

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE – 2 SEPTEMBER 2019

PART I - DELEGATED

6. HEATHROW EXPANSION PROPOSAL – THIRD STAGE OF CONSULTATION (DCES)

1 Summary

- 1.1 The proposed expansion of Heathrow Airport has progressed into consultation stage there have been a number of consultations covering to different areas. The two areas are the Airport Expansion and the other is the Airspace and Future Operations.

2 Details

- 2.1 Following the decision to allow a third runway to be built at Heathrow Airport the District Council has been consulted in regards to the potential impact on the Three Rivers District of the proposed options for development. This relates to the Further information has been published by the promoter here <https://www.heathrowexpansion.com/press/heathrow-reveals-masterplan-for-expansion-with-launch-of-its-largest-consultation/>.
- 2.1.1 The potential impacts of the expansion of Heathrow need to be considered in two separate areas. The construction of the project must be considered separately to the operational impacts that will take effect once the expansion is in use and any changes in the way the airport is used.
- 2.2 Officers consider that the construction of the project is unlikely to have any significant impact on the district due to the significant distance of the site from Three Rivers District. A minor potential impact could result from an increase in traffic on the M25 motorway both at construction and operational stages, but the details of road closures and traffic management will be addressed by relevant local Highway Authorities

Heathrow Expansion decision-making process and consultations

- 2.3 The current consultation invites feedback on Heathrow's proposals for the future layout of the airport, including the new runway and other airport infrastructure such as terminals and road access. Details include plans to manage the environmental impacts of expansion, including a proposed Heathrow Ultra Low Emissions Zone, Heathrow Vehicle Access Charge and a proposed 6.5-hour ban on scheduled night flights.
- 2.4 This is the third consultation on the proposed overall changes to the Airport. The first (January to March 2018) was the subject of the Cabinet Management Board report of the 4 June 2018 (**Appendix A**) It sought "*views on our emerging proposals in terms of what the expanded airport could look like, how it might operate, and how we might best mitigate against the potential impacts, including proposals for compensation and noise insulation*".
- 2.5 The second (January to March 2019) on the Future Airspace Operations proposal invited feedback to help shape the airport's plans for its future airspace for the existing two runways and as part of the proposed expansion. This was assessed and the response at **Appendix B** was returned.
- 2.6 The report to Cabinet Management Board of June 2018 included the indicative consultation timeline below, leading to the submission of a Development Consent Order (DCO). This will be published

here: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/london/expansion-of-heathrow-airport-third-runway/>.

- 2.7 It is important to note that the DCO would not authorise any changes to Heathrow's airspace design (flight paths) or operating procedures. Any such changes that result in changes to the movement of aircraft over the ground will need to go through an airspace change process (ACP). These cannot be included within a DCO and have to be separately applied for and approved by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and, potentially, the Secretary of State for Transport.

Indicative Timeline

National Policy changes	Development Consent (HAL)
Feb – May 2017 Consultation 1	
Oct – Dec 2017 Consultation 2	
Autumn/Winter 2017/2018 Parliamentary scrutiny	Jan – March 2018 Consultation 1 (May 2018)
Summer 2018	Parliamentary vote on Airports National Policy Statement
2019	Consultation 2
2020	DCO Submission
2020/21	DCO Examination
2021	DCO Decision
2021	Construction Starts

Current consultation

- 2.8 The Heathrow project is currently consulting on the Airport expansion, this consultation is to look at how the project could impact on local areas and ways in which they are assessing this and determining suitable controls to manage any impacts.
- 2.9 This consultation amongst other considerations is looking at managing the environmental effects of the expansion. As part of this the promoter has produced a Preliminary Environment Information Report (PEIR). This report and the further assessment that is being undertaken will inform the Environmental Statement which will form part of the Development Consent Order (DCO).
- 2.10 Most of the many impacts that are identified by the PEIR and consultation documents are expected to affect the area around the airport. The PEIR covers the following topic areas, but is important that the committee notes that none of these has been identified to affect the Three Rivers District.
- Air Quality
 - Biodiversity
 - Carbon
 - Climate Change
 - Community
 - Health
 - Historic Environment
 - Land Quality
 - Landscape and Visual Impact
 - Noise

- Socio Economic and Employment
- Transport Network Users
- Waste
- Water Environment.

