

NOTICE OF MEETING

Tuesday 8th January 2008

**4.30 pm in the Board Room at City Aviation House,
London City Airport**



AGENDA

1. **PRESENTATION – METROPOLITAN POLICE (C0 18)**

There will be a presentation on the work of C018 Branch of the Metropolitan Police who are responsible for airport security policing at London City Airport.

2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** should be notified to the Secretary at 9 Palace Green, Croydon, CR0 9AJ, Telephone: 020 8123 6374 or 01689 843434, Fax: 0208 251 9858, E-Mail: secretary@lcacc.org

3. **COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

(a) London Borough of Tower Hamlets

The Secretary has again been in touch with the Council's officers but there has still been no contact with their nominated representative.

(b) Gallions Housing Association

The Association has appointed Sundeep Pawar to represent the Association in succession to Rebecca Miller.

(c) ABTA

ABTA has appointed David Steer to represent the Association in succession to David Kent.

4. **THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 2ND OCTOBER 2007 – PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED**

5. **MATTERS ARISING**

(a) Item 2(d) – Manor Park Community Forum

It was reported at the last meeting that the Airport had asked the Manor Park Community Forum to outline the reasons for its request for membership so that they could give it further consideration. Thus far there has been no response.

(b) Item 4(a) – Parking in local streets

The Airport will update the Committee.

(c) Item 4(b) – Noise Action Plan

At the last meeting Dan Townsend confirmed that contours in the formats required by the *European Noise Directive (2002/49/EC)* had been sent to the Department for Transport. The next step is a *Noise Action Plan* which had to be prepared by mid-2008. Defra guidance on these plans is still awaited.

(d) Item 5(a) - Apron Extension Works - Noise

The Airport will brief the Committee on the progress made in carrying out this project.

Until the piling works were substantially completed towards the end of November 2007 there were a number of complaints – these are reported elsewhere on the Agenda. Among the local residents experiencing problems were Mr and Mrs McKenna. They were in touch with the Airport and received a visit from the project manager, Colin Hillary. It is understood they also raised their concerns with the Environmental Health Officers at the London Borough of Newham. In their discussions with the Airport they asked who locally represented them on the Committee and the Secretary telephoned in mid-October to give them this information. It was suggested they might also like to keep in touch with the Secretary and they were informed of the date of this meeting. No more has been heard.

(e) Item 5(b) - Apron Extension Works – Design of Noise Screens

At the last meeting members were asked to contact Charles Buchanan within the 2-3 days with any further observations they might have on the design of these screens. The Airport would then decide the design in the light of all the comments made.

The Airport will report the outcome.

(f) Item 11 – Fuel Smells

At the last meeting there was discussion of the question of fuel smells which had been referred to by Lyn Juniper in connection with the Airport's current planning application. It seemed unlikely that this was directly related to the issues raised by the planning application and Dan Townsend said the Airport would look into the question as a current issue. The Airport will update the Committee.

6. AIRPORT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Charles Buchanan will report.

7. COMMUNITY REPORT

Elizabeth Hegarty will report.

8. STANDING ITEM ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The report of the Airport's Environment & Planning Manager will be tabled at the meeting.

9. NOISE INSULATION PROGRAMME – PART IV

Jonathan Smith will report progress on the implementation of this part of the programme.

10. DLR WOOLWICH EXTENSION PROJECT – PROGRESS REPORT

Ian Thomas of Morgan Est will update the Committee on the progress of this project.

11. AIRPORT TRANSPORT FORUM

There was a meeting of the ATF on Thursday 22nd November 2007. The meeting opened with a presentation by Karen Bain of the Docklands Light Railway on its current projects. This was followed by a briefing by Phil McKenna of London Underground about the impact of the forthcoming escalator replacement works at Bank LT Station. Finally Charles Buchanan and Janet Goulton updated members on current airport issues, including the interim planning application.

The minutes of the meeting can be seen on the ATF pages on the Committee's website¹ along with copies of the slides used in the presentation²

12. PLANNING APPLICATION

At the last meeting there was discussion of the planning application which the Airport had submitted to the London Borough of Newham permanently to vary the limits in the present airport planning permission so as to increase the number of permitted flights. The new annual limit being applied for is 120,000 per annum compared with about 80,000 such flights in 2006. This is the "interim" application referred to in earlier Committee briefings. The application does not seek permission to construct any new facilities.

The application was logged as received by the Council on 6th August 2007 and allocated the number 07/01510/VAR. The responsible officer of the Council is Luke Downend. The Airport's *Environmental Impact Statement*, and other supporting documents, which accompanied the application can be seen on the Council's public access website³.

