

Item 6: Discussion on Government Response to Consultation on Airspace Modernisation Programme.

Introduction

1. Between February and May 2017, the Government ran a consultation on policy relating to the design and use of UK airspace, to which SASIG made representations. The Government published its response to the consultation and a revised policy document on 24th October 2017. This document is titled: 'Consultation Response on UK Airspace Policy: A framework for balanced decisions on the design and use of airspace' and you may view it on our website or also by clicking [here](#).
2. The Government had almost 800 responses to the consultation. Of course, no group or individual was specifically mentioned within this report however SASIG in its capacity of representing local authority bodies has attended the new Airspace and Noise Engagement Group (ANEG) from its initial meeting in January of this year, to date and attendees do warrant a mention via the link on Page 8. (J. Pine).

Government Response

3. The government will implement the proposals listed on Pages 6 & 7, including:
 - a new Secretary of State call in power on airspace changes of national importance;
 - changes to aviation noise compensation policy;
 - the creation of the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) as a new non-departmental public body;
 - a new requirement for options analysis in airspace change;
 - new metrics and appraisal guidance to assess noise impacts and their impacts on health and quality of life.
4. However they will not be taking forward their proposal to transfer responsibility for noise controls to the designated airports (Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted). Instead, they will make designated airports responsible for sponsoring these changes and these will require approval of the Secretary of State.

SASIG Proposals

5. SASIG views reflected in the Government document include:
 - The renaming Tier 3 to Aircraft operational changes to airspace usage'. The phrase 'Airspace change' also replaces 'Tier 1'. Tier 2 changes will remain in

SASIG Meeting: 16th November 2017

- the near term but at some point will come to refer to changes involving the 'permanent and planned redistribution of air traffic'.)
- Publication of more information relating to noise management at airports and how that information is disseminated.
 - The government proposed four changes to aviation noise compensation policy, to improve fairness and transparency. They were broadly seen as fair, thorough and addressed noise impacts by those that responded. Many also welcomed the cost being absorbed by the aviation industry and SASIG endorsed this fact in its own response as per its core principles.
 - With regard to the setting up of an Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN), *Pages 19/20* the document reports overall support but also were strong calls for ICCAN to be a statutory body and have enforcement powers. SASIG itself was keen for ICCAN to have a 'set of teeth' and so like others will be disappointed that its status remains 'an advisory body' whose value will be kept under review.

Policy issues/proposals that SASIG highlighted in its representations that have not been addressed in the Government's document are:

- Airport Masterplans and their requirement to include airspace change proposals;
- Issues surrounding noise created by helicopters;
- Secondary impacts and associated cost burdens on local authorities and their communities.
- A 'replacement' for PPG24 in the document.
- Ongoing noise management: this chapter concentrated more on who would be responsible for managing this i.e. SoS, CAA, ICCAN or a local authority rather than going into specifics such as how compensation would be decided and when. This was covered quite thoroughly under the earlier chapter on compensation.

Recommendation

That the Chairman write to the Secretary of State on behalf of SASIG:

- **Welcoming those aspects of final proposals that reflect or address our concerns;**
- **Where they have been overlooked asking whether they will be revisited through the aviation strategy process; and**
- **Where this seems unlikely (e.g. in relation to the cost burden associated with signing off the balanced approach), asking why our representations were ignored and seeking his intervention.**