

Question 10	Confidential
<p>Respondents</p> <p>a) Specific: 2M, EANAG, Hacan, HAL, Hammersmith &amp; Fulham Council, Hillingdon Council, Kensington and Chelsea Council, LAANC, RHC, Richmond Council, Wandsworth Council, Windsor &amp; Maidenhead Council, Mayor of London, (13). CAA and Gatwick did not answer Q10.</p> <p>b) Other: Reports submitted by AEF, NATS and Virgin Atlantic that are not question specific</p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Would the proposed third runway hasten or delay the date by which the air traffic noise levels at Heathrow would not exceed the World Health Organization's guideline values on community noise?</p>	
<p><b>Background</b></p> <p>The question re-visits the issues addressed in Question 1 concerning Heathrow's long term compliance with the WHO guideline values on community noise in the day and night periods.</p>	
<p>Template updated 15 Dec 14 PJW</p>	

### **2M, Hillingdon Council and Kensington and Chelsea Council**

Given that there will be new flight paths and hence communities newly exposed to aircraft noise, it can be assumed that the overall impact of the proposed third runway will worsen the impact of aviation noise on local populations and hence it can be inferred that this would delay any opportunity to meet the WHO guidelines for community noise.

In our opinion the third runway at Heathrow is also in conflict with the Aviation Policy Framework objective and the National Policy Statement for Noise which seeks "to avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life".

### **EANAG**

It would delay it. The claim that there would be less noise with a third runway and newer aircraft is unrealistic, or even fraudulent. The noise over west London would increase very considerably, without any prospect of it being reduced

### **Hacan**

We cannot see how any Government which is serious about meeting the World Health Organisation's noise guidelines can give permission for a third runway at Heathrow.

### **HAL**

It is not clear which WHO guideline value the question relates and perhaps worth noting that some of their guideline values relate to internal noise levels which have the potential to be mitigated against through effective noise insulation schemes. In our submission we have set out a commitment to a £550 million mitigation and compensation package. We are currently publicly consulting on the principles that such a scheme should employ.

It is also important to put the WHO community noise guidelines into context and note that there is no date by which these values are required to be met. They do not apply specifically to aircraft noise and the population affected at these levels from other sources such as road and rail will be very much higher. Indeed the WHO itself recognises that around 40% of the European Unions population is exposed to roadnoise in excess of the guideline values. It also recognises that its night-time limit is not feasible in the short-term. Consequently it should be noted that many areas in London experience noise levels in excess

of the WHO guidelines when there is no overflight of aircraft as a result of general suburban noise sources including road and rail.

For example, based on the 2011 round of strategic noise mapping for London published by DEFRA showed that around 2.3 million Londoners are exposed to road noise above 55dB Lden (the EU and Mayor's preferred measure and not the same as the WHO 55dB) and 1.6 million to levels above 50dB at night. For Heathrow (including those outside of London) the figures are around 765,000 for the 55dB Lden and 200,000 for 50dB Lnight.

Consequently if Heathrow shut tomorrow, around 50% of people in the airport's noise footprint would still be exposed to noise levels above "55dB Lden" as a result of traffic noise (based on a review of noise maps from defra.gov.uk).

Another point of interest is the extent to which new development and population encroachment has and is expected to continue to occur within the noise contours for Heathrow. It is unlikely that planning authorities would seek or want to prevent developers or residents choosing to locate inside the contours indicated by the WHO guidelines given the demand and desire to do so.

We do not have data for WHO guidelines; however using the 54dBA (summer day)Leq measure we estimate that a two runway Heathrow would have around 322,000 people within it. For a three runway Heathrow the equivalent figure would be between 346,000 and 458,000 people depending on how flight paths are designed and used.

#### **Hammersmith & Fulham Council**

Given the findings of the CAA report that shows that the number of people affected by aircraft noise at Heathrow would grow significantly if a 3rd Runway was built, it seems likely that such expansion could only delay compliance with the WHO guideline values.