On 9th November the Secretary circulated to all members a copy of a leaflet which the Airport distributed the following week to all homes which normally receive the Airport's periodic publication *Runway News*. A copy was also placed on the Airport's website⁴ and the Committee's website has a copy too⁵. The leaflet seeks to answer many of the questions which have arisen in relation to the present application.

On 27th November the Secretary circulated members with copies of his correspondence with:

- the Council since the last meeting;
- an (anonymous) resident of West Thamesmead. (Note: Since this correspondence the Gallions Housing Association has appointed Sundeep Pawar to serve on the Consultative Committee as its representative)

Also circulated was a copy of the objection submitted by the London Development Agency and information about the online Downing Street Petition "No to the expansion of London City Airport flights - Protect our environment!"⁶

The mailing on 27th November included a copy of a letter which the Council sent on 20th November to the Airport's planning consultants seeking additional information for the *Environmental Statement* which accompanied the application and also clarification on a number of other matters relating to the application. Members will have noted that once the further information has been provided the Council will advertise its availability, and also write to statutory consultees, and there will be a minimum period of 21 days for comment.

It is unlikely that the application will be considered by the Council's Development Control Committee before February 2008.

13. ATTITUDES TO NOISE FROM AIRCRAFT SOURCES IN ENGLAND (ANASE)

The Committee have received reports from time to time on the progress of this long running study launched in May 2001. Its aim was to research how people feel about aircraft noise and especially how they perceive the relationship between noise levels and annoyance, or

¹ <http://www.lcacc.org/atf/minutes.html>

² <http://www.lcacc.org/atf/slide.html#2007>

³ [Click here](#) to see the application on the Council's public access website

⁴ <http://www.londoncityairport.com/masterplan/PlaningAppQAndA.pdf>

⁵ <http://www.lcacc.org/future/Plan%20App%20QA.pdf>

⁶ <http://petitions.pm.gov.uk/Notomoreflights/>

sleep disturbance at night, and how they would value lower noise levels relative to other environmental factors.

The results of the Study were finally published by the Department of Transport (DfT) on Friday last, 2nd November 2007 and details were circulated to members two days later. Copies of the consultants' report, together with peer reviews and Departmental statement papers, can be seen on the DfT website⁷ along with the DfT's press release.⁸ Members may also like to see the attached report considered recently by the *Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee*.

The Government say they will take these findings into account in developing air transport policy. However, in the light of the peer reviews they take the view that the study does not provide a reliable way of attaching a monetary figure to the impact of aircraft noise. Pending the availability of a better alternative, the Government says it will apply the existing valuation for road and rail noise when assessing the economic impact of noise in the cost-benefit analysis of future aviation projects. This is in line with the procedure they introduced for road and rail last year.

Meanwhile the letter which the Airport has received from the London Borough of Newham seeking further information in connection with the interim planning application – see paragraph 6 of Item 12 above - asks the Airport to consider how the “results of the ANASE study might be used to better inform the nature and extent of the impact from the proposals. Whilst recognising the concerns expressed by some of the reviewers, the Department for Transport has stated that the degree of annoyance is greater than had previously been identified. Some recognition of this (and other relevant outcomes from the study) should be reflected in either the ES or the Health Impact Assessment.”

14. DELAYS AT IMMIGRATION

There is concern among Consultative Committees across the country about longer queuing times at Airports for inbound passengers passing through passport control. This flows from new border control procedures introduced by the Government. Desirable and necessary though these may be they take longer and it seems staffing resources are insufficient to ensure that passengers are processed without undue delay.

London City Airport has also experienced problems. There are six immigration desks but they are not always fully manned with the result that there are queues in peak times and the Terminal Manager has had to invest in a queuing system to control the passengers in the arrivals area.

It is known that the Consultative Committees at Manchester, Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted have taken up the issue with the Home Office and also with the Cabinet Office which is said to be conducting a review of the issues arising. It may be that the Committee would wish to add its voice to these expressions of concern?

15. COMMITTEE CONSTITUTION

At the last meeting it was noted that the draft of the Committee's revised constitution was to be held over for the time being and shown to the Committee at a later stage when there was more clarity about how Consultative Committee members will be chosen when the London Borough of Newham's proposed new arrangements for the Community Forums were in place. In this connection it was reported that the Secretary had been in touch with the Council's lead officer, Grant Aitken, and a meeting was to be arranged attended by Janet Goulton, Elizabeth Hegarty and the Secretary.

