



HILLINGDON
LONDON



CABINET

To all Members of the Cabinet:

Date: THURSDAY, 14 MARCH
2019

Time: 7.00 PM

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOM 6 -
CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH
STREET, UXBRIDGE

**Meeting
Details:** Members of the Public and
Media are welcome to attend
this meeting and observe the
public business discussed.

This meeting will also be
broadcast live on the
Council's YouTube Channel.

Ray Puddifoot MBE (Chairman)
Leader of the Council

David Simmonds CBE (Vice-Chairman)
Deputy Leader / Education & Children's Services

Jonathan Bianco
Finance, Property & Business Services

Keith Burrows
Planning, Transportation & Recycling

Philip Corthorne
Social Services, Housing, Health & Wellbeing

Douglas Mills
Community, Commerce & Regeneration

Richard Lewis
Central Services, Culture & Heritage

You can view the agenda
at www.hillingdon.gov.uk or use a smart
phone camera and scan the code below:



Published:
11 March 2019

Contact:
Mark Braddock
Tel: 01895 250470
Email: mbraddock@hillington.gov.uk

Putting our residents first

Lloyd White
Head of Democratic Services
London Borough of Hillingdon,
Phase II, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW

Useful information for residents and visitors

Watching & recording this meeting

You can watch the public part of this meeting on the Council's YouTube channel, live or archived after the meeting. Residents and the media are also welcome to attend in person, and if they wish, report on the public part of the meeting. Any individual or organisation may record or film proceedings as long as it does not disrupt proceedings.

Watch a **LIVE** broadcast of this meeting on the Council's YouTube Channel: *Hillingdon London*

Those attending should be aware that the Council will film and record proceedings for both official record and resident digital engagement in democracy.



It is recommended to give advance notice of filming to ensure any particular requirements can be met. The Council will provide seating areas for residents/public, high speed WiFi access to all attending and an area for the media to report. The officer shown on the front of this agenda should be contacted for further information and will be available to assist.

When present in the room, silent mode should be enabled for all mobile devices.

Travel and parking

Bus routes 427, U1, U3, U4 and U7 all stop at the Civic Centre. Uxbridge underground station, with the Piccadilly and Metropolitan lines, is a short walk away. Limited parking is available at the Civic Centre. For details on availability and how to book a parking space, please contact Democratic Services.

Please enter from the Council's main reception where you will be asked to sign-in and then directed to the Committee Room.

Accessibility

For accessibility options regarding this agenda please contact Democratic Services. For those hard of hearing an Induction Loop System is available for use.

Emergency procedures

If there is a FIRE, you will hear a continuous alarm. Please follow the signs to the nearest FIRE EXIT and assemble on the Civic Centre forecourt.

Lifts must not be used unless instructed by a Fire Marshal or Security Officer. In the event of a SECURITY INCIDENT, follow instructions issued via the tannoy, a Fire Marshal or a Security Officer. Those unable to evacuate using the stairs, should make their way to the signed refuge locations.



Urgency Notice

Agenda Item 5 - Heathrow Expansion: Response to Heathrow Airspace and Future Operations Consultation

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, 28 clear days notice of a decision on this report, to be considered by Cabinet on 14 March, was not practicable.

This report has also been circulated less than 5 working days before the Cabinet makes any decision on the matter and will only be considered if approved at the meeting by the Chairman (Leader of the Council).

Under special urgency rules in the Council's Constitution, the Chairman of the Executive Scrutiny Committee has kindly agreed that a decision on this matter can be considered at this Cabinet meeting because it is urgent and cannot reasonably be deferred.

Timings for this report were dependent on when the Council's consultation response was to be submitted, with a deadline of 4 March. The urgency is so the Council can note in a timely way the Council's response to this key consultation.

Notice of the Council's intention to hold this meeting (part in private) is set out on the main Cabinet Agenda A for this meeting.

