

AUDIO_LUTON_ISH8_SESSION2_29112023

00:05

Welcome back, everyone, the time is now 20 past 11. We'll resume the hearing

00:15

if we can

00:20

we can move on to some of the modelling assumptions.

00:24

A load factor of 65% is used for aircraft modelling, which Applicant confirmed in response to its first written questions is a standard ADT assumption. However, the Applicant slot allocation paper references a load factor assumption of 91.5% more than 19 million passengers per annum application, which suggests that the practical expectation for load factors is actually substantially higher. Can the applicant explain how a 91.5% load factor assumption would affect the noise model?

00:58

Eddie Robinson on behalf of the applicant. So, as part of the overall validation process, we look at departure profiles in terms of altitude and ground speed. So, inherent to those altitude departure profiles is the weight of the aircraft. So a heavy aircraft is going to take longer to ascend, and it's going to take longer to accelerate to takeoff speed.

01:26

So, we inherently include the aircraft weight within those departure profiles through the validation process. So although ADT does set a default load factor of 65%, it that heavier aircraft so in 2019, the need case as one to five states that a load factor is about 87%. So, so those heavier aircraft are accounted for through the validation process.

02:00

And that has 91.5% load factor being applied in the modelling.

02:10

responded with the applicant. If I can just clarify the 91.5% load factor assumption is used in the slot allocation process to estimate the maximum number of passengers that might be on the aircraft to make sure that terminal capacity limits aren't breached. In other words, they don't allocate too many slots to too many flights in an hour in a way that would breach the capacity of the terminal. That's different from the actual achieved load factor, which is the 87% that Eddie Robinson just mentioned

02:48

to 91.5 as a precautionary number for terminal capacity planning.

02:56

Thank you.

03:10

In our first written questions, we asked about the implications of larger planes for modes of runway operation, and the applicant responded specifically in relation to runway modal split. But what I had intended was for the question to cover whether changing to larger planes would necessitate changing operational procedures. For example, changes in flight deployment changes to inset thresholds and such like

03:35

has this been taken into account in the modelling work.

03:43

Eddie Robinson on behalf of the applicant so the the validation work

03:48

accounts for majority of aircraft are currently flying in the US.

03:55

We covered all the aircraft in the forecast fleets with the exception of the 737 max which we provided additional information on so

04:08

we're confident that

04:11

the aircraft we have accurately modelled the aircraft and our future for class for pass through the validation process.

04:25

Dr. Sharpe for the Applicant just to your point on inset thresholds, there would be no requirement to adjust those to account for the larger aircraft that wouldn't be affected. Thank you.

04:34

The noise action plans submitted in response to the GCG questions in rep 5090 suggest that use of the full runway length created a small reduction in noise very close to the airport when it was trialled by the airport in the Applicant confirm

04:53

whether that small reduction noise has been taken into account within the modelling

05:02

Eddie Robinson on behalf of the applicant know that small reduction in noise has not been taken into account.

05:09

And so is there a potential for the operation to somewhat reduced noise in the local area by a change of operation?

05:19

Dr. Sharpe for the applicant, indeed and this is sort of amongst the list of things and different aspects within the noise action plan that you're seeing that the airport operator is trialling steeper descent approaches and various other actions which can be used to mitigate and minimise noise and and fit within the noise envelope

05:38

and appreciate that it is the operator rather than the applicant in this context. But do you know what?

05:47

What that small reduction means in geographic terms, the extent of that noise and which receptors would be affected.

05:55

Much short for the applicant. That's something we'll have to discuss with the with the operator and get back to you think there'll be helpful if you can, like you

06:03

can ask when you would be able to respond.

06:08

But when I want to say on behalf of the operator, I'm hoping it's something that we can pull together quite quickly, I'll say deadline six. Thank you. And Miss lemon, thanks.

06:18

And reliable for ladder can just to add a couple of things here. First of all, small reduction is about half a decibel.

06:26

If the full length runway is used, I was working on the analysis with the airport operator on that.

06:34

I think that pales somewhat compared to the modelling of the a three to one Neo, which as I understand it, has been granted a three and a half decibel noise reduction benefit in the modelling. And yet, the actual noise reduction compared to other aircraft types flown from Luton at the moment is more like one decibel. So the small benefit is rather outweighed by what we regard as an excess allowance

07:05

of benefit from a three to one near which isn't being delivered. And still there is no sign of how it might be rectified or how that might be delivered. Third point just to correct and I have mentioned this before.

