarding the lack of action being taken around aviation. Communities feel that DfT are not recognising their views, nor have a serious interest in them. CL also stated that communities feel DfT does not recognise it has a regulatory responsibility alongside its industry advocacy responsibilities. It was felt that engagement in government consultations was pointless and that the airspace modernisation programme was institutionally biased in favour of industry. CL also suggested the planning system encourages a race for growth and has no overarching policy. CL stated that communities would like to see a credible planning framework put in place for aviation growth.

CL continued that the aviation minister had met with industry over 40 times in the last quarter of 2020 but had refused to meet with community representatives. CL also stated that DfT appear to be uninterested in engaging with local airport issues in an open and honest way, referencing Gatwick and Luton. CL sympathised with industry employees who had been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic but felt that the DfT needed to make broad and deep changes in policy if it was serious about the concerns of impacted communities. CL hoped these issues could be covered during focus groups. IE agreed that these concerns could be delved into in further detail during the focus groups item. IE thanked CL for expressing his views.

PB then gave a short presentation on Luton Airport – PB began by saying that he endorsed CL's views and had had similar concerns expressed to him by Heathrow Association for the Control of Aircraft Noise (HACAN) members.

PB spoke about how the benefits of improved and future technology, in terms of less noisy aircraft, can be shared between industry and communities. PB was raising these points on behalf of colleagues at Luton airport, who looked into how the introduction of the Airbus A321neo, a quieter aircraft than its predecessors, did not produce the expected 3 dB reduction due to the way the aircrafts were operated. How can we regulate the way these aircraft are operated so that they do produce actual noise reductions? PB mentioned a similar issue was seen at Heathrow with the Airbus A380s, which were being flown lower than they could have been, and the noise impact was therefore much greater. PB raised three questions – who is responsible for deployment of aircraft types at airports? Is this the decision of the airport or do they have to respect government policy on reducing noise? And finally, how can community groups report the inappropriate use of different aircraft types?

Ian E thanked PB and noted that this topic had been agreed to be discussed at ANMAC.

Martin Peachey (MP) then raised a point regarding the balance between technological improvements and noise impacts. A better balance needs to be found and we are currently not seeing any benefits for communities. MP continued that while the government have been doing some work on these concerns of late, three years of work have been lost that could have been spent doing the things CL mentioned previously. MP highlighted that the review of SoNA had not happened and there were many other delays in other areas. MP felt the COVID-19 pandemic had provided an opportunity for research to be completed, but this had not happened – for example on PBN routes.

Frank Evans (FE) stated that he felt CL had eloquently presented the views of the community groups but that he was concerned about the availability of information for consultative committees. UKACC had been looking into this and found that CAA categorises airports and when an airport needs improvement, the CAA act as an effective stimulus for change. FE proposed a similar concept for environmental issues. FE would welcome the DfT and CAA taking this issue away and producing a template for discussion at a future meeting.

**ACTION - DfT and CAA to discuss potential CAA rating of airport environmental performance**

Tim Johnson (TJ) confirmed that the views CL had expressed are a coordinated, broad consensus among various community groups and not a personal view. TJ asked the secretariat to ensure this was reflected in the minutes.

TM came back on PB's point about Luton - there were two main issues – one is whether aircraft in service are as quiet as they are rated to be, CAA continue to advise on this. DfT can ask CAA to advise on specific aircraft if this would be useful, ANMAC can take this forward. The second issue is whether, in practice, aircraft are operating in an optimal way for noise reduction. ANMAC could investigate this too. Airlines need to be included in any conversations about this, as we do not have airline representatives present today, ANMAC again would be a good forum for this as airlines are involved there.

**ACTION – discussions on CAA's ratings of specific aircraft and whether aircraft are being flown as quietly as possible to take place in ANMAC meeting, ensure airlines are present for this.**

TM continued onto focus groups – one possible topic that could be discussed in these is night flights, referring to Richard Norman (RN)'s comment in the teams chat – *“Do you plan to consult/establish/confirm the noise objective ahead of the next round of consultation in order for stakeholders to properly assess whether the subsequent proposals? Given Charles' comments it seems that greater clarity around the objective and expected outcomes is crucial to moving the discussion forward.”*



On MP's point - TM noted that there had been a pause in activity due to COVID-19 work, and this had resulted in less progress than expected on these issues.