Flight paths and Noise

- 2.11 The consultation on the Airspace and Future Operations has closed and our response to that is in appendix 1. This consultation was in relation to the principles that would be used in designing the airspace, it is also how the use the existing runways as well as the proposed third.
- 2.12 On 14 May 2018 an officer from the residential Environmental Health Team attended a Local Authority Noise Engagement workshop, following this a report was sent to cabinet management board which is attached in appendix 2. This report summaries the considerations being made and the approach being taken to assess the noise implications of the proposals. The most likely aspect of the expansion to have an impact on the district is from aircraft noise.
- 2.13 National noise policy is stricter now that it has previous been which will result in tighter controls and increased information being submitted in the application for the DCO.
- 2.14 Having reviewed the published information in respect to aircraft noise it is reported that although it is likely that aircraft noise will be noticeable no adverse effects on health and quality of life have been identified however this is dependent on how the airspace is designed. This is mainly in relation to the southern third of the district. It is also reported that whilst there has been an increase in the number of flights over the past few decades the noise contour footprint is currently at its smallest.
- 2.15 The new flight paths that will be associated with the expansion have not been decided at this time and will need consent from the Civil Aviation Authority and full public consultation on the flight path changes for expansion scheduled for 2022.

M25 impacts during construction

- 2.16 There are likely to be some impacts but the key intention is to divert the motorway with an 'offline' temporary diversion to keep the existing M25 open while the diversion is built reducing effects on road users. This will allow construction of the new M25 carriageway and tunnel under the proposed runway up to 150m to the west of the existing M25. The realigned motorway will be lowered by up to 4-4.5m into a tunnel under the proposed runway.
- 2.17 This is therefore unlikely to cause significant impacts toe the Three Rivers District. No changes are proposed for the M25 NW quadrant (that serving the District).

Other observations

- 2.18 The proposals to expand the airport include aspirations to reduce car travel both for employees and customers. No clear proposals to achieve this have been developed or presented, with rail access being 'maintained' rather than significantly increased. This is particularly prominent as it was recently proposed by the Department for Transport when the HS2 project was laid before Parliament, which included a dedicated 'Heathrow spur' (that was subsequently withdrawn).

2.19 No other new rail connections are proposed (unlike for example at Luton London Airport, which recently received authorisation to build a new light rail transit connection). Additionally no mention is made of any other proposals published in recent years to improve rail connections to Heathrow (such as the London Air-Rail Transit System that the District Council has previously supported, which would make use of spare motorway land to run a new light rail system connecting mainlines and settlements around the M25 with the London Airports.

3 Options and Reasons for Recommendations

3.1 The current consultation relates to the design of the airport and its surrounds. No expected adverse impacts have been identified for the Three Rivers District.

4 Policy/Budget Reference and Implications

4.1 The recommendations in this report are not within the Council's agreed policy and budgets because the report subject relates to an external consultation.

5 Financial, Equal Opportunities, Staffing, Environmental, Community Safety, Public Health, Customer Services Centre, Communications & Website, Risk Management and Health & Safety Implications

5.1 None specific.

6 Legal Implications

6.1 The District Council as a neighbouring Local Authority is a statutory consultee for this proposed planning application.

7 Recommendation

7.1 The Committee determines to delegate authority to provide a detailed response to the consultation to the Director of Environmental and Community Services in consultation with the Lead Member for Transport and Economic Development and to take into account Hertfordshire County Council's response.

Report prepared by: Greg Pilley, Residential Environmental Health Manager and Peter Simons, Senior Transport Planner

Data Quality

All data is taken from material published as part of the consultation.

1	Poor	
2	Sufficient	√
3	High	

Background Papers

None.

APPENDICES / ATTACHMENTS

Appendix 1 – Heathrow Expansion Report 04.06.18

Appendix 2 - Airspace and future operations consultation

CABINET MANAGEMENT BOARD - PROPOSED HEATHROW EXPANSION

4 JUNE 2018

1. Background

Following the decision to allow a third runway to be built at Heathrow Airport the Council has been approached in regards to the potential impact on our district of the proposed options for development. Therefore, an officer attended a workshop with Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) on the noise aspect of the project.

There is a process that must be adhered to for consent to be approved for the third runway. We are currently unable to comment on the proposals as details have not been confirmed about what the intentions are in respect to the flight paths. Once this is developed and released (via an Environmental Impact Assessment) we will be able to consider the implications for the district from a noise perspective.

The main potential impact on Three Rivers' residents would be from changes to the flight paths and the use of the airspace in our district.