⁷ <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/aviation/environmentalissues/Anase/>

⁸ <http://www.gnn.gov.uk/Content/Detail.asp?ReleaseID=327707&NewsAreaID=2>

The meeting with Grant Aitken was held on 5th November and was attended as planned by Janet Goulton, Elizabeth Hegarty and the Secretary. Another meeting is to be held, hopefully in February, to be attended also by Deputy Mayor Cllr Christine Bowden and Cllr Pat Murphy the Council's Lead officer for the Royal Docks. The meeting will also be attended by a representative of the *Royal Docks Trust (London)* which is facing very similar issues in appointing some members of its Board of Trustees.

The Secretary will update the Committee at the meeting.

16. **PLANNING FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE: WHITE PAPER**

The Committee discussed this White Paper at its meeting in July 2007. The discussion centred around the paper submitted to the *Annual Liaison Meeting of Airport Consultative Committees* at its meeting at Stansted in June 2007.

The Committee shared the concern expressed in the paper submitted to the Annual Liaison Meeting about the proposal setting an increase of 5 million passengers per annum as the threshold for airport infrastructure projects to be determined by the proposed new infrastructure planning commission. Such a threshold might be appropriate for projects at regional and smaller airports but not at larger airports such as Heathrow, Gatwick or Stansted. A percentage threshold would appear to be a much better option.

There was also concern that any National Policy Statement for Aviation should not involve a repeat of the process used to arrive at the current policy in the White Paper *Future of Air Transport*. The present policy had been very thoroughly explored and consulted about already.

As directed by the Committee the Secretary subsequently wrote to the Department on both these points.

The Government's response to the many thousands of comments made in response to the White Paper was published on 27th November⁹. In relation to the two points raised by the Committee the Response says:

- (a) "The Government recognises the importance of setting thresholds that avoid capturing small schemes that should not be considered nationally significant infrastructure. Following the consultation we have made changes to a number of thresholds in response. For example, we have raised the threshold for airports from five million passengers per annum to ten million passengers per annum."
- (b) "In practice we will need to take a case by case approach on transition of existing policy statements. It will be important that where extensive policy development and consultation has taken place, this can be taken into account. The Planning Bill will therefore contain provisions for the Secretary of State to designate an existing statement as a national policy statement; that he or she can treat an appraisal of the sustainability of such a policy as meeting the required standards for national policy statements; and that he or she may take account of consultation carried out earlier."

The Planning Bill necessary to give effect to the changes was also published on 27th November. A copy of the Secretary of State's statement that day about the Bill can be seen on the Department's website¹⁰

⁹ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/pwpgovernmentresponse?version=1>

¹⁰ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/statements/corporate/sustainablefuture>

17. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

18. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 1st April 2008 at 16.30 hours at City Aviation House, London City Airport.

Agenda Item: 8	Reference: HACC.509
Date: November 22 2007	
Attitudes to Noise from Aviation Sources in England (ANASE)	

Report by the Technical Adviser

BACKGROUND

1. The Department for Transport published a long awaited report of a study into people's perception of aircraft noise on 2 November 2007. The Study was undertaken to investigate the changes which had taken place since 1982, when the United Kingdom Aircraft Noise Index Study (ANIS) was undertaken. This was carried out when the Number and Noise Index (NNI) was in use to calculate annoyance but was later replaced by LAeq which Government concluded better represented people's reactions.
2. The Study was commissioned from the MVA Consultancy in 2001 and it has taken six years to complete. When first commissioned, it was being directed by a steering group of which the Chairman of HACC was a member but that ceased to be operative some years ago. The Study continued amidst a certain amount of controversy and changes in the aims and methodology to be used. The report of the Study was submitted for peer review by a group of specialists who have made numerous criticisms of the work, although agreeing that much of it adds to the sum of knowledge on the subject, and they have called for further work to be undertaken to clarify a number of the conclusions which were reached. There is no indication currently that the Department intends to commission further work.
3. The HACC has been supplied with one copy of the document which was compiled by seven staff of MVA and which runs to 470 pages, many of them tabulations and appendices. Included are reviews of the Study undertaken by peer reviewers.
4. In view of the length and technical complexity of the document, a request was made that it be discussed within the informed membership of the Heathrow Noise and Track Keeping Group to give those members of the HACC who serve on it, an opportunity of being briefed as to the conclusions of the Study and some of the implications for the population around Heathrow. The request was refused with a comment that this should be a matter to be dealt with instead at a HACC meeting.
5. The Executive Summary of the Study does not set out in an easily identifiable form its primary conclusions identifying those key factors which have caught the headlines of the Press and the concerns of environmental groups relating to increased sensitivity to noise, the numbers of people affected now and in the light of future developments in the industry. These have to be picked out from the text.

