

26 August 2014

Dear Councillor

STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL

A meeting of the Stansted Airport Advisory Panel will be held at the Council Offices, Saffron Walden on Wednesday 3 September 2014 at 7.00pm.

Yours faithfully

JOHN MITCHELL

Chief Executive

Martin Peachey, a member of the Stansted Noise and Track Keeping Working Group will be in attendance at the Chairman's invitation to participate in the discussion on the reports.

AGENDA

1	Apologies for absence and declarations of interest.	
2	Minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2014 (attached).	p.2
3	Matters arising.	
4	Consultation on NATS departure route proposal at Stansted Airport.	p.6
5	DfT night flying restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted.	p.14
6	Civil Aviation Authority – “Managing Aviation Noise”.	p.19
7	MAG draft Sustainable Development Plan for Stansted Airport – update to follow.	
8	Any other business.	
9	Date of next meeting.	

To: Councillors K Artus, **J Cheetham**, A Dean, E Godwin, D Jones, M Lemon, K Mackman, D Perry, J Rich and J Rose.

Lead Officer: Roger Harborough (01799 510457)

Democratic Services Officer: Adam Rees (01799 510548)

STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 7.00pm on 9 JUNE 2014

Present: Councillor J Cheetham (Chairman)
Councillor J Rich

Officers Present: R Harborough (Director of Public Services), J Pine (Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer) and A Rees (Democratic Services Support Officer)

Also Present: Councillor E Godwin

SAP1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Artus, Dean, Jones, Mackman, Perry and Rose.

Councillor Cheetham declared non-pecuniary interests as a member of NWEPPHA and of the Hatfield Forest Management Committee.

SAP2 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28 JANUARY 2014

The minutes were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

SAP3 AIRPORTS COMMISSION – UPDATE

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer updated the Panel on work by the Airports Commission since it had published its interim report. In March, the Commission had published its terms of reference for four studies that would be carried out related to the Thames Estuary hub option. The Commission had also published its Appraisal Framework for consideration of the two shortlisted options for Heathrow and the one at Gatwick. It wanted to begin national consultation in autumn 2014. Summaries of the details recently submitted by the scheme sponsors were available on the relevant websites.

On 20 January, the Transport Select Committee held a one-off evidence session with Sir Howard Davies, the Commission Chairman. The letter he had written to the Committee was attached to the report. The letter referred to background analysis carried out by NATS. This analysis showed that the Inner Thames Estuary east to west runways option would necessitate closing Heathrow, London City and Southend Airports. It would increase the number of ATMs available within London airspace by 100,000, which was not sufficient to provide the extra runway capacity that the Commission says is required. The Inner Thames Estuary north east to south west runways option would require Gatwick and Southend Airports to close and a 50% reduction at London City Airport. This would increase the number of available ATMs by 400,000. This would accommodate the one additional runway

required in the south east by 2030. The third option increased capacity at Heathrow and Gatwick by one runway each, consistent with the Commission's shortlisting. The estimated cost of this was less than half of constructing a Thames Estuary hub. M.A.G had predicted that Stansted Airport would reach its 35 million passengers per annum cap by 2027. This was predicated on long term deals that had been secured with Ryanair and EasyJet.

Councillor Cheetham noted that the Stansted Sustainable Development Plan predicted 43 million passengers per annum (mppa) by 2040, although this was dependent on new deals. M.A.G seemed to prefer fully utilising one runway.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer informed the Panel of a sixth discussion paper that had just been published by the Airports Commission entitled "Utilisation of the UK's Existing Airport Capacity". The focus of this paper is the connectivity and capacity provided by airports other than those shortlisted by the Commission for further consideration as long-term capacity options. He would send a draft response to the paper to Panel members. There was also consultation for Crossrail 2. A draft response to the consultation would also be sent to Panel members.

The Panel noted the report.

SAP4

LUTON AIRPORT EXPANSION

The Panel received a report for information from the Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer about the planning application to expand Luton Airport. The application had been approved, subject Section 106 obligations, and had not been called in by the Secretary of State. The main reason for not calling in the application was that the estimated increase in passenger throughput would be less than 10mppa, meaning that the proposal did not qualify as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. Luton Borough Council was looking to impose a number of conditions, including the setting up of a quota count regime to control night noise, similar to the scheme operated at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted by the DfT. There would also be controls on maximum noise violation limits, and via published Leq 16 hour day and 8 hour night time contours. QC2 or noisier aircraft would be excluded from 11pm – 7am, six months after development commenced. QC1 aircraft would also be excluded eventually. It was not yet known how difficult the reductions caused by the conditions would be to meet.

In response to a question by Councillor Rich, the Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that although there were ways of reducing noise caused by aircraft, any effects could be marginal.

The Panel noted the report.