07:21

Dr. Sharpe mentioned trials of steeper descents. There is no trial of steeper descent because the airport operator having consulted with the airlines received back the answer that they weren't prepared to fly steeper descents into those numbers. Again, I mean, that's been mitigated in the noise and track meetings, and I can provide an indication if that will be helpful. So I think that has to be rolled out that that would thank you. You've actually slightly jumped ahead to my next apologise about the a three to omnio.

07:54

So you said in your submission rep. 3060.

08:01

Sorry, your

08:04

comments on the applicants rep. 3060 submission, which was rep 5072. That the airport's quarterly monitoring reports in 2022 23. showed the noise benefits of the a three to one near Neo compared to the a three to one CEO on departure is typically one decibel rather than two decibels, which is used in the applicants model.

08:29

Are you able to provide specific paragraph references or submit that information?

08:35

I will say thank you. And can the Applicant just confirm whether Mr. Lamb borns comments so correct in relation to

08:44

the actual versus the model experience?

08:48

Dr. Sharp for the applicant? Yeah, we I mean, we've we've set out our position on the 321 year and in various places, as you know, including the noise chapter, just to confirm, we've only applied that reduction in phase two. So from 2039 onwards, in phase one, we've assumed the noise performance based on actual measurements. And that's fed into the validation, the assumption which is secured by the green controlled growth, noise envelope limits, because they are of course set on the assumption that the noise issues with 321 year would be rectified is that by 2039, we'd expect another replacement of fleet within that sort of 15 year fleet recycled period, they would either be replaced by 321 years without the engine variant issue that we're aware of, or with another similar quiet aircraft.

09:40

Thank you

09:46

were there any other comments on the a three to one now, before we move on?

09:52

Mr. Evans,

09:53

thank you. Thank you, sir.

09:58

The three to one near

10:00

And the a 320 new were brought in were said to be the mitigation that was promised in 2013. I quote our aircraft, which did not materialise till really close on 2018. And then we discovered that there was no noticeable, shall we say, on the ground

10:21

difference in the a three to one. In addition, it's a bigger aircraft. So, there was a difference I have have to add in the 320. Yeah, which is a smaller aircraft and that was somewhat quieter, not as much as was originally

10:40

professed, shall we say, when I looked up on the Google

10:44

the 321 is a bigger aircraft and it is the aircraft of choice by

10:51

airlines such as whizzer. And so in other words, of the new aircraft coming in, that are quieter, the majority are not quieter. So I think that

11:04

it's a misconception to base everything on these new aircraft that are going to be quieter. The main benefit of these new aircraft to the airlines is that they are cheaper, they use less fuel, so they are cheaper to run. But unfortunately, I don't think three to one new has been proved to be

11:24

noticeably, shall we say quieter? It's this is something like one decibel or less from the people from the perception people on the ground. Thank you.

11:35

Thank you.

11:37

Dr. Sharpe, did you have anything else to add? I think so. The main point is that for phase one, the A 321 Neo data is based on the actual recorded sound not on

11:56

the certification. So yes, as Dr. Sharpe pointed out, it's recognised that those aircraft have not performed and so we've recorded that actual performance and it's that that has been fed into the to the modelling except as I say from as Dr. Sharps just explained from 2039 onwards, it's assumed that those actual aircraft have been replaced and that the replacement would perform

12:27

correctly as indeed other aircraft.

12:30

New generation aircraft do. Understood Thank you.

12:40

So appendix eight B of the 19 million passenger per annum es addendum provides an assessment of likely future fleet mix. And now I acknowledge that we're looking at slightly different timelines, and slightly different projects. But there are some quite large differences between the fleet mixes in the future scenarios for 2028. So if you compare the 2028 2027, there's some some quite wide differences given that it's the same airport and I assume that they should be relatively consistent. So

13:16

this may be something that needs to refer to written questions. But do you have any comments on the differences between what is in the 90 million passengers per annum what is in the future do minimum scenario for the DCO application.

13:31

We've obviously took that fleet assessment into account in looking at our fleet transition assumptions sorry, Louise Condon for the applicant.