#### **Agenda item 6: Industry updates**

Tom Redfern (TR) began the item by introducing himself as the Head of Sustainability at Birmingham Airport – TR was standing in for Ian Jopson and Andy Jefferson, on behalf of industry. SA were continuing to develop their low noise viables work, looking at different approach procedures and assessing whether there is a way to have quieter approaches and how to measure and monitor this. SA believe this is possible and are working on a CAP document to reflect this. TR stated it would be useful to receive an update from CAA on SoNA, as this would allow SA to press on with their work. In the meantime, SA are looking to develop a tool in conjunction with NATS to monitor this in real time across the country.

PB asked whether TR could comment on the distance from airport, that the quieter approach work is looking at? Also, following the publication of the CAP document, airports have to undertake an airspace change proposal to bring these approaches in?

TR responded to PB's points – SA's work is looking at the points of approach prior to establishing the ILS. No change in procedure, airspace, or anything else would be necessary, SA are only looking at monitoring the rate of descent as you join the ILS.

Richard Norman (RN) commented on the earlier point about objectives and outcomes – RN believed that many of ANEG's attendees would believe these are being shared and measured unfairly, due to various attendees being on different sides of the debate. RN highlighted that if an objective and clear outcome(s) are not established, we cannot make an objective assessment of whether this is good bad or neutral. RN requested the minutes reflect that we need to be clearer in how industry are assessing the balance.

Robin Clarke (RC) then provided an update from NATS – their AD6 Luton arrivals consultation concluded recently, NATS are at stage 4 in the CAP1616 process and a final ACP has been submitted to the CAA to consider. There were three main outcomes which RC hoped would provide communities with confidence that their views had been considered and acted upon – NATS moved from their preferred option to a modified option 1 which has the benefit of natural dispersion of flights rather than PBN. Secondly, there were concerns about the hold, this was originally not to be included in the consultation but was as NATS expected communities to be concerned about this. Thirdly, NATS changed the alignment of the hold, moved it further from built up areas and raised its base by 1000 feet.

#### **Agenda Item 7: ICCAN update**

Sam Hartley (SH) led this agenda item – ICCAN were waiting for the government's response to their report on the future of aviation noise management. The review of ICCAN was also still ongoing, IG and his team were working on getting decisions from ministers. Otherwise, ICCAN are continuing with their work programme for the next three-year period. Since the last ANEG meeting, ICCAN have published recommendations on the next attitude noise attitudes survey, on the back of ICCAN's review of SoNA 2014. ICCAN worked with NATS to devise methodology and this was published a couple of months ago. ICCAN will have to reflect on the timing of the next attitudinal survey. Where will funding come from for this and what will the timeline be? SH thanked those involved in the advisory board, positive feedback was received from this and the structure worked well.

SH continued to other pieces of work that ICCAN were doing.



Complaints resolution best practice – SH recognised that people might be more sensitive to noise as we emerge from COVID-19 restrictions, ICCAN are engaging with industry and community groups to look at areas of best practice with the aim of producing guidance.

ICCAN were also kicking off their project on metrics and noise actions plans, transparency measuring and communication best practice. A report was published last July which gave an initial view on metrics and how best to collect, publish and use them for regulatory and performance purposes. ICCAN were also kicking off work on land use and planning.

SH continued that ICCAN are undertaking work on health prioritisation using focus groups, ICCAN were considering longer term priorities on health work. Over the summer ICCAN would conduct a summer survey to capture attitudes around noise and aviation during COVID-19. A similar piece of work was undertaken last year and the same will be done in the summer months, the same five airports will be surveyed and fieldwork for this year's version will soon commence. ICCAN have continued to engage with ANEG attendees and through other meetings, SH was grateful for everyone's engagement.