Issued: 11 March 2019
London Borough of Hillingdon

Agenda

Cabinet Reports - Part 1 (Public)

- 5 Heathrow Expansion: Response to Heathrow Airspace and Future Operations Consultation (Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE) 1 - 16

HEATHROW EXPANSION - RESPONSE TO HEATHROW AIRSPACE AND FUTURE OPERATIONS CONSULTATION

Cabinet Member	Councillor Ray Puddifoot MBE
Cabinet Portfolio	Leader of the Council
Officer Contact(s)	Raj Alagh, Chief Executive's Office
Papers with report	Appendix 1 Response from the London Borough of Hillingdon to the Heathrow Airspace and Future Operations Consultation

HEADLINES

Summary	This report sets out details of the Council's response to Heathrow Airport Ltd's January 2019 Heathrow Airspace and Future Operations Consultation and seeks Cabinet's endorsement to it.
Putting our Residents First	This report meets the Council's objectives of our people and our natural built environment. It also helps to demonstrate that the Council is doing all that it can to protect its residents from proposed Heathrow expansion.
Financial Cost	None directly arising from this report.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents, Education and Environmental Services.
Relevant Ward(s)	All Wards

RECOMMENDATIONS

That Cabinet:

- 1) Notes the contents of the report.
- 2) Endorses the Council's response dated 4 March 2019 to Heathrow Airport Limited's January 2019 Heathrow Airspace and Future Operations Consultation.
- 3) Reaffirms the Council's commitment, working either alone, or in conjunction with partner authorities and others, to take all necessary action, including pursuing appeals to the appellate courts in relation to the current legal challenge, and commencing further separate legal challenges, to oppose the Government's proposals to expand Heathrow Airport and it confirms that the existing delegated authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director of Residents Services and the Borough Solicitor to formally implement any actions directed by the Leader of the Council is to remain in place.

Reasons for recommendation

Heathrow expansion will have a devastating impact on the Borough and its local communities. It is important that the Council responds robustly to Heathrow Airport Limited's proposals which are not only premature but will also have devastating impacts if implemented.

Alternative options considered / risk management

The Council could decide not to respond to this consultation. However, this is not considered to be a feasible option due to the highly unsatisfactory nature of the consultation and the very significant adverse impacts its proposals have on the Borough and its residents.

Policy Overview Committee comments

None at this stage.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Background

The Airports National Policy Statement [ANPS]

1. On 25 October 2016, the previous Government endorsed the Airport Commission's conclusion, as set out in its Final Report dated July 2015, that the case for airport expansion in the South East of England had been properly made out and it therefore announced that its preferred scheme to meet the need for new airport capacity was a Northwest Runway (NWR) at Heathrow Airport. This was in accordance with the Airport Commission's recommendation.
2. The previous Government decided that a National Policy Statement was the most appropriate mechanism for putting into place the necessary planning framework for a new runway at Heathrow on the basis that it falls within the category of a nationally significant infrastructure project within the meaning of the Planning Act 2008. An alternative approach would have been to use the Hybrid Bill process which was favoured for the development of Phase one of the HS2 scheme.
3. The current Government undertook two public consultations, the first in February 2017 and the second in October 2017, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008. Consultees were asked for their views on the draft ANPS which the Government had produced. There were a total number of 72,239 responses to the February 2017 consultation and 11,028 responses to the October 2017 consultation.
4. The Council made robust responses to both sets of consultations, which were formally approved by Cabinet.
5. On 5 June 2018, the Secretary of State for Transport [SST] laid the final proposed ANPS before Parliament together with a set of supporting documentation, in readiness for an impending vote in the House of Commons.

6. The vote in relation to the proposed ANPS took place on 25 June 2018. MPs voted in favour of the ANPS by 415 votes to 119, a majority of 296 with support from across the House.

7. On 26 June 2018, the SST designated the ANPS under section 5 of the Planning Act 2008. It sets the policy framework for Heathrow expansion. On the same day, the Department for Transport published:

- A post adoption statement titled, "*The Airports National Policy Statement: Post Adoption Statement*" setting out how environmental considerations and consultation responses were integrated in to the final ANPS; and
- A relationship framework document, setting out how the Department for Transport and Heathrow Airport Limited [HAL] would work together to achieve additional airport capacity through airport expansion, necessary airspace modernisation and related matters.