13:41

The U 19. table that you refer to had a fleet transition of 50 to 53% in 2025, and 88%, in 2028. Our fleet transition in the court case is 69%. In 2027, which is consistent with both of those two points in the P 19. Table. In that we know that the rate of fleet replacement is accelerating, it started. And currently, as of today, the airport's running at about 38.9% new generation aircraft. And the year as a whole, it will be slightly under that and a rolling total, but but we're getting very close to a 40% mark now. So the 2025 50 53% looks highly attainable. 88% by 2028 looks highly attainable from the P 19. Work. And we're confident that 69% in the core case is robust against that trendline.

14:40

We have a more detailed table, we can put it in it. Deadlines six would help. I think that'll be helpful. Thank you. Yes.

14:47

And then what that table does is take the P 19. Table with the columns and then slot in for the appropriate years, our data and you can then see along the bottom line the percentage of new

15:00

And then you can see how it goes up from, you know, 30 3940, you know, 5055 and then gets to our 69. And then later is sort of 88. And you can see that gradual transition, which doesn't respondent says actually fits very well, so we'll produce that point. Okay, thank you. Mr. lamborn. Thanks, Andrew. I'm on ladder Ken, I'm not quite sure where the 38.9% today of modernised aircraft comes from our observation is that it's more like 30%. But very shortly, the airport operator will publish its Quarter Three, statistics and that should help to clarify the matter.

15:44

In terms of the q3 statistics, you know, when they're normally published, they were coming out within a week or two.

15:56

Yes, please, if those can be submitted

16:02

by me to clarify the source, please, who is confident the applicant is the data was obtained from the airport operator. And if you look at the rolling year to date, it will be lower than that 38.9% Because the transition to new generation aircraft accelerated fairly rapidly from April May this year. So if you look at the earlier months of the year, it was a lower proportion. But what we've seen with the summer schedule is the airlines have introduced more of the new generation types. And that's continuing through the winter and into next year. So rolling totals will be different from in month totals. Okay.

16:40

Thank you.

16:52

In our first written questions, we requested that the applicant provide confirmation from the airlines the fleet forecasts were representative of the proposed operations. And the outcome provided some web articles indicating potential changes in future years. But

17:07

to what you've just explained that you have spoken to the airport about the forecasts, do you are you able to provide any direct confirmation from the airlines that those forecasts are actually representative of their future operations?

17:22

It's very difficult so Louise longer and for the applicant, it is very difficult to get airlines to make those sorts of commitments because they're regarded as commercially sensitive in the public domain, which is why we provided you with those fleet

17:36

order books and articles. We know that we're there who are the largest operator at Luton currently are committed to an a three to one Neo fleet in the UK. The other airlines are equally making the transition to new generation aircraft. But what they won't do for commercial reasons is give public commitment as to where they will place those aircraft that we have to work from the knowledge of their fleet transmission and the likelihood of them placing at an airport light London. So just frankly, they they will not provide that confirmation. That is not something that we could see it they would regard it as commercially confidential to give a public statement about where they're going to place their fleet. Thank you

18:30

Mr. Chairman, Andrew lemon letter can very minor interjection was there a currently busy renting a 320 Neos because they're a three to one Neo fleet is having to be refitted because of problems with the Neo power plants. So there is a bit of a glitch.

18:49

Maybe

18:51

the local authorities wants to add anything on the subject of a three to one news

18:57

or fleet mix. Yep. CRS for the host authorities no nothing to add on this point. Thank you

19:10

I didn't have anything else that I want to ask on fleet mix. So before I move off this point, did anyone else have any further questions or observations?

19:21

Okay, if we can move on to operational noise mitigation measures.

19:27

Many representations of highlighted concerns about the increase in numbers of overflights.

19:33

Other airports are subject to ATM caps, which give a defined limit on the maximum number of flights. Can the applicant explain whether an eight aka excuse me, an ATM cap would be appropriate for Luton?

19:52

Dr Sharpe for the applicant,

19:54

I'm sure we'll discuss this tomorrow as well in light of the controls within within

20:00

The noise envelope and the additional controls

20:03

we

20:05

have set out in, for example, the improvements in the noise envelope paper submission deadline to movement caps or week control of noise impact, they do not correlate particularly well with noise control area, they certainly don't correlate with noise impact.