On night noise, SH stated that ICCAN would respond to part two of DfT's consultation. SH agreed with others that this was a real opportunity to do things differently and agreed with RN that the objectives of night noise policy need to be looked at. SH noted ICCAN were interested to know what the government's intentions were with this and would look to potentially discuss this within a focus group.

MP asked a question on ICCAN's view of the linkage between the number and quality of complaints, and actual noise disturbance, in terms of levels and frequency of events. MP stated there had been a debate on linkage.

SH noted that he could not answer this yet, ICCAN were undertaking a piece of work on complaints that should help answer this and are aware of acoustician's views on the different percentages of people annoyed by different things and non-acoustic factors etc. SH keen to make the complaints work practicable. Complainants and investigators should be able to see what's happening at each stage of the claim, along with outcomes. SH happy to explore MP's question in future.

DS left the meeting at this point and thanked attendees for their discussions. DS stated he was happy to follow up on points outside of ANEG.

### **Agenda Item 7: BREAK**

### **Agenda item 8: Focus Group Topics**

TM presented his slide pack, which was shared with all ANEG attendees for reference, beginning with a reminder of the proposals in the aviation 2050 consultation, an overview of responses and an analysis of the various proposals, noting that noise indicator/noise caps had the most interest from both communities and industry.

TM then discussed three previous focus groups held by DfT in 2018, which were deemed a success. TM explained that a discussion was needed today around what had changed (in terms of priorities), whether responses to the green paper would be different today than they were in 2018 and which areas would benefit from further discussion. TM presented some initial thoughts on what the focus groups could be used to discuss:

- What are the effects of the pandemic on noise forecasts?

- To what extent has the aviation industry's capacity to address noise been impacted by the pandemic?
- Are the challenges still the same as those which the Green Paper proposals were intended to address?
- How can we build on the areas where there was a consensus in principle, e.g. noise indicator, noise caps, noise reduction plans?
- Can we agree on areas for further research?
- Night Flights

TM invited attendees to comment and suggest which discussions would provide the most value.

CL welcomed the idea of focus groups and stated he was keen for ANEG to be more of a force for change rather than just a place for discussion to take place. CL suggested five potential focus group topics –

- Bottom up discussion on noise policy, including air navigation guidance
- Legislative framework for noise, particularly in the context of airspace changes
- Compensation
- Policy delivery and regulation, how do we make sure policy is adequately delivered – planning framework discussion to be included here
- Health impacts

CL emphasised that community groups see each of these areas as having an interaction with the airspace modernisation programme.

TM responded that we need to be careful that we keep track of which forum we are taking subjects forward in, to limit crossover and duplication of work.

CL felt that these items need to be actioned in a timetable that allows for any changes to be implemented in the context of modernisation.

MP queried whether an APF or an aviation strategy document would eventually be published, or if these are in fact the same thing? MP also requested an update on progress of noise action plans and where Defra were with these. MP reinforced that communities would like to see the five items that CL mentioned be discussed in focus groups. Items 4 and 5 are particularly important to MP's communities. Has work or research been done into the WHO October 2018 revised noise guidelines and how they apply to aviation? WHO recommended reducing Lden by 10db – what is DfT's position on this?

TM responded that the document will be a high-level aviation strategy framework, DfT do not expect this to set out lots of detail on noise policy. This would not be possible due to the time constraints of focus groups being in autumn and DfT wanting them to inform new policy. There is some flexibility around when DfT come out with policy and what format that'll be in. There is a possibility that a document may be released next year. TM asked Robert Smail (RS) to respond to MP's query about noise action plans following the remainder of his answer

TM continued that on planning, Joseph Duggan from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) was present at this ANEG and we could explore the question of noise and planning in a focus group with MHCLG input at a later date. On health and research, TM confirmed this would be covered in AOB as BF wished to give a presentation on this. TM stated that if a separate focus group on this topic was deemed useful then DfT would be happy to arrange this.

RN stated he had a similar list of focus group topics in mind to CL's. RN felt that a few of the areas could be combined into one group. The legal framework topic would be especially useful as RN believed there was not a good understanding of the environmental noise directive or the balanced approach regulation and how the framework could help us get through it. An expert stakeholder focus group would also be useful, along with a focus group on research. Need to have a longitudinal approach to this work for the long-term.