The Legal Challenges

8. There is a strict six week time limit, which ran from the date of the designation of the ANPS [26 June 2018], to issue judicial review proceedings in the High Court. The Council, acting with a consortium of other local authorities, Greenpeace and the Mayor of London commenced such proceedings within this time limit. There are four other judicial review claims and they will all be heard in the High Court between 11 - 22 March 2019. The Council's legal grounds of challenge can be briefly summarised as follows:

- Air Quality
- Surface Access
- Habitats
- Strategic Environmental Assessment
- Climate Change
- Consultation Failings [Minds Made Up]

The Development Consent Order [DCO] Process

9. The ANPS is not an end process in itself as it does not confer a consent to either construct or operate any development. Instead, it sets a series of policy tests that must be met in order for development consent to be obtained. If they are not met, then depending on the nature of the test contained in the ANPS, development consent may be legitimately refused.

10. It is for a private developer to make an application for development consent to the Planning Inspectorate, which acts on behalf of the Secretary of State, under the Planning Act 2008. Development consent is another name for planning permission and it is required for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as Heathrow expansion. The Council is of course the relevant planning authority.

11. Although HAL is the Government's preferred developer, any prospective developer can make an application. Indeed, it is understood that Arora Group intend to submit their own

development consent application for all parts of the NWR Scheme, other than the actual runway itself.

12. The DCO process places great importance on engagement with stakeholders and residents. A developer also has to comply with certain statutory pre-application steps including consultation.

13. HAL is in the process of preparing its DCO application in spite of the impending March hearing in the High Court and it appears that it will continue to press on with it, regardless of the outcome. For example, HAL ran an initial, non-statutory consultation exercise from 17 January to 28 March 2018 which sought views on its emerging proposals in terms of what the expanded airport could look like, how it might operate, and how HAL might best mitigate against the potential impacts, including proposals for compensation and noise insulation. The Council did not respond to this consultation.

Heathrow Airspace and Future Operations Consultation

Introduction

14. HAL published this consultation on 8 January 2019, which ran for eight weeks until 4 March 2019. HAL is seeking feedback on changes proposed to the Heathrow airspace and on future runway operations. This consultation is also non-statutory in nature.

15. The consultation consists of 25 separate reports, the majority of which are technical in nature. The main consultation document states that this is an opportunity for consultees to share their views on two key topics related to expansion, namely, Future Operations [how the runways will be used] and Airspace Change for Expansion [the routes aircraft will fly]. In addition, there is a separate document titled 'Making Best Use of Existing Runways' which proposes changes to arrival flight-paths in relation to the current two way runway airport.

16. The consultation seeks views on three key areas:

- Future operations for an expanded Heathrow: how HAL will operate the proposed three runways in future - this includes managing noise; respite through runway and airspace alternation; directional preference and night flights.
- Airspace change for an expanded Heathrow: the local factors that HAL should be considering in different geographic areas when designing future flight paths.
- Airspace change to make better use of the existing two runways: the local factors that HAL should be considering in different geographic areas when designing new flight paths for some arrivals on the existing two runways.

17. The standard of the consultation material, for the avoidance of doubt, is extremely poor. For example, the suite of documents contains an online tool with a postcode checker for consultees to check the information for their own specific area. There is no means via this tool of overlaying the different maps to fully understand the potential impacts of areas impacted by departures and arrivals.

18. There are 16 specific questions under the topics of managing noise and future runway operations, two requests for views on Airspace Change and the potential to add any other comments on the consultation as a whole.

19. The Council has answered each of these questions and it has also added extra comments. The Council submitted its response by the 4 March deadline which was approved by the Leader of the Council under his delegated powers. A copy of the full response is attached as Appendix 1 to the report. Cabinet is being asked to endorse this approval.

Overview

20. The report titled 'Heathrow's Airspace Design for Expansion' includes a series of mapped diagrams called design envelopes which indicate the spatial reach of future flight paths in various different scenarios for arrival and departures from all three runways. The envelopes are up to a height of 7,000 feet, divided into 7 separate categories. The height of 7,000 feet as a cut off is chosen as this is the extent of the control Heathrow, as the airport operator, has in terms of the design of the routes. After this, the design reverts to NATS [National Air Traffic Services]. There is no further information as to how the local design routes will be merged into the wider flight path design at higher altitude.

21. Each height category has an indication of the expected number of flights per hour plus the number of those flights anticipated to be above a defined noise threshold. This threshold is the number of flights above 65dB for daytime operations, and the number of flights above 60dB for night-time operations. These thresholds are set by the Civil Aviation Authority in their Air Navigation Guidance; their use is described as providing a means of portraying those locations where residents will experience being overflown. The maps are segregated into departures and arrivals although there is accompanying text which explains that communities may be impacted by both departures and arrivals.

