

Airspace and Noise Engagement Group – 18 July 2019

Attendees:	
Tim May – DfT (Chair)	Peter O'Broin - AOA
Rob Mills – DfT	Rick Norman – Heathrow/Airports
Ian Greene – DfT	Barbara Perata-Smith - CAA
Ian Elston - DfT	Chris Cain – SASIG
Amartya Menon – DfT	John Stewart – Community Groups
Phil Harper – DfT	Guest Presenters
Philip Mann – DfT	Paul Hooper – MMU
Richard Clarkson – DfT	Kay Jones - CAA
Ben Fenech – Public Health England	
Tim Johnson – AEF	Apologies:
Thomas Barlow – CBI	Keith Bushell -Airbus
Amanda Francis – Express Industry	Frank Evans – UKACCs
Sam Hartley – ICCAN	Jeremy Pine – SASIG
Andrew Lambourne – Community Groups	Robin Clarke – NATS
Charles Lloyd – Community Groups	Colin Flack -UKACCs
Chris Carter – BA (Representing Andy Kershaw – Airlines)	Neil Robinson – Airports/Sustainable Aviation
Geoff Clark – Virgin/Airlines	Andy Jefferson -Sustainable Aviation
Richard Miles - NATS	

Welcome and Introductions

Introductions were made and minutes from the last meeting were agreed. Tim May chaired the meeting as Sarah Bishop was unable to attend. Tim confirmed that Sarah was due to leave her role at DfT to take up a role at BEIS.

Agenda item 1: Update from DfT on Aviation Strategy

DfT summarised feedback from aviation strategy focus groups on the subject of noise. DfT suggested that a major piece of feedback from the sessions was for policy to establish how noise caps could work in practice, as well as understanding the relationship between noise and growth. Forecasting was also discussed as a major focus of these discussions as well as issues of noise regulation – with community appetite for improvement in this area. DfT confirmed that MHCLG would soon be publishing guidance on noise and housebuilding ('Agent of Change')¹.

DfT confirmed that the plan for the Strategy White Paper was to publish by the end of the year. Andrew Lambourne sought to pick up the issue of metrics and Luton Airport – and argued that planning conditions needed to be geared to local amenity, that the airport was not being run to respect this control. Argued that it was not about metrics – but compliance.

Charles Lloyd asked for further clarity on the next steps of the strategy. DfT suggested that there remain opportunities to engage – but the public consultation is closed, and the next steps are for officials to consider policy and put advice to ministers. Reiterated that the White Paper would not be 'the last word' – but that further work would be needed in some areas, which may provide opportunities for further engagement.

Sam Hartley sought clarity around the role of ICCAN's place within the strategy. Tim confirmed that officials were working to ensure ICCAN is not being pre-empted if DfT was aware that an issue forms part of the

¹ This was subsequently published on 23 July: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/noise--2>

workplan. Charles Lloyd wished to clarify how ICCAN's workplan and the Department's white paper would mesh together. DfT confirmed that further thinking was needed – but that their priority was not to cut across any ICCAN workstreams.

Summarising the meeting to discuss mitigations and compensation, DfT explained that the focus group had discussed the need for new research on noise and house prices, the complexities of the Land Compensation Act, the difference between change and status quo in noise, concerns of extending the noise insulation scheme threshold, the role of community funds and the possibilities of tailored mitigations to noise based on subjective experience. Community representatives argued that the Department's work showed that there is a negative relationship between aviation noise and asset values and that the department should therefore move on to developing policy solutions to this issue. They requested an update on the government's plans to ensure people are properly compensated at the next ANEG. There was agreement that community funds were separate and could not be viewed as compensation for asset value diminution. Chris Cain argued for the need to consider value rise as a result of aviation development. Community groups responded that planning gain had always been a feature of infrastructure development in the UK and that the government and the industry could seek to pursue a value capture mechanism if they wished but this was not a valid reason to fail to compensate those adversely affected. Andrew Lambourne argued need for the Land Compensation Act to consider being applied in instances of PBN where there is intensification. Community groups also repeated their request for the Department to set out clearly the government's approach to the industry's externalities and specifically whether the government believes the polluter pays principle should apply to aviation.