RN also expressed that an intervention focus group would help to inform policy and the reaction to the objective we set.

JD sent a message to the meeting chat – *“Re spatial planning: very happy to be involved from MHCLG in any focused work. There are existing tools open to local authorities to manage noise impacts, such as the agent of change principle, planning conditions for noise mitigation etc. But we’d want to engage constructively and recognise there’s potentially more that could be achieved if there’s a consensus on what the ask is. Let’s keep in touch on this.”*

TM thanked RN for his input and agreed that longitudinal research is useful, although difficult to obtain the long-term funding commitment for. The work that ICCAN are doing around the new noise attitude survey, along with the study on night flights that DfT are kicking off, should give attendees assurances that there is some resource available for this.

CC stated he was particularly interested in the topic of noise action plans and the ICAO balanced approach, which could be wrapped up under the noise policy focus group. CC said that safeguarding would also be important to include. PPG24 disappeared despite both airports and local authorities finding it useful, it is unclear what is going to happen in this area now and this is a gap local authorities are concerned about. CC agreed with comments of other attendees around the relationship between land use planning and airspace planning, CC felt that DfT couldn't have a practical noise policy if it didn't deal with this.

CC also stated there should be focus group discussion around forecasting. Newer forecasting was needed for DfT to develop a long-term high-level strategy. CC supported the idea of a coordinated research programme and stated this could be something the Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group (SASIG) contributed to. SASIG were keen to deal with some of the problems identified by the peer review group. CC noted that the economic modelling exercise needed to be reviewed to enable an understanding of the economic side of the argument, as there is a gap in understanding here.

JP sent a message to the meeting chat – *“Chris is right – I think we need to get to a stage where air noise is treated in the land use planning process with the same seriousness as, say, flood risk is. This doesn't mean that land use planning decisions would always be balanced in favour of noise reduction, but decision makers could be confident of the materiality of noise as a planning consideration – PPG24 did this.”*

MP fully supported comments made by RN and CC. MP mentioned that ERCD produce noise exposure contours each year, which is essentially longitudinal research and something that we need to match. MP revisited the point about the eventual aviation strategy being a high-level document, the NPSE is also a very high-level document. MP felt that there are now two high level documents but nothing in detail which is backed up by evidence. MP requested that the focus groups be used to fill the gap in that detail.

TM responded that while it may not be possible for all focus group attendees to come to a consensus on much of the detail, DfT will strive to fill the gap as well as possible. We need to recognise that there will be some areas with differences of opinion. On PPG24 – the removal of this was done to allow detail to be set at local policy level, DfT will look at what can be done to produce guidance on this. MHCLG have stated they would be happy to participate in this.

CL felt there was agreement that many topics would need to be discussed and refinement of the list is needed. CL was concerned that this could end up becoming an open-ended process, how do we go beyond that and get into potentially smaller groups of people who deal with the detail of decisions? CL felt the 2018 focus groups did not lead to tangible action being taken.

PB raised a query on noise forecasts, do we still work based on 2017 forecasts? In the jet zero consultation there was a reference to an updated analysis of the fleet, PB said it would be useful to see this. PB agreed with RN that understanding what the most effective interventions are that can be made is crucial. PB then raised a query on research around the introduction of concentrated flight paths, is it known what impact this has on the numbers of people impacted and their health? And how can we best reduce that impact? PB continued that at the last ANEG meeting there was a reference to a possible review of the European Environmental Noise Directive – is this part of this or something that will be done separately?

TM came back on forecasts, PB was right that all we would have to go on is changes in fleet turnover. DfT can ask CAA to look at fleet changes due to COVID-19. We are not subject to the environmental noise directive but want to remain cognizant of what is happening in Europe, TM asked if there was anything RS could add on this?