SAP5

SOUTHEND AIRPORT EXPANSION

The Panel received a report for information from the Planning Policy / DM Liaison Officer about the planning application for a runway extension at Southend Airport which was approved in 2010. He told the Panel that although the majority of the airport was within the District of Rochford, the land on which the runway extension was located was within the Borough of Southend. The main change caused by expansion was that larger short and medium range jets would be accommodated. These were primarily used by low fares airlines. He thought it unlikely that Southend Airport would compete with Stansted Airport to any significant degree. Southend-on-Sea Borough Council had negotiated noise restrictions with the operator via a Section 106 agreement. These included a quota count system but there was no quota counts ceiling. The system operated in a similar manner to the DfT's scheme for Stansted Airport.

Although there would be public transport contribution payments linked to mode share performance, these were unlikely to be triggered because the airport's existing mode share seemed to be above the trigger level.

In response to a question by Councillor Cheetham, the Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that he did not believe that the Airport had withdrawn from contributing to the 133 service.

The Panel noted the report.

SAP6

UNILATERAL UNDERTAKING – UPDATE

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer outlined the position of Stansted Airport in relation to the obligations it entered into following the Airport being given permission to expand to 35mppa. Since permission had been granted in 2008, passenger throughput had dropped from 24 mppa to 17.3 mppa. Many of the obligations had not been triggered because the 35mppa planning permission had not been implemented. This included all of the obligations surrounding air quality. M.A.G had been working on its master plan, as well as its surface access strategy. The new surface access strategy would be launched shortly. M.A.G had brought its own monitoring back in-house.

In response to questions by Councillor Cheetham, the Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that payments into the Community Trust were required under the Section 106 agreement in 4 x £100k indexed instalments. This funding would no longer be required after 2015. He would check at the next meeting of the airport's Highways Working Group, how much funding was still available for dealing with fly parking around the airport.

In relation to the 25mppa Section 106 agreement, the Planning Policy /DM Liaison Officer had asked M.A.G whether it intended to proceed with a visitor centre even though that particular obligation had not been triggered.

Start-up funding for new or enhanced bus links would be more likely to be viable when passenger throughput reached around 23 mppa.

The Panel noted the report.

SAP7

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Stansted Airport was about to release the Stansted Airport Sustainable Development Plan, which should be discussed at a future meeting.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that Runway UK was holding a seminar looking at land use issues, particularly relating to the Commission's shortlisted options. Sustainable Aviation were also attending to present its current thinking on this issue. He was attending using one of the free places for local authorities that were on offer.

SASIG was organising a meeting on noise related issues to see whether there was an opportunity to produce industry-wide guidance. This meeting would also involve Sustainable Aviation. At the SASIG AGM, the Commission's representative would need to be asked about progress with looking at lifting restrictions at Stansted Airport.

Network Rail was currently producing the Anglia Route Study. It looked at the long term future of rail travel in the region up until 2043. A draft study would be released for public consultation starting in October.

The meeting ended at 7.50pm.

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel

Agenda Item

Date: 3 September 2014

4

Title: Consultation on NATS Departure Route Proposal at Stansted Airport

Author: Jeremy Pine, Planning Policy / Development Management Liaison Officer (01799 510460)

Item for Decision

Summary

1. This report is about a consultation by NATS and London Stansted Airport to change the daytime use of the Clacton and Dover departure routes from Stansted Airport. The report explains what the proposal is, and how it would differ from the current use of the departure routes. Finally, the report recommends how the Council should respond, and asks the members of the Panel for any revisions or additional comments that they think ought to be made.

Recommendation

2. That the Council responds to the consultation setting out the concerns contained in Paragraphs 29 and 30 of this report with any revisions or additional comments that Panel members wish to include.

Financial Implications

3. There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Background Papers

4. None

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	This consultation is being undertaken by NATS and London Stansted Airport, who are the proposal sponsors. As the proposal involves changes to the number of flights using existing departure routes at low levels, the consultation is being undertaken primarily through the Stansted Airport Consultative Committee. It is, however, an open consultation for all interested parties. <u>The consultation runs for 12 weeks from Monday 16th June to Monday 8th September 2014.</u>
----------------------------	---