THE REPORT

6. The Study does not deal only with Heathrow Airport; it was conducted on the basis of a number of pilot surveys, phases and a Main Survey. The Main Survey conducted interviews with 2,733 households at seventy six different sites in areas affected by aircraft noise from airports in England. These established that the "discernible factors" that influence community annoyance were aircraft type, number and time of day or night, and identified the discernible differences in levels for each dimension.

7. A quantitative assessment of reported annoyance in very low aircraft noise areas (areas overflown at heights ranging from 4,000 to 12,000ft) found that there may be some additional factors associated with stacks per se that are a source of annoyance independently of sound levels but, generally, there was little evidence of reported annoyance in these areas.
8. A number of assumptions were examined as to the effects of paying grants or rebates to those affected by certain levels of aircraft noise with an acknowledgement that these could effectively be negated by local council action.

THE PRIMARY CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY ABOUT EFFECTS ON PEOPLE

9. **The Study concludes that more people are affected now than was the case 20 years ago in the previous study. People begin to be more annoyed by aircraft noise before 7.00am or after 11.00pm. The number of respondents at least "very annoyed" by aircraft noise is less than 10% for areas with a LAeq assessment less than 43dB ; the proportion of respondents at least "very annoyed" gradually increases with LAeq for values over 43 dB although there is a relatively large spread in percentages for most LAeq values ; at least 40% of respondents were at least "very annoyed" for all except one of the areas with LAeq greater than 57dB.**
10. **There is no indication from the findings that irregular aircraft events lead to greater reported annoyance than regular aircraft events at any given level of measurement.**
11. **A wide range of variables was tested but only three socio-demographic variables had significant co-efficients:**
 - a. **working from home (those who work from home generally have a greater level of annoyance)**
 - b. **income (those who have a higher household income are generally more annoyed – measured either as average household income or those with an income more than £40,000; and**
 - c. **those in a higher Social Economic category are generally more annoyed measured in SEG A, B or C1**
 - d. **12. In addition to income changes, the Study points out that there will have been other changes over time which are closely correlated to income. Taste effects – such as society's level of tolerance to environmental intrusion and its expectation of acceptable living conditions – have changed over time as has people's willingness to be more openly critical of officialdom and government.**
12. **Time of Day sensitivities – the results of the model used indicate that, relative to the daytime, and with some rounding, the sensitivity to the same aircraft noise at other periods are:**

* 23.00 - 03.00	80% more annoying
* 03.00 - 07.00	35% more annoying
* 19.00 – 23.00	15% more annoying
* 15.00 – 19.00	10% more annoying

Further investigation revealed that people are differentially annoyed at different times of the day regardless of whether they are at home or not.

WILLINGNESS TO PAY

13. The Study tested willingness to pay per month per household to reduce aircraft noise based on one less aircraft per day for different sound levels during the middle of the day (11.00 to 15.00) implied by a National Model. The implied willingness to pay values are given by aircraft type and across LAeq bands in high noise areas (LAeq = 60dB)

- * Jumbo £5 - £9 per aircraft (minimum Single Event Level = 84dB, Maximum = 95dB)
- * Underwing £2 - £6 per aircraft (minimum Single Event Level = 82db, Maximum = 89db)
- * Turboprop £2 - £3 per aircraft (minimum Single Event Level = 77dB, Maximum = 82dB)
- * Tailjet £2 - £5 per aircraft (mimumum Single Event Level = 67dB, Maximum = 84dB)

14. There are questions raised in the report about the link between respondents willingness to pay for a reduction in aircraft noise (e.g. around £5.00 a month for one less Jumbo every day during a certain 4-hour period) and their assumed improvement in their quality of life. These values are considered high and the result is questioned as being very high when the number of aircraft – even Jumbos – that would need to stop flying overhead in order to reduce the overall LAeq by 1dB at the site is considered. Additionally, a large number of respondents “professed zero willingness to pay”.

THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE REPORT

15. The analysis of the ANASE survey data showed that the respondent's household income and Socio Economic Group were the most important influences on the level of annoyance. Once these factors are accounted for there are no further significant location effects (i.e those affected by aircraft at Heathrow, for a given LAeq and income, are no more annoyed than those living close to other airports covered in the study).