**ACTION – DfT to ask CAA to look at fleet changes due to COVID-19**

RS confirmed that the next round of END mapping would take place in Summer 2022, with plans to be drawn up from that. RS noted that he had not heard of plans to change that delivery, but that those matters are currently being drawn up and modelling is being undertaken. Going forwards, there could be changes on the subsequent set of maps, but this set is still being undertaken.

SH then put forward ICCAN's point of view. ICCAN supported the use of focus groups and see them as a practical approach. SH echoed CL's point on the need for measurable objectives rather than only discussions. SH noted that some of the proposed focus group topics might be things ICCAN are already working on and asked that ICCAN be involved in any discussions to avoid duplication of work.

JD sent a message to the meeting chat – *"A quick note on PPG24 for reference – it was withdrawn but there is guidance for local authorities on addressing aviation noise here. And there is also relevant policy in the NPPF here – to the effect that planning decisions should ensure new development is appropriate for its location taking noise and light pollution into account. There's always room to consider further, but just to note I do not necessarily agree that the spirit of PPG24 is lost in its entirety."*

IE then closed this agenda item. IE agreed with CL that there was clearly much to discuss and DfT need to ensure they come up with topics that include all those things. IE was keen to ensure measurable objectives were set, with a clear timetable of when they will be delivered. We also need to ensure this work feeds into the airspace modernisation programme.

TM and IE requested that any proposals for topics should be sent to them in writing. TM noted that in previous focus groups, discussions lasted for three hours and a similar timeframe would be used this time

around. TM stated that DfT would produce a plan of how these groups would be run and then set up the groups in diaries. TM noted that the focus groups would likely take place in October/November.

**ACTION – Attendees to suggest areas for discussion in focus groups in writing to DfT**

**ACTION - DfT to send out agendas and meeting invites in due course**

#### Agenda item 9: SoNA update

Ed Weston (EW) introduced himself as head of the Environmental Research and Consultancy department at the CAA, he then gave a presentation on the second edition of the SoNA CAP 1506 2014 annoyance study and Kay Jones (KJ) presented on the SoNA sleep study CAP 2161, alongside an update on further analysis of the SoNA reports that CAA are currently working on. EW confirmed that the reports would be published that day or the next.

EW and KJ then ran through their slides, which have been shared with all ANEG attendees for reference.

IE thanked EW and KJ for their presentation and invited attendees to comment.

MP began by asking if CAA had looked particularly at the shoulder periods, as these had been found to be a more sensitive period of the night for communities?

KJ responded that no dedicated research into shoulder hours has been done, this was due to a sample size issue, to look at an hourly basis for sleep research.

EW continued that we need to bear in mind the survey was not set up initially to look at the night. CAA did not want to carry out any analysis that would overplay the quantity of data they had available. EW acknowledged the sensitivities of shoulder period.

MP noted that there was a clear a gap if there is not up to date evidence on the impacts of noise in the shoulder period. Could this be something we discuss in focus groups?

PB asked if CAA had looked at the difference between arrivals and departures in SoNA sleep, in terms of the different use of metrics? What additional evidence do CAA need to facilitate a policy change if there is insufficient evidence currently?

EW responded that in terms of arrivals and departures, it comes down to the quantity of data that CAA had. The sampling was based on a spread of respondents that were receiving different levels of noise. There were not enough data points to distinguish between arrivals and departures. On further evidence, EW stated that depending on the evidence that comes out of the current study, it may be a case of further work being done to reinforce points made.

PB replied that for HACAN members, the number of events is causing the disturbance and annoyance. How do we restructure a research programme that allows us to investigate that in more detail?

EW responded that this felt like more of a policy question and is something that CAA need to take away.

**ACTION – CAA to look into PBs comment**

PB queried whether CAA had investigated n60?

KJ stated that CAA had investigated n60 in the sleep study, there was a correlation with n60, but this was not as good as LAeq 8 hours. LAeq 8 hours was still the preferred correlator.

IG began by responding to points raised by MP, the study that DfT are shortly kicking off, which GM mentioned in his presentation, is looking to fill that research gap. Specifically, in time distribution, sensitivity by time of night and the relevant metrics that will be associated with that. When SoNA was set out in 2013 it was not aimed to look into these areas and that is why the gap exists.

