

SHORT (& MEDIUM) TERM MEASURES - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MEASURE SET	Enhanced Mitigation	
MEASURE TITLE	Noise Management	
MEASURE SUMMARY	These measures are aimed at improving the potential for better management and mitigation of aviation’s air noise impact.	
MEASURE INVOLVES	<div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Behavioural Change</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational Change</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Technical Change</div></div> <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure Change</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulatory Change</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy Change</div></div>	
WHAT DOES THIS ADDRESS?		
<p>This measure set attempts to manage and mitigate the noise effects of aviation on local communities.</p> <p>It is widely recognized that of the environmental effects of aviation, the local impact of air (and ground) noise is a significant constraint on aviation’s public acceptability. The AC Discussion Paper on Noise (July 2013) states <i>“For communities adjacent to airports, and people living or working under flight paths, aircraft noise is an issue of significant concern, and this has presented a major issue for airport developments in the past. If anything, these concerns appear to have deepened even as aircraft have become progressively quieter, probably due to the increasing frequency of flights at the UK’s busiest airports.”</i></p>		
WHAT WOULD BE DONE?		
<p>A Quota Count derived structure would be introduced for regulation of Air Traffic Movements (ATMs). As well as guiding / managing expectations regarding what is reasonable from S106 and local (noise) mitigation and compensation schemes, there is a proposal to use an existing methodology – QC – to manage the noise impacts from aircraft over periods other than night time.</p> <p>A noise envelope concept would be developed creating a balance between growth and noise reduction and with an objective of incentivising airlines to introduce the quietest suitable aircraft as quickly as is reasonably practicable. This is articulated in the Government’s Aviation Policy Framework. As noted in the AC Discussion Paper on Noise, the noise envelopes <i>“therefore have the capacity to act as an operational restriction [... but ...] may be used to adjust permitted operational capacity in response to an airport’s overall noise performance.”</i></p> <p>A proposal to establish an independent noise regulator was put forward – this is potentially not a short term measure.</p>		
WHAT IS THE IMPACT?		
<p>Use of a QC mechanism for regulating ATM could conceivably allow for an increase in ATMs within an agreed QC budget without causing an overall increase in noise exposure, and potentially reducing noise impact. This could replace or augment an absolute ATM cap, similar to the way in which night flight movements are currently managed.</p> <p>Noise envelopes would give a level of certainty regarding the spatial, temporal and intensity of noise impacts on local communities, and could be developed so as to allow continued aviation growth as aircraft noise is reduced at source from aircraft whilst avoiding the growth of, or even reduction in overall community noise impact</p> <p>An independent noise regulator would address community and NGO concerns over ‘trust deficit’ in aviation noise data and reporting of its effects.</p>		

