

SHORT (& MEDIUM) TERM MEASURES - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MEASURE SET	Enhanced Mitigation	
MEASURE TITLE	Planning and compensation	
MEASURE SUMMARY	This proposals are aimed at ensuring locally relevant policy, planning regimes and compensatory action is available to mitigate aviation's environmental and community impacts	
MEASURE INVOLVES	<div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Behavioural Change <input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure Change </div> <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational Change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulatory Change </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy Change </div>	
WHAT DOES THIS ADDRESS? <p>These proposals attempt to manage and mitigate some of the negative effects of aviation on local communities. There is the potential to articulate an 'environmental and community standard' for aviation within the context of the National Planning Policy Framework that would mean that people could 'expect' the negative effects to be addressed in an agreed manner, whilst retaining specificity for particular impacts. Section 106 agreements have been used in many cases, but expectations differ regarding what might be delivered (or deliverable). Airport specific noise compensatory / mitigation schemes have been delivered, but the nature of these varies.</p>		
WHAT WOULD BE DONE? <p>Clear guidance could be produced ('living near an airport') on the sort of planning, policy and compensatory action that would be considered appropriate to address significant environmental and community effects at the local level. This might be achieved by an environmental expectations statement. This would be simpler than the current Noise Policy Statement for England, National Planning Policy Framework position following the cancellation of Planning Policy Guidance 24.</p> <p>An agreed compensatory package could be developed based on best practice, to reduce confusion over what might be acceptable levels of support / recompense.</p> <p>A code for property sales near airports e.g. requiring properties within Noise Action Plan contours or Noise Exposure Category boundaries to have noise contour information (similar to flood risk data) and/or an insulation standard (similar to EPCs for energy) to be included in sales details, could be developed and implemented, reducing concern of new buyers and managing expectations of purchasers.</p>		
WHAT IS THE IMPACT? <p>This is likely to include as the main focus reduced exposure of receptors to noise nuisance, and an agreed position from which airport operators and local communities can both understand what would be reasonably expected to manage the most significant negative effects of aviation.</p> <p>A nationally agreed standard for compensatory action would give clarity over expectations for compensation e.g. from noise nuisance.</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-PAC-1 EMit-PAC-2	<p>These proposals cover the policy and planning context of mitigating the environmental effects of aviation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of related planning restrictions and Section 106 agreements • Compensation packages 		
Approach	<p>The approach for each of the proposals is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of planning to provide detailed local environmental mitigation – examples are included in section 106 agreements for a series of airport developments, and reference made to other documentation • Extension / standardisation of provision of compensation for households affected by negative environmental impacts from aviation. 	<p>Stated Capital Cost: Not stated</p> <p>Capacity (mpps): Not stated</p> <p>Capacity (atm): Not stated</p>	
Benefits	<p>The benefits of detailed local environmental mitigation expected through the planning system would limit the negative impacts of airport development through e.g. limiting residential development within certain noise contours, required environmental monitoring, and support for public transport.</p> <p>Compensation through either direct payment for agreed ‘blight’ or through specific schemes e.g. enhanced noise insulation, would benefit the households concerned, but could bring wider benefits by trading off enhanced noise insulation with airport operations that might otherwise be considered unacceptable.</p>		
Issues & Risks	<p>Whilst the planning regime and section 106 agreements have been shown to be effective in certain circumstances, the issues surrounding Heathrow’s third runway proposal and the second generation Stansted proposal (both stemming from the SERAS work) illustrate the difficulties that can also be attached in the consensual navigation of the planning system.</p> <p>Provision of compensation requires detailed consultation, and careful boundary conditions. Direct benefit schemes such as enhanced noise insulation are considered to be effective, but “full compensation” schemes pose risks of high costs and limited effectiveness in mitigating environmental impacts.</p>		
Mitigations	The proposals in this template essentially cover mitigation opportunities.		
Dependencies	<p>The key dependencies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Planning Policy Framework • Aviation Policy Framework • Noise Policy Statement for England • Night Flights • National consideration of noise standards across other modes of transport particularly in respect of noise compensation • The Airport Commission’s long term options recommendation. 		

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

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

Strategic Fit	
Economy	TBD. The benefits would be dependent on the airport under consideration, and if additional capacity were realised through reduced noise impacts, this would bring benefits to UK economy overall. Not yet quantified. The costs of any universal / comprehensive compensatory package would need to be considered. Given that noise insulation schemes are currently locally specific, it is unclear how a 'standard scheme' might work, although a standard scheme could either replace or augment local schemes.
Surface Transport	Any precedent for compensatory regimes for noise disbenefits would need to consider why aviation was 'special'. Otherwise the related noise impacts of road and rail transport will need to be addressed. Post Planning Policy Guidance 24 this is an uncertain area and no single 'standard' for such transport noise compensation exists. There are no specific legal limits on noise from rail or roads, although new schemes may trigger compensatory events.
Environment	Policy and planning mitigation packages should result in environmental gains, or limitations of negative environmental impacts dependent on location and development under consideration. Movement to a broader QC methodology would provide some certainty regarding noise impacts whilst allowing a shift from absolute numerical ATM caps.
People	Section 106 and compensatory schemes will affect local communities.
Cost	TBD. Will vary according to the nature of local planning responses and compensatory schemes. Heathrow's Day Noise Insulation Scheme commenced in 1996. It is designed to protect homes within the boundary that are exposed to the highest level of noise disturbance. It is restricted to the 18-hour 1994 69dB LAeq noise contour, enhanced to take account of early morning arrivals noise, and an enhanced scheme (Quieter Homes Initiative) has been trailed in 2012/3. The full costs of this scheme have not been identified at this stage.
Operational Viability	There are no known operational issues from the enhanced mitigations proposed here.
Delivery	Noise insulation and Section 106 schemes are known to be deliverable. Wider compensatory packages could be difficult (and costly) to deliver.