Short Summary of Hillingdon Response

22. This consultation serves to wholly support the Council's action in judicially reviewing the Government's ANPS in that the environmental implications of expansion are substantial, totally unacceptable and indeed unlawful. The ANPS has not taken proper account of the environmental implications, and in particular noise arising from the proposed Heathrow NWR expansion. This view is supported by the level of detail now presented within this consultation.

Implications for Hillingdon

23. For the first time, the enormity of the noise impacts which will emanate from the operation of a third runway at Heathrow has been displayed in a manner which allows residents to anticipate whether they will be flown over and to what extent. What is clear from the consultation is that all parts of the Borough will be impacted by flight paths, from Harlington in the South where there are indications of 47 flights an hour [approximately one every one and a half minutes] to Harefield and Northwood in the North at 17 flights an hour [approximately one every three and a half minutes].

24. This is in direct contrast to the information presented by the Government in the draft ANPS February and October 2017 consultations when noise information was displayed in the form of noise contour maps. These indicated that there would be no noise impacts past the southerly parts of the Borough. The Council consistently complained at every opportunity that the Government's approach to the information displayed as contour maps was not representative of the actual impacts. It is only now, that the ANPS having been designated, will communities begin to understand the true picture.

25. It is also clear that the proposed airspace changes [independent parallel approaches] at the current two runway airport will mean, if accepted, that from 6am there will be flight paths over areas of the Borough that do not currently have overflights and where this occurs, there will be potentially a concentration of approximately 25 flights in the hour between 6am-7am. This is wholly unacceptable to the Council and its residents.

Consultation on noise management and airspace should be halted

26. This whole process is being rushed through by HAL without appropriate safeguards being put into place for residents and communities. To make matters worse, this is being done at a time when various judicial review challenges have yet to be heard and determined by the High Court, with the potential for the ANPS to be quashed if it is found to be unlawful.

27. The Airports Commission, in its Final Report in July 2015, called for the establishment of an independent noise commission with the key aim of building trust between communities and the aviation industry and influencing decisions relating to aircraft noise, its management and mitigation. This has been supported in Government policies such as the ANPS itself, the Government's Airspace Change Policy and also within the CAA Air Navigation Guidance, which have all referred to the establishment of the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise [ICCAN].

28. The remit of the ICCAN was described in the Government's Airspace Change Policy consultation as giving:

"communities assurance that noise impacts are being considered and that noise management procedures are being taken forward in the best possible way by industry."

29. It went on to state that:

"The Government recognises that independence and credibility will be key to the foundation of ICCAN. We wish to see its influence taking effect to support Heathrow Northwest Runway airspace decisions and therefore would like to see it established as soon as possible."

30. Yet this level of independent engagement has been absolutely denied to all the communities around Heathrow. HAL have pressed on with the process in spite of ICCAN not yet being in place and therefore not having both the time and opportunity to influence the process. This is wholly unacceptable and this process should be halted now - no ifs or buts. It immediately sets the so-called Balanced Approach in firm favour of the aviation industry with no independent voice for the huge swathes of communities who will be adversely impacted.

31. To allow what will be one of the biggest change in airspace in aviation history, together with changes in runway operations which will impact on hundreds of thousands of people, to go ahead without this independent view and community safeguard, is at best misconceived, perverse and irrational. The Council will be calling on Government and the CAA to halt this consultation process until such time as ICCAN is in place and is therefore in a position to influence the process in the manner which has been anticipated and expected since the recommendation of the Airports Commission in July 2015.

32. If the Government and the CAA ignore the Council's request, then the very independence and credibility associated with the establishment of ICCAN will be lost on the basis that ICCAN will come into the process when key decisions will have already been made and opportunities to address any shortcomings will have been lost forever.

Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations contained in the report.

RESIDENT BENEFIT & CONSULTATION

The benefit or impact upon Hillingdon residents, service users and communities?

Proposed Heathrow expansion, together with Phase One of the HS2 scheme, are the most significant and devastating set of Government development proposals facing the Council and its residents. Cabinet approval of the recommendations is an important part of the process in terms of the Council's continued opposition to Heathrow expansion.