	<p>There are co-sponsors of this consultation because London Stansted Airport is responsible for airspace management below 4,000ft and NATS is responsible for the same above 7,000ft. Between 4,000ft – 7,000ft there is a shared interest.</p>
Community Safety	<p>This proposal does not affect Stansted Airport's Public Safety Zones, which were last reviewed by the CAA in April 2012. They are due to be reviewed again around 2019 to ensure that the data underpinning them remains robust.</p>
Equalities	<p>None.</p>
Health and Safety	<p>Government guidance identifies 4,000ft as the altitude below which local noise is the key environmental airspace design objective. Between 4,00ft and 7,000ft the objective is to balance noise and CO² emissions, whereas above 7,000ft local noise is not a priority. This consultation focusses on the local environmental impact below 7,000ft.</p> <p>A reduction in the overall area regularly overflowed below 7,000ft in the daytime, and therefore populations exposed to potential noise is cited by the proposal sponsors as a benefit.</p>
Human Rights/Legal Implications	<p>It is for the CAA to decide whether any airspace change proposal should be approved. The legal framework is set out in Appendix D of the consultation.</p>
Sustainability	<p>Reduction in aircraft fuel burn and CO² emissions are cited by the proposal sponsors as benefits.</p>
Ward-specific impacts	<p>This proposal will affect the wards in the southern part of the District that are currently overflowed by departing aircraft from Stansted Airport. All relevant town and parish councils have been notified of this proposal by the District Council, and advised to make their own representations direct to NATS.</p>

Workforce/Workplace	Officers' and Members' time in preparing and considering this report.
---------------------	---

Situation

The Departure Route Proposal

6. Aircraft which depart from Stansted Airport for destinations in mainland Europe or beyond take-off, turn and climb on one of four established Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) up to 4,000ft. The aircraft then head out either east towards Clacton or southeast towards Dover whilst continuing their climb on what is known as a Standard Instrument Departure (SID).
7. This report is about a consultation on a proposal to change the use of Stansted Airport's Clacton and Dover SIDs. It is not a proposal to change the SIDs themselves or to alter the four NPRs. The proposal, which is being promoted by NATS and London Stansted Airport, is to switch most of the daytime traffic (0600-2300) from the Dover SID to the Clacton SID, significantly reducing the number of aircraft on two of the NPRs. This means that aircraft that currently use the Dover SID would initially head out east and then turn south over Clacton to pick up the original Dover SID track east of the Kent coast.
8. A very small number of aircraft (estimated at no more than 2 per day) use the first part of the Dover SID and then continue in a more southerly direction to cross the coast at Lydd. Aircraft using the Dover/Lydd SID will continue to do so, and are not part of this consultation. Night time usage of the SIDs is not proposed to be changed, so that is also not part of this consultation.
9. The proposal sponsors give the following reasons for wanting to make this change. These reasons are considered in more detail later in this report:
 - i) Reduction in the number of people regularly overflown during the day,*
 - ii) Reduced delay for passengers using Stansted Airport and neighbouring airports, and*
 - iii) Reduced CO² emissions and fuel burn*
10. NATS points out that airlines may already choose to fly the Clacton route instead of the Dover route, and are expected to do so increasingly in the future to avoid congested London airspace.
11. The proposal is a small part of Phase 1 of a wider programme of airspace modernisation over South East England, which is known as the London Airspace Management Programme (LAMP). NATS advises that Stansted, Luton, Northolt and Heathrow operations are all closely linked because of their alignment and geographical proximity. A major redesign of the airspace serving these airports is not planned until later (LAMP Phase 2) and will be subject to a separate and much wider consultation.

Existing Clacton and Dover departures

12. About 70% of the time aircraft take-off to the southwest (Runway 22), and 30% of the time to the northeast (Runway 04). The runway direction in use is primarily determined by the direction of the wind, and will not be changed by this proposal.
13. Separately, the CAA and London Stansted Airport have published radar track data showing a one week sample of departures for the 2013 summer period. Runway 22 departures on the Dover SID take-off, turn and climb over Tilekiln Green and Great and Little Hallingbury before straightening out and continuing their climb over the western part of Hatfield Heath and beginning to disperse over Matching Green onto wider tracks as directed by Air Traffic Control. Runway 22 departures on the Clacton SID turn more sharply east over Hatfield Heath and south of Hatfield Broad Oak whilst continuing their climb before beginning to disperse over Aythorpe Roding and High Roding.
14. Runway 04 departures on the Clacton SID take-off, turn and climb over Brick End/Broxted and Tilty, after which they straighten out to head between Duton Hill and Great Easton whilst continuing to climb before beginning to disperse over Stebbing Green and the south of Braintree. Runway 04 departures on the Dover SID turn very sharply south to the east of Brick End/Broxted, passing to the west of Little Easton and Great Dunmow whilst continuing their climb and dispersing over The Rodings and The Easters.
15. Aircraft using the Clacton SID have a relatively clear climb to 7,000ft, usually reaching that height southwest of Braintree. Aircraft using the Dover SID do not, as they have to cross Heathrow arrivals in the Brentwood and Billericay area which are heading west at about 8,000ft or above for either a straight-in approach to Heathrow or a hold at Lambourne. Dover SID aircraft are kept below the Heathrow arrivals until they have cleared them, and most do not reach 7,000ft until they cross the River Thames. As a result, aircraft on the Dover SID are below 7,000ft for roughly twice the distance of those on the Clacton SID.
16. About 85% of aircraft on the Clacton SID achieve continuous climb, compared to only 10% on the Dover SID. At night, continuous climb performance on the Dover SID is comparable to Clacton because there are relatively few Heathrow arrivals, meaning that the Dover departures are likely to get a clear climb.
17. Delays on the ground can occur because aircraft on the Dover SID have to cross departure routes from London City. Departures at both airports therefore have to be co-ordinated to ensure clear flightpaths. As both airports become busier, Dover SID delays can be expected to increase.

