

Agenda Item:	Reference: HACC. 566
Date: September 14 2009	
Environmental Noise Directive – Draft Heathrow Noise Action Plan 2020 -2015	

Report by Technical Adviser

BACKGROUND

1. Noise Action Plans are required to be prepared by the responsible airport management or operators about what they recognise the noise situation created their activities is and what they can do and propose to do to meet the requirements of the relevant European Noise Directive. There is also a requirement to IDENTIFY the problems and the situations which need to be improved, although it may not be within the airport’s own ability to rectify them.

2. Annex V of the END as it applies to airports, spells out the elements of the action plan which must be included. These were illustrated in a slide presentation given to the HACC meeting on 29 July by Rick Norman, Head of Noise and Air Quality for Heathrow. All of the slides used then to illustrate the presentation have since been distributed to Members by the Secretariat.

3. All Members were sent a copy of the Draft Noise Action Plan which has been the subject of consultation at meetings with stakeholder groups of local residents, the HACC and of the presentation and discussion on 29 July. Because of the many and complicated matters which need to be considered in our response, Members were invited to notify the Secretariat by early September of the views they, or the organisations they represent, and who should have received their own invitation to consider the Action Plan, wished to see reflected in our response. At this date of writing, only one response was received – this morning.

4. Some indications of other stakeholder views or responses have been identified from letters or other mentions in the Press and have been taken on board. Regrettably, many of these responses fail to understand which authority has jurisdiction in the matters they are referring to, and are proposing that BAA should say what action it would take where it would not have the authority or ability to do so since, in a number of activities which lead to noise concerns around Heathrow, BAA is obliged to recognise and implement decisions made by other authorities, perhaps for quite valid technical reason, even if it is unhappy about the implications.

5. For example, several references have been made to BAA saying what action it would take to deal with Night Flight quotas and their implications for nuisance. This is an area which the Secretary of State for Transport has responsibility for deciding although BAA has to implement those decisions and suffer the criticisms which derive from it.

6. Recently, there has been an increase in the agitation for use of steep angle approaches to be made by arriving aircraft at Heathrow because of the reduction in aircraft noise expected to be experienced on the ground. There are many problems to be considered of feasibility before this could be done, by a number of international aviation organisations, pilot's organisations (the safety of such landings) service providers (such as NATS) and also examining the design characteristics of each aircraft type to decide if it could safely perform such an operation. Whilst BAA would clearly need to take a view of this, it cannot of itself introduce such a measure but only make recommendations (Section 3 page 8)

7. One recent letter in the press called for this Action Plan to cover both Heathrow and London City Airport Airports although no justification or benefit was quoted. Traffic levels at London City are now high enough (over 50,000 ATMs annually) to require the preparation of an Action Plan which is proceeding. It also called for re-evaluation of the Continuous Descent Approach (CDA) procedure. which is, anyway, undertaken periodically and the performance of it is considered by the Heathrow Noise and Track keeping Working Group, on which HACC is represented, and also by the Department's Aircraft Noise Monitoring Advisory Group. The identification and protection of Quiet Areas is already a requirement of the Noise Directive but the criteria to be used in doing this has not been decided by DEFRA, the sponsor Department, despite me and other

representatives drawing attention to this and the difficulties for those having to decide and implement it with the conflicting views likely to arise. The Action Plan recognises the need to protect Quiet Areas in Section 9 Action number 1.2.17

8. However, Element 7 of Annex V does require "Identification of problems and situations that need to be improved " and that would seem the place to record those matters referred to in para.4 above, where BAA Heathrow has to implement or comply with decisions taken by other authorities.

9. The Foreword to the Action Plan states quite specifically that " It does not tackle the issue of aircraft noise associated with future development at Heathrow such as a third runway". There is no further mention of this in the Draft Action Plan where there is a need to detail future actions and, although it is rather early to determine specifics, some acknowledgement of the implications, in Elements 10 and 11, would be appropriate.