CORPORATE CONSIDERATIONS

Corporate Finance

There are no direct financial implications arising from the report. However, the Council has established a contingency fund for opposing expansion at Heathrow. This is reviewed annually as part of the MTFP process and stands at £409k.

Legal

The Borough Solicitor is the author of the report and all necessary legal implications are therefore contained within the body of the report.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Nil

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1

Heathrow Airspace Change and Future Operations Consultation

Please see below the response from the London Borough of Hillingdon. Please accept the full detailed comments to each question and our response under other comments. We do not wish our detailed views to be lost in an evaluation of consultation responses distilled down to a simple yes/no.

Sent on behalf of Councillor Raymond Puddifoot, Hillingdon Council Leader

Response to the Questions

Managing noise at an expanded airport

Question 1 Do you support our proposals for a noise objective?

Answer - No

This whole process has been rushed through without the appropriate safeguards for communities being put in place. The Airports Commission called for the establishment of an independent noise commission with a key aim of building trust between communities and industry. This has been supported in subsequent Government policies such as the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) and Airspace Policy which have both referred to the establishment of the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN).

Key to the development of any noise objective is that the ANPS defines the role of ICCAN in terms of the production of independent guidance including specifically in terms of helping to achieve a balance between growth and noise reduction and in relation to specifics such as runway alternation schemes. ICCAN should, therefore, have a key role to play in the setting of such a noise objective.

Yet this level of independent engagement has been totally denied to all the communities around Heathrow. Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) has pressed on with the process despite ICCAN not yet being in place and in a position to influence the outcomes. This is unacceptable and the process should be halted. It immediately sets the so-called Balanced Approach in firm favour of the aviation industry with no independent voice for the swathes of communities who will be impacted.

We do not support the noise objective as suggested; it cannot be taken as being agreed. Its development is premature and should be postponed until ICCAN is in place and able to influence the outcome and help define the appropriate objective. This would bring a degree of independence to the process, something the communities have been promised since the Airports Commission Final Report in July 2015.

Question 1b: any comments you have on HAL proposals for a noise objective

“To limit and, where possible, reduce the effects of noise on health and quality of life and deliver regular breaks from scheduled flights for our communities during the day and night.

We need to do this whilst making sure the measures we put in place are proportionate and cost effective” HAL proposed objective

Answer: the wording is not supported

The wording of the proposed noise objective includes the text from the ICAO Balanced Approach which states measures must be proportionate and cost-effective. Yet in reality the proposals HAL are putting forward, by way of this consultation, simply reduce the duration of the regular breaks that communities currently experience; the night flights proposal is not in line with that recommended by the Airports Commission or supported by the communities; and the additional proposal for making best use of the existing runways, Independent Parallel Approaches, simply adds more flights in the night time period between 6am -7am. There is no evidence within the consultation to demonstrate these proposals have been balanced in anyway apart from to support the aviation industry.

The ANPS requires any proposals to avoid adverse effects in health and quality of life and minimise negative effects. There are no definitions in this consultation as to what is meant by adverse effect in health and quality of life therefore no evidence to understand how the proposals would meet the objective criteria.

The wording of the objective is not supported. There would need to be an independent process by which proportionate and cost effective measures could be agreed and the consultation has not demonstrated this has happened. The consultation is simply hiding behind the wording of the Balanced Approach without providing independent evidence as to why the balance should tip in favour of the airport operations over the health and quality of life of the local communities. It is premature and should be postponed until ICCAN is in place and able to influence the outcome and help define the appropriate objective.

Question 1c: any other comments or suggestions on HALs proposed approach to developing a package of noise measures for an expanded Heathrow.

Answer - see below

One of the aims of ICCAN is the building of trust between communities and industry, the lack of current community distrust is not helped by the presentation of a misleading consultation and the offers of environmental restraints which are so easily dismissed by HAL. Two examples are given below:

The presentation of this consultation is misleading. The opening line states that *Heathrow has long been at the forefront of international efforts to tackle aircraft noise*. It is accompanied by an illustration indicating a reduced noise footprint from 1974 to 2013 using the 57dB (LAeq) noise contour as proof of its success. Given that, even with these so-called "efforts", its operation imposes unacceptable levels of noise over more people than the other European hub airports combined, this does not make this a success story in terms of community impacts.