Effect of Implementing the Departure Route Proposal

18. The first point to make about this proposal is that, if it is implemented, there will be winners and losers because some areas will be overflown more and others less. There is no “win-win” situation for local residents. It will be for the CAA to weigh up the benefits and impacts of the proposal in accordance with Government guidance should the proposal sponsors recommend that it is implemented. A realistic presumption is that the proposal will be implemented because it will help to relieve congestion in the London airspace pending the more detailed LAMP Phase 2.

19. The consultation includes information on the existing average number of flights/day using each SID, and the resulting number should the proposal be implemented. The data is shown in the table below:

SID / Runway	Existing average flights/day	Proposed average flights/day
Clacton 22 + 04	51	109
Dover 22 + 04	58	Negligible (Dover / Lydd)

Source: Compiled from NATS Departure Route Proposal at London Stansted Airport – 2012 figures

20. It should be noted that this data is based on airport throughput in 2012 which, to the end of the year was 17.46 million passengers per annum (mppa). As the airport has planning permission to grow to 35mppa it is realistic to expect that this number could nearly double depending upon the traffic mix that is achieved.

21. The consultation also estimates the number of households and people who live in the areas where overflying by aircraft at less than 4,000ft (i.e. on the NPRs) would either be virtually eliminated or would increase as a result of the proposal. There is no comparable analysis between 4,000ft – 7,000ft. This is because the wider dispersal of aircraft on the Dover SID resulting from congested airspace to the south of the Airport could overstate the benefits compared to the Clacton SID where flights stay more concentrated.

22. The estimation is set out in the following table. The table does not include those residents and households who should experience no change in overflying, such as Brick End (Runway 04 departures) and Great and Little Hallingbury (Runway 22 departures).

(Space intentionally blank: table on next page due to sizing)

Departure Route	Impact	Population	Households
Dover 04	Virtual elimination of regular daytime flights over <i>Lt Easton, High Wood (west of Great Dunmow) and Gt Canfield</i>	780	320
Clacton 04	Increase in regular daytime flights over <i>Tilty, Duton Hill/Gt Easton and Stebbing</i>	2,050	800
Dover 22	Virtual elimination of regular daytime flights over <i>Sheering and Matching Green</i>	690	290
Clacton 22	Increase in regular daytime flights over the area south of <i>Hatfield Broad Oak</i>	350	120

Source: Compiled from the population analysis in NATS Departure Route Proposal at London Stansted Airport

23. The population analysis shows that the proposals would result in 1,470 fewer people being regularly overflowed during the day. These are the people who live under the two Dover NPRs. However, 2,400 people under the two Clacton NPRs would experience double the existing level of overflying during the day. In addition, there would be double the existing level of overflying of Gt Easton Primary School, which lies north of the main village under the Clacton 04 NPR centreline. According to the 2013 summer track data, the School is overflowed on 43% of all days with a range of 0 - 67 departures/day. If this proposal is implemented the range would increase to 0 – 144 departures/day with the average number of daily departures increasing from 14 to 33. It is acknowledged that the school is not open all the time these overflights occur. A doubling of overflights can still be expected when it is open and this does not take into account further overflying as the airport gets busier and the number of air transport movements increases.

24. The consultation also includes details of how the Leq 16hr contour would be affected by the proposal. The 2 published versions are for 20% and 40% increases in traffic over the 2012 level with overlays to take into account the shift to the Clacton SIDs. In both cases the effect on the contour to the north of the airport is barely perceptible because it is principally defined by Runway 22 arrivals. To the south the contour skews slightly to the east. The conclusion is that the proposal would result in a small reduction in the overall number of people within 57dba in both growth scenarios and a small reduction within 60dba for the 40% growth scenario. As the Panel will be aware Leq is an averaging metric, and it may have been more useful in this instance for the Leq contours to have been supplemented by “Number Above” contours which would show the frequency of individual noise events at given locations.