#### Where does the Draft Action Plan deal with the requirements of Annex V ?

9. These requirements are set out in the illustration in para.2 above. Some of the requirements are dealt with not in one but in several of the Sections of the Draft and may be identified most simply in the Executive Summary of the Draft Plan. BAA believes that it has met the requirements of the European Noise Directive as legislated for by DEFRA but Members may have found it difficult earlier to locate the appropriate Section in which to satisfy themselves of this before raising any questions or adverse comments .

Element 1 A description of the airport ..... See p.9 of the Draft Plan

Element 2 The authority responsible See Purpose and Scope - Page 9

Element 3 The legal context See "Background ." starting on page 10

Element 4 Any limit values in place  
See bottom of page 20 and Annex V on page 49

Element 5 A summary of the results of the noise mapping  
See the data produced from the Noise Mapping exercise in Section 7, page 26 and maps in Annex 3.

Element 6 An evaluation of the estimated number of people exposed to noise.  
See Section 7 for the evaluation and the numbers involved

Element 7 Identification of problems and situations that need to be improved  
See Sections 7 and 10.and Annex 4

Element 8 A record of public consultations organised.

This appears to be missing as a schedule although, of course, a number of such meetings has been held, the last on 2 September at The Academy.

Element 9 Any noise reduction measures already in force and any in preparation.  
See page 6 of the executive Summary

Element 10 Actions which the airport operator intends to take in the next five years...  
See Sections 8 and (in particular) 9

Element 11 Long term strategy  
Set out in Section 6 "BAA's framework for noise management" Starts page 15.

Element 12 Financial information (if available ); budgets, cost-effectiveness, assessment, cost-benefit assessment  
See Annex 9 of the Draft Plan on page 55.

Element 13 Provisions envisaged for evaluating the implementation and the results of the Action Plan.  
See Sections 8 (p.29) and 10 (p.39)

Also, the Action Plan should contain estimates in terms of the reduction of the number of people affected (annoyed, sleep disturbed, or other.)

## **CONCLUSIONS**

10. The Draft Action Plan does seem to have provided for most of what the Directive and END require of it although some people may believe that more actions could, or should, be undertaken by BAA Heathrow than those which are listed. The Secretariat has received virtually no advice of what those particular views would require nor of any satisfaction with what the Plan does contain. There are, of course, very mixed views about this with the interests represented on the Committee which are difficult to represent adequately and concisely.

11. Because of the passage of time, many actions, agreements and practices, of long standing are often overlooked and a very helpful summary of this is contained in Section 9 " Our approach to managing noise (the action plan)". Closer reading of this might have satisfied some of the concerns which have been raised recently.

12. The areas about which the Committee could usefully reply on are:

Elements 10 and 11 – should acknowledge that Runway 3 will have implications even if they cannot be quantified at this time (para.9 above)

Element 8 – the Committee is aware that public consultation meetings have been held on a number of occasions but these do need to be recorded in this part of the Plan

Element 7 – Identification of problems and situations that need to be improved. This is referred to in para.s 4 to 8 above and the relevant matters which should be referred to in the Plan would be identified.

The tail end requirement of Annex V -- estimates in terms of the reduction of the number of people affected. does not appear to have been actioned and this omission should be drawn to attention.

13. Included in the Draft Action Plan are maps illustrating the areas which are included in the Community Buildings Noise Insulation Scheme (Annex 8 page 52) and the Home Relocation Assistance Scheme (Annex 8 page 53). The HACC badly needs an update about the operation of these schemes.

14. Responses to the Consultation are required by 5 October so that there is still an opportunity to seek, take account of and action any concerns or comments raised by Members in discussion of this report on 23 September .

15. It will be extremely helpful to the Secretariat if Members with proposals about what they would like to see in the response can provide these on paper at the Committee meeting to assist the Chairman and so that there is no difficulty ( as sometimes occurs) in deciphering some parts of the electronic recording.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the formal response of the HACC be drafted to include the matters referred to in para.s 12 and 13 above and such others as are appropriate which are raised in discussion of this report during the Committee meeting .on 23 September.

mgh/566

Agenda Item:	Reference: HACC. 565
Date: September 11 2009	
Frankfurt Airport Activity Report for 2008	

Report by Technical Adviser

1. It is our policy to keep Members informed of what happens at the several European airports which are the prime competitors to London for the dominant position which it has (or had?) in air transport matters and the economic benefits which they perceive as flowing from that. This is sometimes questioned when other concerns are voiced, particularly environmental concerns, so it is important that access to relevant and factual data is available to anybody concerned to evaluate these claims.