Such statements bring no relief to the hundreds of thousands of people the 2-runway operation currently impacts upon. It simply illustrates that the metrics used to describe noise impacts are inadequate in terms of assessing the noise impacts on local communities. There is no reference to

the recent scientific evidence from the SONA 14 study that communities are now more sensitive to aircraft noise and that the Government Airspace Policy now uses metrics set at a lower level than that illustrated in order to reflect this.

The statement that expansion must be delivered within environmental limits, along with the offer of legally binding limits, is meaningless. The current two runway airport is subject to a current cap of 480,000 Air Transport Movements (ATMs), set as a form of noise envelope, and supported legally, via the imposition of a planning condition. This was set in the T5 Inquiry to help attempt to control the substantial environmental damage inflicted by the operation of the airport. Yet this consultation has provided information that HAL is proposing to overturn this cap for the current two runway and increase the flight numbers by 25,000 ATMs. Given this it cannot be surprising that the local communities will give little credence to a suggestion that environmental damage will be contained simply by the inclusion of legal obligations.

The discussions on noise management and mitigation measures should be halted until processes are in place to ensure ICCAN is established and can exert the anticipated independent influence over the discussions between industry and local communities.

Future operations

The CAA Air Navigation Guidance (2017) specifically references ICCAN in terms of the airspace change process and their potential role in the development of best practice guidance in the airspace change process including the principles of flight path design. These are all fundamental issues being explored by HAL as part of this current consultation.

- Respite through runway and airspace alternation

Question 2a - would you prefer to have longer periods of respite less frequently (all day on some days but no relief on other days) or a shorter period of respite (e.g. for 4-5 hours) every day?

Answer - there is insufficient evidence to make an informed response

It is not clear how Heathrow expect communities to reply to this when the current situation at Heathrow allows for eight hours of respite delivered via runway alternation and this proposal sets to reduce this to 4-5 hours and to introduce the concept of mixed mode operations on one of the runways at all times. It is not clear what definition of respite HAL is referring to and what is meant by relief. Without it the question cannot be answered in an informed manner.

The use of mixed mode is stated as being necessary to balance out the numbers of arriving and departing aircraft, yet to the communities impacted it will bring increased times of continual overflights, described as a "*stream of aircraft*". Using location A in the runway operation as presented in the consultation as an example, the communities in this area would only receive one period in four where there were no overflights and even this is caveated to say "*there will still be an awareness of aircraft landing/departing from the adjacent runways*".

Mixed mode has been previously dismissed for use at Heathrow in the past due to its negative environmental implications (Decisions following Adding Capacity at Heathrow, 2009). It is not clear what options have been explored to fully test the need for its application. For example, although the consultation states all three runways in mixed mode would give maximum capacity but offer no

respice therefore this has been dismissed, it simply states all options must instead have one runway in mixed mode. There is no evidence produced to understand if there was no introduction of mixed mode whether respice could be increased and if so what the ensuing health benefits would be for the surrounding communities and what the disbenefits may be for the operation of the airport. There is no evidence to allow consultees to make an informed choice, in regard to the implications or nature of the impacts of the different options.

Question 2b: Any reasons you have for your preference

Answer - as discussed above, without further information there can be no informed response in regard to what constitutes a preference. Put simply, the communities have insufficient evidence to make an informed preference.

Question 2c: Any other comments or suggestions you have on runway and airspace alternation

Answer - no further consultation should be carried out until ICCAN are established and fully engaged in the process with the communities as well as industry.

- Directional preference

Question 3a: Should we continue to prefer westerly operations during the day and easterly operations at night to reduce the total number of people affected by noise?

Answer - this is a divisive question, how it will be answered will depend upon where communities live. No further consultation should be carried out until ICCAN are established and fully engaged in the process with all impacted communities.

Question 3b: Any reasons for your answer

Answer - see above

Question 3c: Should we sometimes intervene to change direction of operations to provide relief from prolonged periods of operating in one direction – even if that means slightly increasing the number of people affected by noise?

Answer: see above, in addition the consultation question is unclear, there is no definition of what is meant by relief for consultees to make an informed decision.

Question 3d: Any reasons for your answer

Answer - See above

Question 3e: Any other comments or suggestions you have on directional preference.