25. In the consultation document, NATS and London Stansted Airport say (Paragraph 5.1):
“Aircraft operate more efficiently at higher altitudes meaning that less fuel is burned creating fewer CO² emissions. When aircraft are at higher altitudes it is also less likely that there would be local impact from noise or visual intrusion. It is therefore in everyone’s interest that aircraft can climb continuously to higher altitudes rather than being constrained to follow a “stepped” climb with periods of level flight at lower altitudes”.
26. In its Noise Road Map, Sustainable Aviation says of continuous climb operations (Paragraph 4.6.1): *“it is likely that the effects of continuous climbs on noise profiles are small as their effect can be some distance from the airfield and at altitudes where the noise change may not be perceptible. There may nevertheless be localised opportunities where noise benefit can be derived and these should be pursued where appropriate. The greatest manifestation of continuous climbs is likely however to be in their scope for significant reductions in fuel burn and CO² emissions”.*
27. Computer simulation modelling has been carried out to assess the potential fuel and CO² emissions savings that would result from this proposal. The savings are set out in the following table:

	2012 traffic grown by 20%	2012 traffic grown by 40%
Average enabled fuel burn saving per departure to the southeast	100-200 kgs	100-200 kgs
Approx flights via Dover that would benefit from revised route via Clacton (rounded to the nearest hundred flights)	20,000	24,400
Annual fuel saving (rounded to nearest hundred metric tonnes)	2,000 – 4,000	2,300 – 4,700
Annual CO ² emissions saving (rounded to nearest hundred metric tonnes)	6,400 – 12,700	7,400 – 14,900

Source: NATS Departure Route Proposal at London Stansted Airport

28. The fuel and CO² emissions savings would come principally from the ability to implement continuous climb on the Clacton SIDs. In 2012, aircraft in the landing and take-off cycle at Stansted Airport emitted about 181,000 tonnes of CO². Using the above table, the average emissions saving would be about 0.6% which is very small.

The Council’s Response

29. As there is no “win-win” situation for local residents, extreme care must be taken in making a judgement about the merits or otherwise of this proposal. In the Aviation Policy Framework (APF), the Government says that it wants *“to strike a fair balance between the negative impacts of noise (on health, amenity (quality of life) and*

productivity) and the positive economic impacts of flights” (Paragraph 3.3). In Paragraph 3.12, the Government states that its overall policy on aviation noise is “to limit and, where possible, reduce the number of people in the UK significantly affected by aircraft noise”. Under this proposal more people would experience more overflying than the number who would experience less, and there is also the effect to consider of increased overflying of Gt Easton Primary School. NATS and London Stansted Airport should therefore be asked to clearly explain to the CAA how this proposal would comply with Government policy in the APF and its guidance on environmental airspace design objectives. If this proposal is to be implemented, there should be a prior examination of whether the use of performance based navigation could reduce the effect on the primary school by either finding an optimal path within the Clacton 04 NPR swathe or by practicing dispersal.

30. There may be wider benefits of this proposal from improved fuel efficiency, reduced CO² emissions, reduced passenger delays and reduced congestion in the London airspace. It is not clear, however, how these are to be weighed against Government policy and guidance on mitigating noise impacts below 4,000ft.

Risk Analysis

31.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That this proposal would result in an overall net reduction in the quality of life for Uttlesford residents through more residents experiencing more overflying than the number who experience less.	2. The final decision on whether to implement the proposal will lie with the CAA based on its assessment of how the proposal meets Government policy and guidance.	2. There will be varied localised impacts for residents depending upon where they live.	Respond to the consultation setting out the Council’s views and concerns about the proposal.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel

Agenda Item

Date: 3 September 2014

5

Title: DfT Night Flying Restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted

Author: Jeremy Pine, Planning Policy /
Development Management Liaison Officer

Item for information

Summary

1. This report advises the Panel about the Government's decision on the new night flying restrictions for Stansted Airport. The Government has announced a new three year regime which will maintain the main features of the existing one.

Recommendations

2. That the Panel notes the report.

Financial Implications

3. There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Background Papers

4. None.

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	<p>The DfT embarked on a two-stage consultation to replace the existing night flying regime. The Stage 1 consultation looked at how the existing regime has operated and asked for views on the structure and content of the new one. The consultation also sought views on how to assess the costs and benefits of night flying in drawing up the new regime. The Panel received a report on the Stage 1 consultation on 11/4/13. The Council's response was sent on 19/4/13.</p> <p>This Stage 2 consultation set out the Government's proposals for the new regime, taking into account the views it received in Stage 1, the recently published</p>
----------------------------	---

	Aviation Policy Framework (APF) and the results of the Heathrow Operational Freedoms Trial. The Panel received a report on the Stage 2 consultation on 28/1/14. The Council's response was sent on 29/1/14.
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	In drawing up the new regime, the Government says it has balanced any perceived economic benefits of night flights against the effect on human health, especially sleep disturbance.
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	The regime impacts all parts of the district overflown by aircraft at night.
Workforce/Workplace	Officer time in preparing this response.

Situation

6. The Government has confirmed that it is not making any significant changes to the night flying restrictions before the Airports Commission publishes its final report in 2015. It has therefore announced a three year regime to 2017, which will retain the main features of the current regime.