20:27

There is a helpful guidance document from Civil Aviation Authority cap 1731, which I will find a quote for because I was expecting to talk about this tomorrow. But I'll find it because it's useful. And it sets out how Civil Aviation Authority doesn't recommend the use of movement caps as a noise control limit for the reasons that we've discussed. They don't relate to noise impacts, they're a measure of of input rather than output. Our situation remains that the best control of noise is the noise contour area limit, which defines the health impacts of the airport operation, it is recommended by the Civil Aviation Authority. Along with the other controls that we've introduced, such as quote, account budgets, current account limits, we think we have a very robust set of noise controls now within the noise envelope and the additional controls that we'll be bringing in at deadlines six, which we've signed posted to in our deadline five submissions

21:23

in your submission on

21:26

cumulative noise impacts, and the reason why la cues couldn't be cumulatively or additively. Considered. You stated that

21:38

that was because noise impacts from aviation weren't experienced in an average way, they were experienced on the basis of the individual overpasses. So there is obviously a direct link between the number of flights and the noise impact

21:53

are short for the applicant. Absolutely. And that's that's fully taken into account in the la queue metric. So that takes into account the number of events of every single event that occurs within the period of which is being assessed. And the combination of the noise levels are those events, which a movement indicator certainly does not because it's just a number of movements, it doesn't capture any of the noise information associated with those individual movements.

22:19

I think also, it's important to note so that the sonar report from a few years ago did a huge survey of the correlation between various metrics

22:38

including la q 16, hour L, den, and 60s and 70s and various other metrics against

22:51

things such as annoyance and came out with the

22:57

clear view that LA Q 60 Now was the best correlated with annoyance. Of course, la Q, as you will remember, replaced the old system many years ago of NMI, the noise number index, which directly looked at the number of events and the noise of events, again, that was replaced by Le aq 69 la QA tau for the night because those metrics take into account the number of events and people's response to them in a in a better way. One of the

23:38

cited difficult things in in DC examinations, rather than

23:44

planning inquiries is that you tend not have a battery of core documents, which are just sort of reports you get references to documents and quotes from documents. But the sonar report, which I think has been 2016 or something around that 2017 Yeah, this survey was undertaken in 2014. But it's been updated as recently as 2021 and 2022. In terms of the reporting and analysis and and, and that is the effect the state of the art position on on on the use of the index, and it confirms that the FAQ 16 our index correctly. I'm aware of the

24:25

report so exactly so correctly, reflects and takes account of the number of events. If I can ask Mr. Landlord to come in, please. Thanks. Andrew lamb on ladder can

24:39

a few comments on this. First of all,

24:42

it's aircraft movements that for example, wake people at night and the more movements the more likely that there is a being awoken if the noise level is at or above the level of which you're going to be awoken.

24:57

I respectfully disagree with Dr. Sharpe that

25:00

The noise contour reflects the noise contour hide this, because if you have a noise contour of a particular value, and you double the number of movements and reduce the noisiness of each aircraft by three decibels, your noise contour broadly speaking, as I understand it stays the same. And so an average hides the actual numbers. And that's why the noise envelope design group felt it was important to have more than one parameter to describe and characterise noise and the number of events above a particular decibel level is a valuable way of characterising disturbance, as opposed to average impact. And on the sonar report, as I understand it, again, the aviation noise environment group of the DFT is currently working to update that study, recognising that it has been widely criticised as inadequate. And I think work is underway with a view to starting to publish new material next year. So all these things are up in the air, so to speak, and from the point of view of people on the ground.

26:17

An average isn't what they hear. It's an individual transit of an aircraft. Thank you.

26:24

Thank you. Miss Timmons.

26:27

Thank you, sir. Could I ask the applicant please to clarify whether they agree that by having sort of, eventually 80,000 more flights a year 2000 more flights at night, that the noise will not be increased by the compound effect of having planes going over, say every two minutes for departures?

26:52

Can I ask Dr. Sharpe to respond on that point?