Answer: see above

- Night flights

We want to know whether you would prefer HAL to:

Question 4a: Option 1 Use one runway for scheduled arrivals from 5.30am (runway time 5.15am);

Answer: No

Question 4a: Option 2 Use two runways for scheduled arrivals from 5.45am (runway time 5.30am);

Answer: No

Or don't know.

Answer – none of the above

Question 4b: The reasons for your preference

Answer: We do not agree with HAL's proposals for early morning flights from either 05:30 or 05:45.

The two options presented are either an earlier wake up for fewer people or slightly later (15 minutes) for more people. It is impossible to distinguish in this context what is best when both are unacceptable. The question is closed in terms of the hours suggested which makes the consultation unfair in this respect. No evidence is presented as to why there is an economic need for the chosen times.

The Airports Commission recommended that with expansion all the current night flights could be accommodated after 6am, at the very minimum this proposal should have been explored by HAL. The reality is that any night flights (11pm - 7am) should be avoided. Lower levels of noise in this period can have significant health effects.

It seems that HAL are keen to ensure maximum rewards from expansion which is contrary to a balanced approach. Furthermore, it is entirely premature to even pose this question without first understanding the effects on people or what sensitive noise receptors are at most risk. It seems the "balanced approach" has already been applied without any understanding of the social or health effects; simply put, this consultation demonstrates HALs unbalanced approach to putting profit ahead of people and health.

Question 4c: Any other comments or suggestions you might have on early morning arrivals

Answer: the consultation has not presented evidence of the balanced approach in terms of its options, a proper independent appraisal is required including the health benefits of a ban until 6am and 7am.

The consultation document notes the balanced approach as being the ability for a full day's business for passengers versus interrupted sleep and the resulting detrimental health impacts. The so-called benefits have no independent analysis of need, one reference simply says "*it is widely surmised that early morning transatlantic arrivals are among the most financially valuable flights for airlines at Heathrow*".

We firmly support a total ban on night flights until 7am. The reasons for not extending beyond 6am are given as not being able to accommodate the Airports NPS of at least 740,000 ATMs, the significant economic impacts and reducing Heathrow's ability to compete with European hub airports. There is no demonstrated "balance" to this approach in terms of community impacts and

the health benefits that may be gained by a longer ban. As with all other aspects of this consultation we ask for this consultation to be halted until the establishment of ICCAN.

- Night flights - Other night restrictions

Question 5a: Any comments or any other suggestions on how we should encourage the use of the quietest type of aircraft at night (outside the proposed scheduled night flight ban)?

Answer : the scheme as operated rates aircraft in regard to their noise certification. However given the substantial detrimental health implications of night noise there needs to be an additional rating given dependent upon the time of day the aircraft is in operation.

Question 5b: Any other comments you have on night flights and restrictions.

Answer: no evidence has been provided to show how the balanced approach has been evaluated in regard to restrictions on night flights.

Airspace Change

This part of the consultation seeks a view on:

Local factors that you think we should consider when designing flight paths with these design envelopes for an expanded three-runway airport;

Answer - the design envelopes as presented confirm the whole of the borough will be impacted by flightpaths with an expanded Heathrow. In this situation it is unclear as to how HAL expect consultees to respond to this question. We have no trust in a process such as this being run by HAL, it has been rushed ahead of the process recommended by the Airports Commission which sought to regain community trust and give independence to community engagement via the introduction of ICCAN.

Design envelopes

In terms of the design envelopes, the consultation includes a post code search facility to allow consultees to find information on aspects such as the number of flights and the potential height of the flights at given noise levels (65dB during the day and 60dB at night). The numbers of flights is confusing and is displayed as a range, for example, 0-47, with the number expected at the noise level of 65dB during the day (or 60db at night) with a range of heights which, for departures, can range from 4,000ft to 15,000ft.

The full impact of the new flightpaths has not been shown. The extent of the flight paths is only to a height of 7,000 feet and there are no means of allowing consultees to overlay the proposed changes to be able to assess any cumulative noise effects. There may be many locations where communities are impacted both by departures and arrivals.

The information that can be gained from the design envelopes confirms how far reaching the impact of the proposals for the expansion with a third runway will be in Hillingdon. All of the borough will now be impacted by flightpaths.

