



INDEPENDENT PARALLEL APPROACHES DESIGN PRINCIPLES FEEDBACK & DISCUSSION

HCNF Workshop 13th December 2018

Heathrow
Making every journey better

RESPONSES

- AN3V
- EANAG
- HACAN
- LAANC
- Richmond Heathrow Campaign
- Teddington Action Group

SUMMARY OF HCNF FEEDBACK

- i. Want more evidence, especially on impacts and benefits of IPA including a reduction in late running departures, before design principles are agreed
- ii. Opposed to minimise new
- iii. Respite & sharing is the priority
- iv. Should minimise number of people significantly impacted by noise
- v. Any respite must be meaningful – is there enough room?
- vi. Opposed to any increase in capacity ahead of 3rd Runway, especially 0600-0700
- vii. Should take into account WHO guidance
- viii. IPA should be classed as a trial, not permanent owing to 3R
- ix. Proposed principles are similar to 3R
- x. We have not consulted widely enough on IPA DPs
- xi. Must adhere to ANG2017

PROPOSED IPA DESIGN PRINCIPLES

1.	Must be safe
2.	Must meet the three aims of the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSe): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life • Mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life • Where possible, contribute to the improvement of health and quality of life
3.	Must meet local air quality requirements
4.	Must base our airspace design on the latest navigation technology widely available
5.	Must meet Heathrow's hourly landing rate requirements
6.	Should limit, and where possible reduce, local noise effects from flights:
	a. Use more noise efficient operational practices
	b. Maximise sharing through predictable respite
	c. Avoid overflying communities with multiple routes
	d. Minimise the number of people newly overflown
	e. Minimise total population overflow
	f. Design flight paths over commercial and industrial areas (rather than residential areas)
	g. Where appropriate, prioritise flight paths over parks and open spaces (rather than residential areas), but avoid overflight of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty where possible
7.	Should minimise impact on Heathrow's existing traffic patterns and other airspace users
8.	Should minimise fuel and CO ₂ greenhouse gases per flight
9.	Should be simple and efficient flight paths for operational efficiency

ADDRESSING THE RECURRING POINTS

i. Want more evidence, especially on impacts and benefits of IPA including a reduction in late running departures, before design principles are agreed

CAP1616 does not require engagement or support for a sponsor's Statement of Need and requires that the design principles are developed at the start of the process before flight path options are created and then assessed. In order to understand the impacts of IPA routes on health and quality of life, we first need to create flight path options. This does not start until Stage 2 of the CAP1616 process. Our statutory consultation on IPA planned for 2020 will explain in detail the output from our full appraisal of our preferred option(s) in line with CAP1616.

ii. Opposed to minimise new

iii. Respite & sharing the priority

iv. Should minimise number of people significantly impacted by noise

These have been reflected in the prioritisation of the design principles. Recognising that IPA will result in new areas being overflowed, we will seek to share the noise over the fewest number of people as possible. We will seek to offer predictable respite to those overflowed especially if required to reduce and/or mitigate adverse or significant effects of noise.

v. Any respite must be meaningful – is there enough room?

In Stage 2 of the process, we will be undertaking an assessment of each segment of the design envelopes to see if discernible and valued differences can technically be achieved to try and inform the potential for respite that exists within the constraints of each design envelope. The design envelopes will be included in our Future Airspace and Operations consultation beginning 8th January 2019.

ADDRESSING THE RECURRING POINTS

vi. Opposed to any increase in capacity ahead of 3rd Runway, especially 0600-0700

Any proposals to add capacity before the third runway opens would be the subject of further consideration as part of the development of the proposals for expansion more broadly. This would take place through stakeholder engagement and then our statutory consultation on airport expansion proposed for June 2019. Heathrow still intends to progress IPA regardless of expansion.

vii. Should take into account WHO guidance

We will undertake our environmental assessment of IPA in compliance with the requirements of CAP1616 (Stage 2B and 3A). The assessment methodology will include criteria to assess noise impacts and health effects. This will be informed by a full review of noise policy, standards and guidance including those published by the WHO. Our assessment methodology and output will be included in our statutory consultation for IPA, currently scheduled for 2020.

viii. IPA should be classed as a trial, not permanent - owing to 3R

CAP1616 describes the categories of airspace change as Permanent, Temporary (less than 90 days) or a trial (not usually more than 6 months).

ix. Proposed principles are similar to 3R

The process to develop the design principles for an expanded Heathrow provided us with significant insight on our stakeholders' priorities for airspace design, as well as highlighting the main areas of difference of opinion. Given that this exercise completed just before the start of our engagement process for IPA, we decided to use a similar, but not identical set of design principles as the starting point for our engagement on the IPA Design Principles, rewritten in the context of IPA.

We have purposefully aligned the wording of some of the design principles with those for future expansion to minimise confusion however, our CAA submission clearly sets out the different feedback and associated rationale for the chosen principles for IPA.

ADDRESSING THE RECURRING POINTS

x. We have not consulted widely enough on IPA DPs

CAP1616 states that *“design principles must be set through a two-way process”* and that *“we are not requiring the change sponsor to carry out a lengthy or detailed consultation, since this will take place in Stage 3 of the process”*

It says design principles *“are to be drawn up through discussion between the change sponsor and affected stakeholders. Local stakeholders will normally include elected community representatives, local community groups, the airport consultative committee and representatives of local General Aviation organisations or clubs. The change sponsor may consider convening a focus group with a mix of representatives”*.

We believe we have met this requirement through engagement with:

- Heathrow Community Engagement Board (HCEB)
- Heathrow Community Noise Forum (HCNF)
- Representative members of our Local Authorities (LAs) potentially impacted by IPA
- National Air Traffic Management Advisory Committee (NATMAC)
- Future Airport Strategy Industry Implementation Group (FASIIG)
- Four public focus groups to hear from individuals who live in areas less affected by today’s operations but who may potentially be affected by the new IPA flight paths in the future

xi. Must adhere to ANG2017

Absolutely. It is recognised that the airspace change process will need to take into account the requirements set out in the Air Navigation Guidance (ANG) 2017, particularly in terms of the altitude-based priorities of the government.