26:56

Torture for the applicant, there's a number of issues there. So I'll take them in turn, if I may. And I said I would return back to the CAA guidance document because I think it is relevant. So this is in cap 1731 relating to movement caps. So it notes that movement capture reasonable correlation with D noise contour area, but gives no mechanism to limit impact within a given area, it does not have any correlation with people exposed. So it would not be effective in controlling population noise exposure, or in driving noise reduction. Overall, the number of movements is a metric that should be monitored to understand the growth of the aviation market. But it does not provide effective controls to limit noise generation noise exposure nor noise impacts. And of course, they make the point there that it's important to to monitor and report movement limits. And that is secured in in the GCG framework air noise monitoring plan.

27:51

In terms of the DFT studies that Mr. Lamborn mentioned, those those have already taken into effect and several of them have been published. So the updates to the sonar documents, and then further analysis and 2021 and 2022. Were in response to those additional studies. And they have not changed the conclusion that the appropriate metric for nighttime impacts and daytime impacts is the hill AQ metric.

28:18

In terms of the increased number of movements and the impact that has on on the noise contours and the noise effects, of course, that that is fully taken into account and reported in chapter 16 of the environmental statement. There's a lot of information in there about the impacts as a result of those noise increases or movement increases. Sorry. Thank you.

28:47

And the Applicant Summit is now outlining ground noise management plan at deadline for and submit an operation of

28:56

All right, we've got Mr. Thompson, with hand up online.

29:03

Thank you, sir. Matt Thompson, Dr. Matt Thompson for the children's conservation board. It was just an observation really on the last point because as I understood it, the

29:15

Civil Aviation Authority guidance relates to the impacts on areas of population, which usually relates to, again, as I understand it,

29:27

the ways in which mitigation measures can be provided. So when you're talking about a change in the numbers of overflights

29:38

that

29:40

you know, when when you've put mitigation noise, attenuation measures in place in areas of population.

29:48

It doesn't matter really how many planes or fly the areas that triple glazing or whatever, mitigation works for all of those, but the the impacts on a

30:00

On the tranquillity of places around

30:04

the airport are affected by the numbers of overflights and can't be mitigated. I just think that's just an observation as to the sort of source of that guidance that I thought was worth making. Thank you, Miss Thompson. We will be touching on the AONB tomorrow in the green control growth session.

30:31

Mr. Eddington.

30:33

Thank you.

30:35

Could I bring your attention to the response from the applicant? In

30:41

reply to your question

30:45

at scene, rep four, zero 60. And it was ID number 1.18. Where you asked about cumulative noise.

30:59

The applicant responded and said yes, it is technically possible, but not appropriate to add dBs, from different noise sources then proceeded to explain why you couldn't add the air noise database which in LA EQ, to construction noise, which have different Sol and different levels, but didn't explain why it was not possible to add ground noise to the air noise. Does that is also an intermittent noise. And cumulatively, it's what we experience our ears do not differentiate between air and ground noise. It's just the source of the noise.

31:44

Thank you, Mr. Ellison. Dr. Sharpe, if you could respond on that point. Yep. Dr. Sharpe for the applicant. Ground noise in the way that it's assessed isn't an intermittent noise source in the same way aircraft noises. Because it accounts for all the movement and existing aircraft as a taxi around the runway in the airport. There are then occasional intermittent spikes throughout the day when there is for example, ground run up tests or extended use of APA APU usage or various things. So it isn't a intermittent source in the same way the aircraft noises. So as we've set out, there's no methodology, no appropriate way of adding those together and being able to understand what the impact of that would be, other than the qualitative way that we have already done that within the environmental statement and taking into account the qualitative addition of ground noise and air noise together.

32:43

Thank you.

32:46

And welcome to the applicants Sorry, I wasn't fast enough earlier. And can we just return to

32:52

what did I say for the applicants or the host authorities sorry.

32:58

To return to the ATM cap.

33:01

Why, whilst it as a standalone measure may not have any particular control over noise, it is certainly a valuable effort in as a suite of controls as we set out at the noise envelope design group recommendations.

33:16

It particularly gifts that certainty to the local community that

33:22

really isn't certainty from any noise envelope.