Performance based navigation

The consultation explains that developing flight paths for an expanded Heathrow involves the introduction of performance based navigation technology which allows for more accurate and flexible positioning of flightpaths. This would give the ability to concentrate flightpaths or to disperse them. At London City the introduction of these accurate concentrated flightpaths were deemed "noise ghettos" by the heavily impacted residents.

The Heathrow design principles give a number of options for limiting and reducing the local noise effects from flights including, minimising newly overflown, avoiding overflying by multiple routes, minimising total population impacted, maximising sharing of noise through dispersal. There is no clarity as to how these differing options can be accommodated.

There is no clarity on the process as to how HAL will evaluate and make decisions on the consultation responses. This is a very divisive question, for example, communities currently overflown could be seeking dispersal, communities not currently overflown could be seeking concentration. Such decisions require robust community engagement overseen by an independent body such as ICCAN, it is our firm belief that this cannot be left in the hands of the airport operator.

What sites or local factors should we be aware of in your area when designing new arrival flight paths to make better uses of our existing two runways.

Answer - the requirement for the introduction of Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA) is not supported.

There is no demonstration of the so-called benefits this introduction brings. Reference is made to improvements to punctuality, reduction in flight cancellations and recovery from delays yet none of these benefits have been quantified. There is no evidence presented as to why Tactically Enhanced Arrivals Management (TEAM), as currently used, is not adequate, there are triggers in this process to ensure it is used only when delays occur, therefore there is a degree of control over unnecessary community impacts.

The striking difference is that what IPA would do is introduce flightpaths over communities in Hillingdon not currently overflown therefore the detrimental environmental impacts are enhanced. This would lead to increased flights in the night-time period with newly exposed communities being subjected to up to 25 flights i.e. approximately every 2minutes in the 6-7am slot at anything from 4,000 feet to 7,000feet.

Early growth

This proposal is given as information only. At this stage we wish HAL to note that we do not believe there is Government policy support for this either through the Government's "Making Best Use of Existing Runways" policy paper, which specifically excludes Heathrow, or in the ANPS which only supports expansion via the North West Runway development.

Other comments

We wish to make clear that we believe the whole process is being rushed through by Heathrow Airport Ltd (HAL) without the appropriate safeguards in place for communities. The remit of

Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) was described in the Government's Airspace Change Policy consultation as giving:

communities assurance that noise impacts are being considered and that noise management procedures are being taken forward in the best way possible by industry.

It went on to state that:

The Government recognises that independence and credibility will be key to the foundation of ICCAN. We wish to see its influence taking effect to support Heathrow Northwest Runway airspace decisions and therefore would like to see it established as soon as possible. (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/593017/uk-airspace-policy-consultation-independent-commission-on-civil-aviation-noise.pdf)

Yet this level of independent engagement has been totally denied to all the communities around Heathrow. HAL have pressed on with the process despite ICCAN not yet being in place and with time to influence the process. This is unacceptable and this process should be halted. It immediately sets the so-called Balanced Approach in firm favour of the aviation industry with no independent voice for the swathes of communities who will be impacted.

To allow what will be one the biggest change in airspace, along with changes in runway operations which will impacts on hundreds of thousands of people, to go ahead without this independent view and community safeguard in place is totally unacceptable. The Council will be calling on Government and the CAA to halt this consultation process until ICCAN is in place and is able to influence the process in the manner to which it has been anticipated since the recommendation of the Airports Commission in 2015.

Cumulative Assessment

Whilst HAL has their own interests very much to the fore, it has not been lost on residents of Hillingdon that there are further proposals for expansion; at Gatwick and at Luton making the airspace of London somewhat more cluttered.

We note that there has been neither, recognition of these proposals, nor, any joined up thinking with the other airports which makes consultations like this only part of a much larger issue which needs to be considered as a whole.

Quality of Consultation

Finally, the Council is extremely disappointed in the standard of the consultation material. The maps caused significant amounts of confusion with highly ambiguous outcomes, e.g. a home might experience between 0 (very good) and 17 (very bad) flights a day at various heights; in terms of effective community engagement, this consultation falls someway short of being of assistance. This was further complicated by the fact that there was only one consultation event held to serve the people of Hillingdon (population c300,000) making attempts to clear up the confusion extremely difficult indeed.