16. A comparison between the survey work in 2005 and that undertaken in 1982, has shown that for the same amount of aircraft noise, measured in LAeq , people are more annoyed in 2005 than formerly. If Leq is an appropriate proxy measure of annoyance, one possible explanation of the increase in reported annoyance for a given LAeq between those years, may be a combination of changes in income/standard of living and changes in attitude within society.

17. The 2005 results have shown people to be much more sensitive to aircraft noise at night (particularly around midnight and the early hours thereafter). In contrast, people are least sensitive to aircraft noise in the morning and early afternoon. Ideally therefore, a metric that reflects attitude to aircraft noise should reflect these time of day sensitivities better than the existing LAeq metric – which does not weight by time of day.

18. Having found an increase in the relationship between annoyance and aircraft numbers in 2005, the increase in reported annoyance for a given LAeq may reflect the changes in the composition of number and sound level that people are exposed to, suggesting the use of a different formulation to that implied by use of the LAeq metric.

19. The report goes on to suggest that reversion to the earlier used Number and Noise Index (NNI) type of measure gives a larger weight to the number of aircraft relative to the sound level than does LAeq and that such a use might be more appropriate.

REVIEWERS OF THE REPORT

20. The report of the Study has attached to it the views expressed by peer reviewers – Professor Ian J. Bateman and Dr Brett Day - and another by the Chief Economist of the Department which will be of concern to Members in evaluating the evidence of the Report.

21. Both Professor Bateman and Dr Day are critical of the ANASE report in many of the same respects. The comments by Dr Day in an eleven page critique in which his comments and suggestions for further work are set out, lend themselves to be summarised most easily and are as follows:

- There are reservations concerning the modelling of the contingent valuation (CV) data in which respondents were asked directly how much they would be willing to pay to reduce aircraft noise at their home. Accordingly, he is of the opinion that the values reported for a 1dB Leq change coming from that study are not reliable
- The parameters used by the consultants to establish the relative annoyance at different times of the day are confounded by the fact that they do not account for presence or absence from the home; it is not believed that the relativities reported are accurate
- One very important issue that is ignored by the current study is that of self-sorting with regards to noise exposure. In particular, households with relatively high tolerance for noise will choose to locate in areas with relatively high levels of aircraft noise exposure since they are compensated through cheaper housing costs. Conversely, noise intolerant households will be prepared to take on higher housing costs so that they can locate in relatively quiet areas
- One could convincingly argue that the current study is fundamentally flawed because it does not account for self-sorting
- In para.11.1.77, the consultants had suggested taking the contingent value(CV) estimates (£11 and £18 a year) as defining the absolute value of a 1dB reduction in aircraft noise exposure. Brett questions how these absolute values would be disaggregated and says it is far from clear to him how this would work. He questions what exactly should be taken as being the value of a reduction in noise resulting from a Jumbo in the middle of the day? Or a tailjet at night? Indeed, he says, the consultants are very unclear as to how the outputs from the Study should be applied in practice. For this research to be of use to the DfT, he believes these issues need to be considered and clear advice presented in this report.
- Referring to analysis showing different sensitivity to the same aircraft noise in different time periods, he points out that this represents the average (relative) sensitivity to noise at each time period across the entire sample of respondents. However, as shown in tabulations, up to 50% of the sample may be absent from the home in any one period. Individuals are likely to realise little benefit from aircraft noise reductions at their homes when they are in another location.
- Since the measurement of the relative sensitivity to aircraft noise across different periods of the day is one of the key objectives of the study, Brett feels that it is important that the consultants address this issue more thoroughly

22. The Chief Economist of the Department says in a Statement attached to the report that, " in particular, the peer reviewers consider that ANASE results are not sufficiently robust to use quantitatively in certain aspects of policy making" and "they counsel against using the detailed results and conclusions from ANASE in the development of Government policy" and they argue that "the valuations reported coming from the Study are not reliable".
23. The Chief Economist points out that the ANASE Study shows no evidence of a threshold, or step point, at which people become very much more annoyed, that the results show that some people are concerned – and value – aircraft noise at relatively low levels and that people's annoyance – and valuation – increases as noise levels increase. There is no particular threshold at which the increase in annoyance (and valuation) accelerates significantly. He says the finding is in line with the research evidence on noise from road transport and consistent with DfT's approach to the valuation of noise impacts from road and rail.
24. He concludes that further work would be useful in a number of areas such as:
- Further work on numbers and noise
 - Additional stated preference work
 - Further work as recommended by peer reviewers
 - Seek the views of other experts