MEASURE SET:	Enhanced Mitigation	Short Term	<input type="checkbox"/>
MEASURE TITLE:	Policy, Planning and Compensatory Action	Medium Term	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Proposed by:	2M group (001); The Air League (006); Individuals (028, 037, 038); KFAS (041); Luton Airport (049); NATS (053); Guild of Air Pilots and Navigators (067); Westminster Council (074)		
Proposal: EMit-NMT-1 EMit-NMT-2 Emit-NMT-3	<p>There are six measures proposed covering the mitigation of the environmental effects of aviation through policy and planning procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aviation specific policy such as Quota Count (QC) category flight restrictions Development of the Noise Envelope concept, with variations Establishment of an independent aviation noise regulator 		
Approach	<p>The approach for each of the proposals would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An expansion of the current use of QC categories as a method for incorporating noise management into airport capacity management Work with Government and the CAA to develop guidance on a noise envelope concept which allows for greater noise impact certainty whilst allowing for growth in aviation as quieter aircraft become more commonly used Agreement of the terms of reference and identification of the relationship with CAA and Environment Agency for an aviation noise regulator. The relationship between this body and other modes of transport would need review. 	Stated Capital Cost:	Not stated
		Capacity (mppa):	Not stated
		Capacity (atm):	Not stated
Benefits	<p>Use of QC categories as a broader mandatory mechanism could help manage noise impact from any increase in the use of an airport. If QC related caps were set, there is the potential to add capacity by shifting from purely ATM defined caps, although this is unlikely to be an immediate measure.</p> <p>The noise envelope concept could allow greater spatial and temporal certainty regarding noise impacts, and could be used to avoid growth (and possibly allow reduction) in noise impacts as capacity increases, should that capacity be provided by quieter aircraft. However as current caps are set in planning, a shift to noise limited caps may not be a short term measure.</p> <p>The benefits of an independent noise regulator are unclear, although a joint HACAN/HAL/BA submission to the Government's Aviation Policy Framework consultation suggested that there was a trust deficit in terms of aviation noise, and that an independent regulator could address this by providing objective data based on standardised metrics.</p>		
Issues & Risks	<p>The wider application of the QC concept is novel – the system is applied to the night flight regime, but there are no reasons why it could not be used to manage the acceptability of an increase in the use of airport capacity by managing overall noise impact. The system is already understood and aircraft (e.g. A380) have been designed to meet QC criteria at Heathrow.</p> <p>Some submissions to the Government's Aviation Policy Framework consultation suggested that noise envelopes would only be acceptable under very prescribed circumstances, so the concept would require careful development. Even then, there is no guarantee that local communities would accept the noise envelope as set</p> <p>The overlap of roles of a noise regulator with the CAA, the Environment Agency, and local authorities would need to be explored. Whilst provision of 'independent data' might be achievable, the role of the body to regulate is unclear.</p>		
Mitigations	The package essentially covers mitigation opportunities.		
Dependencies	<p>There key dependencies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Planning Policy Framework The Government's Aviation Policy Framework – specifically the noise envelope development concept 		

MEASURE SET:	Enhanced Mitigation	Short Term	<input type="checkbox"/>
MEASURE TITLE:	Policy, Planning and Compensatory Action	Medium Term	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise Policy Statement for England Night Flights Regime
--	--

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Strategic Fit	These measures would develop practical guidance from the Government's Aviation Policy Framework. If noise management packages manage environmental impacts and enhance public acceptability of aviation operations then this is a good strategic fit.
Economy	TBD. The benefits would be dependent on the airport under consideration and if additional capacity were realised through reduced impact, this would bring benefits to UK economy overall. Not yet quantified. The costs of an independent regulator would need to be considered.
Surface Transport	Unlikely to impact. If additional capacity were generated, then surface access issues for additional travellers would need consideration.
Environment	These Noise Management measures should result in environmental gains, or limitations in the negative environmental impacts dependent on location and the airport development under consideration. Movement to a broader QC mechanism would provide some certainty regarding noise impacts whilst allowing a shift from absolute numerical ATM caps. A regulatory body would appear to have no actual effect on noise generated or experienced, only in how this is reported.
People	<p>Vulnerable groups have been identified as particularly susceptible to many of the impacts such enhanced mitigation might offer. Use of QC related caps or noise envelopes would manage overall noise impacts, but an increase in the number of flights might result.</p> <p>An independent noise regulator may provide some additional comfort for community groups on the validity of noise data.</p>
Cost	TBD. Will vary
Operational Viability	There are no known operational issues from the enhanced mitigations proposed here, although the proposals would need to be assessed working with airlines to ensure that the QC limits set were reasonable bearing in mind aircraft investment underway so as not to limit flight operations (e.g. early morning BA flight from Nigeria has to use a 747-400 as Lagos runway not yet able to accept A380, and traffic volume militates against smaller, quieter aircraft)
Delivery	<p>The QC night flight regime has generally been successful, and an extension of the scheme across 24 hours, 365 days a year would provide various challenges, but appears broadly deliverable.</p> <p>The noise envelope concept is identified within the Government's Aviation Policy Framework and is subject to further review from the CAA, so it is assumed deliverable; it is likely to be deliverable in the short term, given priority.</p>

MEASURE SET:	Enhanced Mitigation	Short Term	<input type="checkbox"/>
MEASURE TITLE:	Policy, Planning and Compensatory Action	Medium Term	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Establishing a new regulatory body would take time, and the fit with the strategy of reduction in regulatory bodies / structures from the current Government is unclear.
--	--