Ian Greene (DfT) provided an update on issues put by Martin Peachey that were raised by MPs in PQs related to SoNA and WHO. Confirmed that CAA is still doing work on data, and that DfT, ICCAN and CAA were considering repeating SoNA. Community groups argued that a historic survey based on sampling in locations where there had been no change in noise was not an appropriate basis for assessing the consequences of airspace changes in which there will by definition be change. They requested that a new SoNA should be in place as soon as possible and in any event in good time to inform airspace modernisation. They suggested that Airport Community Funds be used to fund SoNA at earliest opportunity. DfT suggested this would need further investigation.

Actions for DfT: To consider potential involvement of MHCLG in future ANEG meetings. To provide an update on the government's policies on compensation and its approach to the industry's externalities. To consider and report back on proposals for a new SoNA.

Agenda item 2: Update from DfT on airspace modernisation

DfT summarised the forthcoming meeting of the Airspace Strategy Board and suggested that there were some updates to be published in late 2019 with regard to engagement entities and delivery groups.

DfT confirmed that the Airspace Change Organising Group (ACOG) had been established, with 9 out of 15 roles filled, including Mark Swan named as Head of ACOG. Recruitment for the outstanding roles will proceed once Mark is in place. The CAA are also starting a second round of recruitment for the Head of the DMO.

DfT summarised the process for the proposed airspace legislation. Consultation conducted, 66 responses were analysed and a Government Response had been drafted and was currently being cleared across Government, with a view to publication shortly. Aviation industry has viewed the proposals positively, but some concerns articulated by environmental and community groups. DfT confirmed that it remains unclear whether the airspace legislation would receive Parliamentary time.

Community group representatives argued that there should be a specific noise SRO appointed for the airspace modernisation programme. DfT set out our position that noise is one of several key objectives of the Airspace Modernisation Strategy – alongside capacity, access to airspace, military requirements, and other environmental factors. Each key senior leader will need to focus on all of these objectives, including noise. DfT believe that this is more appropriate than having a single SRO focussed only on noise.

DfT confirmed that it would undertake some internal work on the application and interpretation of Section 70 (of the Transport Act 2000) with CAA.

Agenda item 3: Paul Hooper (MMU)

Paul Hooper (PH) introduced the work of ANIMA (Aviation Noise Impact Management through Novel Approaches) - an EU funded project designed to contribute to improved management of aircraft noise impacts. PH reiterated that ANIMA was grounded in effective practice – an aim to fill gaps in evidence rather than seek ‘best practice’ that might not be tested by a clear framework.

Summarised recent work, defined by an exercise to establish current noise management practice by ANIMA partners. This capture revealed the need for ANIMA to play a role in taking a ‘toolkit’ approach – by designing approaches and implementation principles. PH suggested that ANIMA was considering questions for airport end users such as what such toolkit might look like.

Another piece of work was to conduct a critical review of noise health impacts, and to review the data and assumptions of WHO evidence. ANIMA addressed links between noise annoyance and health outcomes, and a further piece of working looking at annoyance in more detail. ANIMA suggested that their work had found some associations between noise annoyance, sleep disturbance and health outcomes. In particular, the work revealed that declining noise exposure was not always commensurate with reduced annoyance – and therefore a different managed response may need to be considered. PH reiterated that these are not proven causalities – but there is some interesting work to be done about unconscious processing of noise and the interrelationships between annoyance, sleep and health.

ALTIMA summarised findings by suggesting that if Quality of Life improvements are to be central to noise management – the evaluation of outcomes of best approach interventions needs to extend beyond the consequences for noise exposure.

Tim Johnson (AEF) asked whether ALTIMA would track the continued benefit of improved communication between airports and stakeholders, and whether value of comms and engagement changes if positive outcomes were not delivered.

Actions: ANIMA to share slides and to circulate draft report, under condition that it be treated in confidence ahead of formal publication.