7. The Government says of its decision to roll forward the current regime:

“This will help give certainty around the night noise environment for those living near airports. Our aims include to maintain stability until decisions have been made about any new airport capacity and to ensure operational capacity at these airports is not affected pending such decisions. Three years is shorter than recent regimes but by this time the Government of the day should be in a position to have reviewed these night flying restrictions in the light of decisions made about any new airport capacity”.

8. The movement and noise quota limits for Stansted will be as follows:

Winter 2014/15	Summer 2015	Winter 2015/16	Summer 2016	Winter 2016/17	Summer 2017
Movement limits					
5,000	7,000	5,000	7,000	5,000	7,000
Noise quota limits					
3,310	4,650	3,310	4,650	3,310	4,650

Source: *Night Flying Restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted, DfT July 2014*

9. These are the same movement limits that have endured since 2006/7, and the same noise quota limits since 2011/12. The night period remains 23:00 – 07:00 and the night quota period stays as 23:30 – 06:00.

10. The Government says that in its Stage 2 consultation it received evidence which suggested: *“unforeseen increased demand for night flights in the summer at Gatwick and Stansted which, if it were to materialise and continue, would mean that the existing movement limits would imposed additional costs to industry by 2017”*. It is presumed that “additional costs” means that the movements limit would bite at that point restricting night flying and that the airport operators have asked the Government either for a “predict and provide” approach or for more flexibility to carry over unused movements.

11. The Government says it is not convinced that these projections are robust, and a consultation on the next regime, which would take account of any actual increase in demand, is expected to begin early in 2016. The Government will monitor the new regime from the outset and this will provide evidence on whether operational capacity at Gatwick and /or Stansted is being affected before 2017.

12. The Government has extended the operational ban on QC8 and QC16 aircraft to the entire night period. This is a minute benefit to residents affected by aircraft noise at Stansted. In 2011, there was one QC8 cargo departure at Stansted between 23:00 – 23:30, and in 2012 there was one QC8 passenger departure (a privately operated flight by a state owned aircraft). There were no QC16 departures at Stansted in either year. Unscheduled arrivals rated at QC8/16 are not currently prohibited during the night period, but an aircraft this noisy on arrival would most likely be a “Chapter 2” aircraft which was phased out in 2002.

13. The Government has decided not to bring trials within the dispensation guidelines. This is because trials have to last for more than a short period in order to get detailed evidence. The power to issue dispensations is intended to be used only for specific occasions or short term events, and longer term trials would require public consultation with affected communities.

14. In the Stage 2 consultation the Government proposed a number of environmental objectives for the three airports. The setting of environmental objectives is required under EU law. The following objectives have been set for the three year period of the new regime:

Environmental Objective	How it will be measured
1. Limit and where possible reduce the number of people significantly affected by aircraft noise at night.	Area and number of people within the 6.5 hour night quota period contours, and in particular the 55dB contour. Population changes due to new housing development will be taken into account in measuring changes in number of people.
2. Maintain a stable regulatory regime pending decisions on future airport capacity and, at Gatwick and Stansted in particular, to allow growth in movements up to existing night movement limits and within noise quotas.	Movements and noise quota used in the night quota period
3. Encourage the use of quieter aircraft during the night quota period so as to reduce the overall impact of aircraft noise and in particular the likelihood of sleep disturbance.	Average QC points per movement. Proportion of movements made by the noisier types of aircraft (QC/4 and QC/2) during the night quota period.

Source: *Night Flying Restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted, DfT July 2014*

Risk Analysis

15.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That the future night flights regime implemented in 2017 will have a detrimental impact on the quality of life of local residents.	2. There is some risk because the Government will have to balance the economic case for night flights against local environmental considerations. Whilst the Government has rolled forward the	2. Any increase in night flights would affect the quality of life of local residents.	The Council will need to respond to the consultation on the 2017 regime when it is launched in 2016.

	<p>existing movement and quota limits, Stansted currently operates well within both. However, the headway will be reduced as passenger (and cargo) throughput increases along with the number of air transport movements.</p>		
--	---	--	--

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel

Agenda Item

Date: 3 September 2014

6

Title: Civil Aviation Authority “Managing Aviation Noise”

**Author: Jeremy Pine, Planning Policy /
Development Management Liaison Officer**

Item for information

Summary

1. This report tells the Panel about a guidance document that the CAA has published entitled “Managing Aviation Noise”. The document contains a number of recommendations to help improve the way aviation noise is managed by the industry.

Recommendations

2. That the Panel notes the publication of this report by the CAA.

Financial Implications

3. There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Background Papers

4. None.

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	None
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	All the wards affected by aviation noise
Workforce/Workplace	Officer time in preparing this report

Situation

6. “Managing Aviation Noise” was published by the CAA on 29th May 2014. In its accompanying press release, which is a useful summary of the document, the CAA says:

“More people in the UK are affected by aviation noise than in any other country in Europe. With the Airports Commission currently considering proposals for increasing the UK’s aviation capacity, the CAA is clear that the industry will not be able to grow unless it first tackles its noise and other environmental impacts more effectively. To help drive improvements from the industry, the CAA has published Managing Aviation Noise, a document setting out a series of recommendations to help reduce, mitigate and compensate communities for aviation noise.