2. As reported some months ago to the Committee, authority to construct a further runway was granted to FRAPORT, the airport group which includes Frankfurt Airport, and the runway is now under construction. The resultant increase in that airport's capacity will make it more attractive for passengers to use it and for commercial organisations to choose that area in which to locate their offices because of the additional services/destinations which it will offer them.

3. The Annual Frankfurt Airport Traffic results 2008 has been received and digested. It runs to 37 pages, too long to copy and distribute to all Members – and not all would welcome it. However, at the Attachment to this report is a short selection from it of data which records the scale of some of the most helpful data we should be interested in. Each of the traffic sections has also a management commentary about the activity, what affected it and trends in that class of air transport activity.. Those who want to know more of the contents should apply to the Secretary asking for the section dealing with their particular interests.

3. In terms of the various classes of users, in 2008, Frankfurt suffered a small decline in these activities in common with most other air transport providers because of the effects of the international financial crisis, but not to the same degree as many others because of the continuing importance and range of the services it provides as a Continental hub. This can be seen from the data recorded but the management commentaries which accompany each of the traffic sections, explain what has caused this and what is expected to change.



Agenda Item:	Reference: HACC.557
Date: 9 September 2009	
Economic Impacts of Hub Airports	

Report by Technical Adviser

1. The Secretariat has received a copy of a report with this title produced for the British Chambers of Commerce by an eminent consultancy, Colin Buchanan, which was commissioned to examine the direct and indirect impacts of hub airports to the UK in relation to business users, and investigate the role of hub airports in economic growth, both generally and more specifically within the UK.
2. The report was funded by Future Heathrow, said to be a broad-based coalition of business, trades unions and the aviation community.
3. Heathrow is the only hub airport in the United Kingdom.
4. This is yet another in the long list of reports and studies of the economic importance of Heathrow Airport to the United Kingdom, and to the London region in particular. There has been some controversy about the conclusions reached by the earlier economic reports, in particular whether those such as the Oxford Economic Forecasting are still reliable or whether the conclusions are now outdated. This report brings some of that information up to date. As with earlier studies, this does not attempt to assess environmental costs.

#### **EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT**

5. One conclusion drawn is that it makes little difference in economic terms where a UK hub airport would be located (as long as it had good connectivity to London and the regions) and can be delivered in a timely and cost effective manner.
6. The authors say that they have assessed the economic impacts of expanding Heathrow because this appears to be a quicker and less expensive option than other possibilities. The report highlights some alternatives to having an expanded hub airport, such as expanding Stansted or Gatwick from one runway each and also high speed rail links.

#### **SOME CONCLUSIONS FROM THE REPORT**

7. On its own, use of high speed rail would do little to alleviate the current capacity constraints at Heathrow as eliminating current UK flights (except Belfast) would free up around 9.7% of slots if all air passengers were to transfer to rail.

8. Concern is expressed about the lack of understanding of the economics of hub airports and the economic impact of expanding the UK's hub at Heathrow.
9. It is pointed out that, due to scarce capacity, Heathrow has fallen from being 1<sup>st</sup> in Europe to 5<sup>th</sup> in terms of destinations served and the number of UK regional cities it serves has fallen from 21 to 6 and that it has fallen behind its rivals in serving the fast growing BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, China) economies
10. Adding capacity at Heathrow would deliver more destinations, greater frequencies and fewer delays in the short term and make the UK more competitive for investment.
11. Using proven methodology and conservative assumptions, the report suggests that economic benefits would include £8.6 billion to £12.8 billion Present Value, even greater than the £10 billion estimated by others for High Speed rail to the North
12. A copy of the executive Summary of the report is an Attachment to this report.

Mgh/557