IE suggested a separate ANEG discussion in August around the papers that CAA are producing.

**ACTION – DfT to set up a separate call to discuss CAA papers in latter half of August, with understanding that we may not be able to find a suitable date for everyone**

RN – on the time distribution survey, it asks which is the best correlator. These surveys could be repeated over a regular interval to test the correlations over time. We need to ensure we are hearing views on this from people outside of our usual network.

BF reminded the group that LAeq includes both the number of events and the loudness of each event. Results being seen are broadly consistent with those from Europe, where they tend to find that Lden or LAeq are the main correlators, but recent research is showing the correlation can be improved by combining LAeq and N metrics, perhaps this is a way forward?

**ACTION – OC to send out link to SoNA report when it comes out - completed**

#### **Agenda item 10: Airspace Change Organising Group (ACOG) Airspace Modernisation Update**

Cheryl Monk (CM) introduced herself and her colleague Matt Ross (MR), both from ACOG. COVID-19 put the airspace change programme on pause and government provided short term funding to remobilise those programmes in March 2021. The programme is now beginning to ramp up again. One of ACOG's key tasks is to create the airspace change masterplan, with work on this resuming now. ACOG want to engage with stakeholders at this early stage.

CM then handed over to MR, who presented ACOG's slides. These have been shared with all ANEG attendees for reference.

MP highlighted that from a communities point of view, it is important the benefits of airspace modernisation are equally directed at communities, in terms of the environmental impacts of aviation, as they are at industry. MP queried what the basis would be for assessing this? The factors need to be determined so that communities can have confidence they will share the benefits of airspace modernisation. Will the second item on ACOG's "what will be included in the masterplan" slide be fleshed out?

MR confirmed that this would be fleshed out. As the sponsors move through stage 2 and into the early parts of stage 3, this will become a core part of ACOG's work.

FE continued on conflicts – how will they be resolved if, for example airspace improvements at Luton have an adverse effect on residents near Stansted? Who would deal with this and how would it work?



CC asked for clarification – are all ACP's to similar timescales and do they have forecast traffic movements associated with them? If they are all on different timescales, how will they be brought together into one coherent picture, and what is the timeline for this?

MR responded to FE's point. This is a piece of work that needs to evolve, and it will not be ACOG that decides on trade-offs. ACOG have begun looking at metrics and the cumulative impact of some of these changes, to understand if there are competing changes, what this means for everyone involved. This work will continue over several months due to the complexity of the issue.

IE added that this was one of the reasons ACOG is set up, to facilitate communication between airspace change sponsors. If ACOG are not able to help sponsors come to agreements, the escalation point would be the Secretary of State for Transport. This would all still need to go through the CAP 1616 and consultation processes.

MR responded to CC's point on timelines – the large majority of proposals are at approximately the same stage, but there are two or three that are right at start of process and will need to catch up, or will require other proposals to wait for them. MR said that the changes needed as part of the programme would be undertaken over the next 10 years with the first implementation in around 2024. MR highlighted that the alignment of timelines in London would be more complex to deliver due to the complexities of the area.

CC asked MR if he could follow up on this outside of the meeting, as airspace changes are very important to SASIG and CC keen to understand how this all works

**ACTION – CC and MR to catch up outside of ANEG**

MP then asked if ACOG were looking at the fourth dimension when mapping airspace changes, for example flow management techniques or sequencing etc?

MR responded that ACOG are not currently using these, but are aware this is a concept that is potentially available

#### **Agenda item 11: AOB**

IE thanked MR and CM for their presentation. IE stated he was aware that BF was due to present some slides, but that due to time constraints this would not be possible. BF offered to present the slides in the following ANEG meeting.

**ACTION – BF to present slides in the next ANEG.**

There was no other business from other attendees.

IE announced that the next ANEG meeting would take place in November and that DfT would write out to attendees with a selection of potential dates.

**ACTION – DfT to send out a selection of dates for next meeting**

IE wished all attendees a good summer and thanked them for their participation