The recommendations cover changes airports and airlines could make now, as well as improvements policy-makers and industry could make ahead of any future increases in capacity. There is a strong focus on making sure airports work with their local communities more closely, as well as operational changes and ideas for incentivising airlines to reduce the noise impact of their flights.

Key recommendations for the aviation industry include:

- Airports and airlines should ensure that operational approaches to mitigate noise are incentivised and adopted wherever feasible. The CAA will work with industry to consider, trial and promote novel operational approaches to noise minimisation.*
- When looking to expand, airports should do more to ensure local residents see benefits from additional capacity – whether through funding community schemes, direct payments, or tax breaks.*
- Airports seeking expansion should significantly increase spending on noise mitigation schemes to get closer to international competitors – including full insulation for those most affected.*
- Airlines should focus on noise performance when purchasing new aircraft.*
- Airports should structure their landing charges to incentivise airlines to operate cleaner, quieter flights.*

In addition, the document proposes creating a new Airport Community Engagement Forum bringing together local residents, the aviation industry, policy makers and planners focussed on how new capacity can be developed and operated to minimise noise impacts and maximise community benefits, rather than whether it should be built.

Measures that Government and local authorities could consider include the potential for tax breaks for local people and businesses and, if other methods are not successful, the potential for a future noise tax to incentivise airlines to procure and operate fleets in the most noise efficient fashion possible and to internalise noise impacts in consumer decision making.

7. The CAA document considers aviation noise under a number of chapter headings:

- 2. Context
- 3. Measuring aviation noise
- 4. Quieter aircraft design
- 5. Operational approaches to noise
- 6. Mitigating noise on the ground
- 7. Incentivising the industry
- 8. Engaging the community
- 9. The international picture (Frankfurt and Amsterdam used as examples)

Chapter 10 contains the CAA's recommendations. These are attached at the end of this report in full detail for the Panel's information.

Risk Analysis

8.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
None	None	None	None

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

“MANAGING AVIATION NOISE”: CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY

CHAPTER 10

RECOMMENDATIONS

MANUFACTURE

The most significant potential noise reduction benefits in terms of reducing noise can be produced through enhancement in airframe and engine manufacture. It is through creating quieter aircraft that the significant benefits in noise reduction have been driven since the 1950s.

Airlines

The CAA urges airlines to continue to focus on improving noise performance when they purchase new aircraft. Measures to incentivise airlines to prioritise noise performance over and above other priorities are explored in the incentivisation section below. This is important as with the recent introductions of two new aircraft types with significant noise benefits over their predecessors (Airbus A380, Boeing 787), operators now have more options when considering new type purchases.

Policymakers

Policymakers should be aware of potential noise and carbon trade-offs when considering incentives around sustainability and ensure that perverse incentives are not introduced which lead to increasing noise impacting local residents.

Manufacturers

Aircraft manufacturers face a series of pressures when they come to consider new product innovations including cost, configurability, efficiency, emissions, comfort and noise performance. While many of these elements have an impact on aviation's externalities, improving noise performance uniquely improves life for people who may see little or no benefits from aviation. We would strongly encourage manufacturers to continue to work to drive noise improvements, working collaboratively, and ensuring that trade-offs with other elements do not mean increasing noise.

OPERATE

Continuous Descent Operations (CDO)

We recommend airports consider the potential for such league tables to add value in their efforts to reduce noise, and consider other measures to ensure airlines adopt CDOs.

Low power low drag

Airports should consider measures to incentivise airlines to deploy landing gear at the appropriate point to balance operational and safety requirements and noise reduction.

Reduced landing flap

Although a number of operators already use or utilise the reduced landing flap technique, such a measure could be adopted relatively quickly by others to enhance noise benefits. Airports should work with their operators to enhance adoption of reduced landing flap.

Displaced landing thresholds

We will work with industry to gain a better understanding on the issues associated with displaced landing thresholds and will engage with industry, government and the Airports Commission to move forward operational assessment of the potential benefits.

Slightly steeper approaches

The aviation industry should consider the potential for slightly steeper approaches to impact on existing practices such as low-power/low-drag and reduced landing flap techniques as part of consideration of adopting this procedure where appropriate to mitigate noise.

Two-segment approaches

We will work with industry to explore the potential for two-segment approaches, and request that the broader aviation industry actively engage with the work we have initiated with British Airways, and consider the potential for this concept to significantly reduce approach noise.