Agenda item 4: CAA Presentation on Health – Kay Jones

CAA summarised the scope of the report – an update on recent work in aircraft noise and health. Euronoise findings found that aircraft noise exposure associated with increased risk of hypertension per 10 dB in noise. Also summarised some work being done by University of Florence which had created a new methodology for examining noise impacts on child education.

CAA summarised aggregate studies that looked at annoyance surveys conducted at European airports since early 2000s. The meeting discussed that the findings appeared to suggest SoNA had found less sensitivity than other previous studies.

CAA summarised findings from the Internoise workstream, in particular the use of the Community Tolerance Level metric. Also suggested that noise exposure variance only accounts for around a third of observable change – suggesting other non-acoustic factors remain key for consideration.

CAA summarised a research roadmap which has been developed by ACI Europe Noise Task Force in conjunction with Heathrow and other airports. This work addressed issues such as community engagement and transparency.

CAA summarised work completed by Gjestland, which criticised WHO guidelines for optimistic decibel limit threshold, non-selection of certain post-2000 studies and the high number of high-rate change airports included. Comparison of post-2000 survey in comparison to Miedema survey (2001) – less than one standard deviation. CAA summarised response by Guski to Gjestland – which refuted suggestion that WHO decibel threshold was incorrectly calculated and defended WHO methodology to realise this limit.

CAA outlined future studies that are going to be completed in the UK, funded by the Medical Research Council. The stated aim is to establish whether aviation noise has a relationship with mortality, hospital admissions and vectors such as hypertension and heart-rate variability.

The meeting discussed whether the CAA examined complaint data for airspace change for sufficiently broad use to be generalised to observe health impacts. CAA suggested that this hadn't been done, and PHE sought to clarify that it would be difficult to incorporate this in a robust way.

ICCAN sought to clarify the role of such research, and how it feeds into strategy process and decision making. Charles Lloyd also asked whether such research fed into airport growth mechanisms – DfT confirmed that it added to knowledge and understanding, and that it also informed WebTag-based policy making.

Agenda item 5: Update from CAA -Barbara Perata-Smith

CAA summarised PPR, defined by a planned and permanent redistribution of air traffic through changes in air traffic control operational procedures. CAA clarified that as yet, it does not have a consultative role in such changes – but this is due to end. Government directed CAA to introduce a new process for making decisions on relevant PPRs by November 2019. CAA currently analysing response to a consultation on this issue, and are aiming to introduce a process in November, which will include a revised CAP1616.

CAA then summarised airspace information transparency, which provides best practice to industry to provide detailed reporting data on flight track data. Data is collected and RAG-rated by CAA in terms of its compliance with information disclosure best practice. The CAA requests updates to information from 10 airports and from NATS in February and September. CAA notify relevant stakeholders post-publication of release of new data.

Agenda item 6: Update from ICCAN - Sam Hartley

ICCAN summarised current activity, with the organisation appointing its 9th permanent member of staff. A further appointments process for a fifth commissioner was due for decision by the minister.

Concluded consultation on corporate strategy with over 100 responses. Key themes around timing of work, ambition of programme and issue of statutory powers. Final strategy and responses to consultation to be

published next week. This strategy will confirm work programme, likely to be not wholly different to draft plan. Evolution of work plan is possible, given the new status of the organisation and interaction with Government.

ICCAN has published its response to the DfT's aviation strategy consultation, generally supportive and keen to continue dialogue with policy making progress. As work plan proceeds, hope to engage with small groups – industry stakeholders and policy makers.

Likely biggest challenge is 'adding value' – ICCAN keen to avoid repetition of work, and to focus on independence and impartiality.

AoB/Close

- A closing observation from Charles Lloyd, commenting on new public awareness of environmentalism – but a perception that DfT and industry continuing to prioritise aviation growth. A request for next ANEG meeting to discuss the arrangements the Government plans to put in place to ensure aviation growth is consistent with net zero greenhouse gas emissions and its broader climate change policies, in the context of increased environmental concern.