33:26

So one example that comes to mind is that as as Mr. lamborn said if your aircraft get 3d be quieter, then you could have twice as many that's a concern that lots of people haven't understood if they get 3d required to you would have half the quote accounts say and therefore you could fit in twice as many aircraft into your quote account and movement limit would at that point kick in and say well, there's we have a set number of aircraft that could fly. So all of these things as we said, At Issue specific three fit around each other, it's not just

33:57

taking each one in turn, they all interlink each one corresponds and kick in or bite at different points. So simply writing off an ATM cap, as it is not as good as the LA EQ 16 hour doesn't really matter. That's it's not its job. If it applies over a whole year, then it in combination with an L aq 16 hour, you also control your outside of the summer period, your winter period, because you have to either side and therefore you effectively frame the winter period. So these things all fit together nicely.

34:33

Thank you

34:36

so much for the Applicant. I wonder if I can just come back on that. Just Just very briefly. I just want to make the point. We aren't just setting aside movement limits. What we're saying is we don't think it's appropriate to add on top of all the additional sorry, all the controls that are currently secured. We don't

think an additional movement limit over and above what we already have security's is appropriate. So just as a reminder, of course we have the nighttime area. Counter

35:00

are some limits and thresholds for both day and night 68 hours we do have a movement limit within the sensitive most sensitive part of the night period from half past 11 to six in the morning we have a court account limit which is being added in at deadlines six we have a ban on QC two aircraft and above and it's this combination of of controls which we think is appropriate and and doesn't need anything further added to it to be able to secure the outcomes. Okay, I think we will come back to this at length tomorrow I'm sure well, okay. Thank you.

35:33

If we can move on the Atkins missus and outline grandma's management planet deadline for and an operation noise management plan explanatory notes.

35:42

As as appendix 16.2. The plans are specific to aircraft activities in the air and on the ground. What measures does the app can propose to ensure that other sources of ground based noise are controlled for example 24 hour car parking noise doors slamming into the startups and vehicle movements, loading activities and the like within the within the airport

36:09

to shore up for the applicant that isn't a noise source that we have had scoped into the assessment of environmental effects. We don't think it's a noise source that would result in any adverse impacts that needs to be controlled.

36:28

I just tend to be in Borough Council as to whether you have a view on that position, there's no need to control car parking noise traffic noise vehicle noise within the airport grounds

36:43

have been Holcomb for the host authorities.

36:47

That isn't typically or in any example I've ever seen scoped into any airport scheme.

36:58

Nor would I know how you would actually assess it against what criteria of significance

37:07

potentially all as a lot more minor than the noise sources that are affected that are assessed.

37:13

Here. Thank you.

37:16

Mr. White.

37:18

Thank you, sir. In the plans, there are plans for massive staff and other car parks within the boundary along the Green Road. Currently where the car centre is, the noise from those will directly affect the residents on that road and in the estates behind it.

37:36

So you can't lock out the effects of anything like that any. And also you've got the effects of the car parks which are potentially planned for Whitmore Park in phase one, then they will have a noise effect over the open space of the rest of the park car parks living with more you can't you can't scope those out because they will have an effect. Thank you. Thank you, Tasha or Charlotte the Applicant Yeah, I think it's just want to make a point of clarification when we talk about road traffic and surface excess noise of course that is taken into account and that is fully assessed. So cars accessing the carpark and increased traffic movement for the car park is all is all fully assessed and would be mitigated if required through the noise cancellation policy and

38:23

in the compensation policies, the movement of cars within the carpark would be at a much lower noise level than then would be experienced on the actual road traffic itself.

38:36

As well as the other noise sources from from the airport which are the key ones that we've assessed and are controlling.

38:43

I suppose the particular concern is just that with the movement of those car parks much closer to the residents and the potentially antisocial hours of people arriving home there is the potential for you know heading back to your car after your holidays cuddles opening shots, things slamming engine startups during the nighttime period is potentially quite intrusive.

39:11

In in terms of mitigation for noise from car parks, is there anything particularly posed within the application?

39:21

Data sharp for the applicant? No, there's there's nothing proposed for mitigation from noise from car park specifically on the basis that we don't consider it to be a significant noise source or indeed mitigating.

39:39

Thank you.

39:41

I'm following the examining authorities written questions regarding the ability to insulate parked mobile homes in the penstock and Woodside Park area. Ladder cans.

39:53

Mr Lamborn has left at an inconvenient moment.

40:00

A lot of counsellors yesterday that around 40% of park home properties are less substantially built, potentially not capable of being insulated. And that noise survey should be done. I was going to ask Mr. Lam one particular question on this, but in the meantime, have you as the applicant done anything to look at the viability of actually insulating the properties such as the park homes? And has that been in any way assessed?