2. The Legal Context

There are three main tiers of regulation which govern aircraft noise in the UK, none of which is enforceable by the Council:

- The International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) – a specialised agency of the UN
- The European Civil Aviation Conference
- National – UK Aviation Policy Framework, Planning Policy, Act of Parliament and UK Aeronautical Information Publication

3. Environmental Metrics and Assessment Requirements

The Government's priorities when considering environmental impacts arising from proposals to change airspace routes are set out in its Air Navigation Guidance:

- airspace from the ground to below 4,000 feet - the Government's environmental priority is to limit and, where possible, reduce the total adverse effects on people
- where options for route design from the ground to below 4,000 feet are similar in terms of the number of people affected by total adverse noise effects, preference should be given to that option which is most consistent with existing published airspace arrangements
- in the airspace at or above 4,000 feet to below 7,000 feet, the environmental priority should continue to be minimising the impact of aviation noise in a manner consistent with the Government's overall policy on aviation noise, unless the CAA is satisfied that the evidence presented by the sponsor demonstrates this would disproportionately increase CO2 emissions
- airspace at or above 7,000 feet, the CAA should prioritise the reduction of aircraft CO2 emissions and the minimising of noise is no longer the priority
- where practicable, it is desirable that airspace routes below 7,000 feet should seek to avoid flying over Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and National Parks; and
- all changes below 7,000 feet should take into account local circumstances in the development of the airspace design, including the actual height of the ground level being overflown, and should not be agreed to by the CAA before appropriate community engagement has been conducted by the sponsor.

4. Airspace Design

The factors which influence noise are mainly operational and meteorological. Operational factors are:

- Departure route and destination choice
- Aircraft type
- Airline procedure

Meteorological factors are:

- Wind
- Jet stream
- Weather

Options that will be considered for airspace design are covered by six key principles:

Principle 1 - three options:

- a) to minimise the total number of people overflown, with routes designed to impact as few people as possible, or
- b) to minimise the number of people newly overflown, keeping routes close to where they are today, where possible, or
- c) to share routes over a wider area, which might increase the total number of people overflown but would reduce the total number of people most affected by the routes as the noise will be shared more equally

Principle 2 - two options (urban v rural areas):

- a) prioritise routing aircraft over urban areas, recognising that urban areas have higher general noise levels; or
- b) prioritise routing aircraft over rural areas where fewer people live

Principle 3 - two options (only applies if urban areas are impacted):

- a) design flight paths over parks and open spaces rather than residential areas, or
- b) design flight paths over residential areas, avoiding aircraft overflight of parks and open spaces

Principle 4 - two options (noise v emissions):

- a) prioritise the reduction of aircraft noise for local communities over those that reduce fuel burn, or
- b) prioritise reduction in fuel burn and emissions over those that reduce noise for local communities

Principle 5 (technology and innovation):

- The airspace being designed now needs to be efficient for the foreseeable future

Principle 6 (night flights)

- HAL will encourage only the newest and quietest planes to fly in and out of the airport, particularly during the night period. The majority of Heathrow's flights in the future will be between the hours of 7am and 11pm, so the set of design principles they choose will apply to flight paths mainly during the day. The Government requires a 6.5 hour ban on night flights; therefore HAL's preferred solution is for this to be between 11pm to 5:30am.

5. Framework for Noise Management

The General Commitment at HAL to address the challenge of aircraft noise, while continuing to safeguard the connectivity and economic benefits that the airport provides is based on:

- Quieter planes (e.g. fly green and quiet)
- Quieter procedures (e.g. ground noise management plan)
- Land-use planning and mitigation (e.g. noise insulation schemes)
- Operating restrictions and voluntary measures (e.g. night restrictions)
- Working with local communities (e.g. engagement forums)

6. Next Steps

HAL has agreed to consult on and establish a clear, legally binding Noise Envelope Plan (encompassing the framework in point 5 above) that will give certainty to local people on how noise is addressed.

Workshops with partners will be ongoing so Officers will engage and attend as necessary. Formal comments will be made through the consultation period.

Heathrow Airport provides a dedicated noise website, further details can be found at: www.heathrow.com/noise

Appendix One details an indicative timeline for the progress of the project.
Appendix Two details the measurement and reporting of aircraft noise.

Report prepared by ~~Greg Pilley~~, Residential Environmental Health Manager

Appendix One

Indicative Timeline

National Policy changes	Development Consent (HAL)
Feb – May 2017 Consultation 1	
Oct – Dec 2017 Consultation 2	
Autumn/Winter 2017/2018 Parliamentary scrutiny	Jan – March 2018 Consultation 1 (May 2018)
Sumer 2018 Parliamentary vote on Airports National Policy Statement	
	2019 Consultation 2
	2020 Submission
	2020/21 Examination
	2021 Decision
	2021 Construction Starts

Appendix Two

Measuring and Reporting Aircraft Noise

Measuring noise by describing its impacts and change is complex. There are many subjective effects such as perception, attitude, and visual impact – collectively known as ‘non-acoustic factors’. Still there is a need to quantify noise with objective metrics to be able to manage the noise challenge.