Optimised lateral path

The CAA will continue to engage with industry through the Airspace Change Process and the Future Airspace Strategy programme to identify opportunities for optimised lateral paths to deliver noise benefits.

MITIGATE

Insulation funding

Airports should assess their insulation schemes within the context of their individual circumstances, but when insulation funding is offered, it is most effective where funding is available in full for those most seriously impacted by noise. It is also sensible to allow eligible households to source their own supplier, allowing market forces to drive down overall costs. Where part funding is available, the proportion funded by the airport should depend on the level of noise impact – with more funding offered to those who experience greatest noise.

Property removal

In the Airports Commission final report, a review of the potential impact of property removal alongside land rezoning in order to mitigate the highest noise and potential health impacts on local residents would help to give certainty that the numbers of people affected by new noise will be minimised.

Barriers and other noise absorption mechanisms

Airports, in particular when seeking to expand, should consider the potential to utilise noise absorption methods to limit the impact of aircraft ground noise – particularly to newly exposed populations.

Expenditure

Increasing spending on mitigation to compete with international best practice would be expensive given the UK's population density, particularly at Heathrow where noise affects

many more people than any other European airport. However, increasing spending significantly above today's levels would achieve greater equity between airports and communities, and the CAA believes that it is likely to be a pre-requisite for the significant expansion of any airport.

INDUSTRY INCENTIVISATION

When considering both manufacturing and operational improvements, policy makers and regulators often do not have direct powers to affect changes to improve noise performance. As such, consideration of a range of incentives to ensure the aviation industry fully reflects the environmental externality caused by noise in its decision-making is vital.

Landing charges

Airports which have not already done so should adopt the CAA's good practice principles for landing charges to encourage quieter operations set out in the Environmental Charges publication.

Facilitation

Where they don't already exist, airports should provide effective fora to coordinate and drive operational techniques to mitigate noise impacts.

Noise envelopes

The imposition a noise envelope for any new runway capacity developed in the south east, which would contain a series of trigger points to allow new capacity to be utilised only when noise limitations are met, could have benefit for noise management and community trust. Imposition of such an envelope would be a decision for the Airports Commission and Government. The final design of such an envelope could be agreed by the Airport Community Engagement Forum.

If such an envelope is proposed, in setting out their National Policy Statement, government should apply the CAA's suggested principals to setting the noise envelope. Planning authorities considering additional capacity elsewhere should consider the utility of introducing a noise envelope to manage community noise impacts, and apply the principles if they choose to impose one.

Noise tax

Government should consider the potential for a future noise tax to incentivise airlines to procure and operate fleets in the most noise efficient fashion possible, if other methods are not successful, and to internalise noise impacts in consumer decision making.

Were it to be considered, the design of such a tax should, as the French one does, reflect the individual circumstances of different airports and their varying noise impacts - ensuring that impacts are proportionate and based on a clear cost/benefit analysis. If introduced, the CAA believes that it would more equitable for revenues to benefit local communities, either directly via funding insulation measures or indirectly through supporting schemes which benefit the entire local area.

ENGAGING COMMUNITIES

Even taking all the measures set out above, aviation noise will not be reduced to a level which annoys nobody in the foreseeable future, particularly if capacity expansion aims to meet

demand growth. As such, alongside the proposals to minimise noise, more must be done to ensure communities are engaged with the aviation industry.

Information publication

The CAA will continue to develop proposals to make aviation's noise impact more easily understood to the public.

Airport Community Engagement Forum

An Airport Community Engagement Forum charged with ensuring clear, effective links and dialogue between local communities, the aviation industry, policy-makers and planners would help to facilitate community engagement and could help to ensure the Airports Commission's recommendations are delivered. For such a Forum to be effective, it must have respected, independent and objective governance to give weight to its recommendations around noise management strategies, community engagement and compensation measures. The Forum's core aim would be focussing on how new capacity is developed and utilised, rather than whether such capacity should be created – a decision which is for the Airports Commission and Government.

Financial incentives

Financial incentives for local communities could be an important part of compensating people for the negative impacts of aviation. The Airports Commission may propose such incentives in their final report – these are likely to be most impactful if local communities have a say in their design and if they are underwritten by law to ensure that residents can rely on them.

Landing charges and fines

Scheme proposers should consider the potential to do more to engage communities by spending more than they presently do on community engagement opportunities.

In reaching its final recommendation, the Airports Commission could consider the potential for hypothecating an element of the airport landing charges and slot fines to benefit local communities, either directly via payments or indirectly through local schemes. This could include considering the potential to enhance deliverability of the proposed project, weighed off against the impact on its financeability.

Ownership options

Although they are radical and likely to be challenging to implement, scheme proposers could consider the potential for utilising a novel ownership structure to better engage communities with airport success.

Tax breaks

Government and local authorities should consider the potential for tax breaks for local people and businesses to help to compensate local communities.