#### **Hillingdon Council**

See 2M

#### **Kensington & Chelsea Council**

See 2M

#### **LAANC and Wandsworth Council**

In our view the construction and operation of third runway at Heathrow can only delay the date by which it might otherwise be possible by 2030 to make progress towards achieving WHO guidelines for community noise.

In our opinion the third runway at Heathrow is also in conflict with the Aviation Policy Framework objective and the National Policy Statement for Noise which seeks "to avoid significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life".

#### **Richmond Heathrow Campaign**

We estimated (in our response to Question 1) that communities living within audible distance of Heathrow's existing flight paths are exposed to noise levels in the day (0700-1900), evening (1900-2300) and night (2300-0700) that exceed the WHO community noise guideline values by wide margins.

HAL's noise assessments for two and three runways in 2030 and 2040 show that the sizes of the population that would be exposed to air traffic noise would be smaller than in 2012 but would still be large. Since

HAL's assessments are based on higher noise values than the WHO values, compliance with the lower WHO values would still not have been achieved with two runways or three runways:

- with two runways the margins of non-compliance would be large, albeit not as large as in 2012.
- with three runways: (a) the margins of non-compliance would be larger than with two runways; (b) the period of respite for communities currently overflown by arrivals would be shorter than with two runways; and (c) the third runway flight paths would expose communities in 2030 and 2040 that were not exposed in 2012.

There are two further points to consider regarding the margin of non-compliance with WHO values in 2030 and 2040:

- We argued (in the final paragraph of our response to Question 4) that the noise at Heathrow in 2030 should be compared with 2025, in order to identify any reduction that might occur between 2012 and the third runway coming into full use. In our view, this comparison is likely to show that any decrease would be larger between 2012 and 2025 than between 2025 and 2030 (i.e. the rate of decrease towards the WHO values slows after 2025).
- We argued (in our comments on HAL's noise assessments) that HAL's assessments should not be accepted at face value. In our view, the exposed population in 2030 and 2040 with two runways and with three runways would exceed the WHO values by wider margins than are implied by the HAL assessments.

### **Richmond Upon Thames Council**

It seems that a third runway would be likely to delay the date of achieving the WHO guideline values. In addition to achievement of these values, we need to remember that new metrics are needed, to account for the increases in frequency. Likewise, a level of resilience needs to be included from the start, so that congestion issues are avoided. If the airport were made to operate at a sustainable level of capacity, then the WHO levels would be easier to achieve. Noise is an important issue, and more than just an annoyance. Noise has an effect on health, which is why WHO treats it as significant. It is vital that HAL, the Airports Commission and the Government should take aircraft noise seriously.

### **The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead**

RBWM fully support the assertions put forward by LBH

### **Mayor of London**

10.1. Given that aircraft flying to or from Heathrow overfly significant swathes of densely populated London, it is extremely unlikely that they will ever be so quiet that the WHO Guideline levels would not be exceeded for a significant number of people.

10.2. Yet Heathrow Airport believe that a third runway could be accompanied by a reduction in the number of people exposed to aircraft noise. TfL refute this assertion in the strongest possible terms. Heathrow Airport's assertion is based on very optimistic assumptions about new technology: both in terms of the rate of technological progress (in the face of a slowing in noise improvements over the last decade) – and the rate of fleet replacement.

10.3. But the most fundamental flaw in Heathrow's modelling is that it has assumed just 570,000 ATMs annually – effectively the third runway operating less than a third full. This is clearly not tenable if one is seeking to assess the full noise impacts of an additional runway.

10.4. TfL's own noise modelling was conducted based on a series of relatively conservative assumptions identified and agreed by Atkins, set out in section 5.1 above. These were then modelled by the CAA ERCD. It found that an extra 372,100 would be exposed to noise above 55dB Lden. As such a third runway at Heathrow would make even more remote the possibility that WHO guideline values on noise might not be met by the airport.