There are a range of metrics which are used to describe aircraft noise and inform policy. For studying long-term trends in environmental noise, it is convenient to use a single-number descriptor, e.g. to define an entire day’s noise history. Therefore, in describing environmental noise:

- Equivalent Continuous A-Weighted Sound Pressure Level $L_{Aeq, T}$ is that constant level in dB(A) which, lasting for as long as a given A-weighted noise event, i.e. for a period of time T, has the same amount of acoustic energy as the given event
- Community Noise Equivalent Level L_{den} is a 24-hour equivalent continuous level in dB(A) where 5 dB is added to the evening noise levels from 19:00 hours to 22:00 hours and 10 dB is added to night-time noise levels from 22:00 hours to 07:00 hours
- Day-Night Average Sound Level L_{dn} is a 24-hour equivalent continuous level in dB(A) where 10 dB is added to night-time noise levels from 22:00 hours to 07:00 hours.

The most common internal measure of noise is the L_{Aeq} (often shortened L_{eq}) which means ‘equivalent continuous noise level’. This proves to have the best correlation with associated health outcomes such as annoyance and sleep disturbance.

In the UK, daytime aircraft noise is typically measured by calculating this average noise level in decibels (dB) over 16 hours (07:00-23:00) over the summer period to give a single daily figure. As these L_{eq} 16hr contours have been used in the UK for over 30 years, they allow historic trends to be monitored. Past Government research concluded that a L_{eq} of 57 decibels marks the threshold above which ‘significant community annoyance’ begins.

Effects of Noise –Current evidence

Effect	Specific Outcomes	Key Metrics Used	Current strength of evidence
Cardiovascular	Hypertension Stroke Coronary Heart disease	L_{den} L_{eq} L_{eq24hr}	Sufficient
Self-reported sleep disturbance	Interference with falling asleep	L_{night} and L_{max}	Sufficient
Objective sleep disturbance	Awakenings	L_{night} and L_{max}	Sufficient
Cognitive development	Reading Standardised test scores	L_{eq} , L_{den} and, for a few studies, L_{max}	Sufficient
Annoyance	Bothered, disturbed or annoyed by noise at home	L_{eq} 24hr, L_{den} and L_{dn}	Sufficient



Three Rivers District Council
Three Rivers House
Northway
Rickmansworth
Herts WD3 1RL
Tel: (01923) 776611
Fax: (01923) 896119

DX: 38271 Rickmansworth

By email to:
info@heathrowconsultation.com

My Ref : TPP-1.11
Your Ref :
Date : 29 August 2019
Tel No : 01923 727227
Email Add :
Department : Regulatory Services

Dear Sir, or Madam,

Airspace and future operations consultation

I am writing on behalf of the District Council, in response to your consultation.

The District Council supports any response provided by Hertfordshire County Council in its role as strategic transport authority. The District Council has considered the information provided in the context of its statutory roles in respect of environmental impacts and specially pollution.

While the District Council promotes the health of local populations through enforcement of legislation like the Housing, Environmental Protection and Health Acts (in respect of communicable disease) and the Food Safety Acts, it recognises that the duty to improve public health of local people lies with the upper tier authority, Hertfordshire County Council under the Health and Social Care Act 2012, so our comments are focussed on localised pollution.

The District Council comments generally that the consultation is not particularly useful to general respondents. The document in isolation is not helpful to explain the real impacts of your proposals. District Council Officers have looked at this document in conjunction with others to put it into context. It is recognised that the situation is emerging and that more information will become available later, especially in terms of noise impacts, so the District Council requests that it is consulted in further detail in the future.

Based on the limited information available, the District Council do not raise specific concerns about impacts on local communities, expressing no comment at this stage on questions 1 to 5. Should further information become available we will review this position. While we do not respond specifically to questions 1 to 5, we wish to highlight our concerns that:

That proposed flight paths must be adhered to (concerns are raised that these will not be adhered to, as demonstrated by deviation from current paths). It has been suggested to the District Council that flight paths that are currently located to the south of Abbots Langley are regularly ignored since the actual paths are reported by local Councillors to regularly diverge from these parts as demonstrated by tracking websites such as flight radar. In this context, please note that local Councillors made representations to NATS which supports this information.

There is a specific need to protect the openness of the sky over the major local employment and tourism provider, the Warner Bros. studios at Leavesden. Concerns are raised about impact of flight noise and views affecting the air space above the outdoor 'backlot' which is regularly used for filming.

That despite significant impact on local people in Carpenders Park and South Oxhey, South of Watford, no local event was held to advise them of impacts and there is general lack of awareness of the consultation. This is particularly worrying given the very technical nature of the consultation which would require more support for uninformed parties to enable them to effectively comment.

Please feel free to contact me with any further queries or comments.

Yours sincerely,

Geof Muggeridge
Director of Community & Environmental Services