40:25

Dr. Sharpe for the applicant in Yes, that's taken into account in the development of the noise insulation policy and the various thresholds that are set in sort of, you know, what is required to be done at each of those thresholds. So as we set out in our in our written response to the question in red 4060, that there are no Park homes within the sole contour that we're aware of. So the policy requirement to avoid significant effects on health and quality of life, in the context of sustainable development doesn't apply to park homes. There are some that we are of course aware of between the law and the sole contours. And within that exposure, the policy requirements is to mitigate and minimise as far as reasonably practicable. Now, of course, the practicability of actually installing that installation must be taken into account in that in that consideration.

41:15

So yes, the majority of those part combs are substantial and are expected to be available, possible to be insulated, if there is a situation. And of course, it's part of the compensation policy, we've noticed that surveys will be taken for every eligible property to determine what could be practicable what could be possible, and if a sort of particularly different type of installation might be required, for example, for a lightweight structure.

41:43

But if that survey were in some circumstances to determine that it wouldn't be possible to improve the noise installation of a property simply because of its construction,

41:52

then that still, I think, is within the realms of as far as reasonably practicable. And the noise installation requirements. It's only within the sort of voluntary extended noise installation contours within which these properties fall. It is beyond what is required by policy, both in terms of noise policy statement for England and UN ANPS aims, but also the aviation policy to provide insulation at 63 Potentially extended to 60 as part of the vision 2050. So these are voluntary extended mitigation measures which will be applied as far as reasonably practicable,

42:27

which takes into account the items that we've discussed on those Park homes. And thank you, to the local authorities have any comments around Park homes and potential for installation and Holcomb for the host authorities. We've also had a look for Park homes within Seoul and I've not come across any.

42:46

I would also note that the just to reiterate that there is a flexibility in this proposed noise installation scheme so that however best appropriate

42:57

seems a reasonable approach

43:06

Thank you.

43:11

If we could move on to non residential receptors. The applicant provided details for the non residential receptors screened into the assessment. A non existent non exhaustive search by the examining authorities suggests the list of receptors excludes reference to sue Ryder neurological care centres Dagenham, and the Woodside nursing and residential home and slip and can the Applicant comments on the potential for effects on these receptors

43:38

can absorb for the applicant. So, table 16.7 of chapter 16 of the environmental statement clarifies that for the purpose of the noise assessment nursing homes and care homes are considered residential receptors. And that's on the basis that they may have long term

43:55

people staying in there and therefore the long term exposure that is taken into account for residential receptors, which is a lower criteria is appropriate. So I can confirm this the writer neurological care centre and the Woodside nursing and residential home and slipper and alongside any other care homes and nursing homes and similar properties are taken into account in the noise assessment as reported in in chapter 16, or the environmental statement. And that's why you don't see those receptors listed in the non residential criteria because they're they're considered residential properties. Okay, thank you

44:37

Mr. Atkinson.

44:39

Thank you, Michael Robinson.

44:42

I'd like to ask the applicant to confirm how a residential home is treated in respect of insulation. Is it

44:53

a bedroom? Or is it a habitable room? And is that for every single room in a room?

45:00

analysis

45:02

and or shall place Dr. Sharpe for the applicant. So it will vary depending on the noise insulation scheme that applies to the property. So, within the draft compensation policy document,

45:15

we have

45:17

set out exactly the eligibility criteria that applies for each of the schemes. So for example, for the full cost of the installation, which is schemes one, and three, they apply to all habitable rooms for the daytime for those that are exposed above the nighttime so it's all bedrooms within a property. But yeah, that's set out within the within the documentation in terms of the different eligibility criteria.

45:47

Countries have all we have noise installation on tomorrow so

45:51

further detail we can we can provide it then. Okay. Yes, I think we might come back to that point.

45:58

Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments in relation to noise?

46:09

If not, we'll move on to health and community.

46:13

Just

46:15

sorry, Mr. Cough

46:24

Hi, can you hear me okay.

46:27

Yes, we can Hi. I wanted to just raise and point about woodlands as a particular case for noise disturbance, which are quite unlike urban areas or homes. This is partly because human enjoyment of woods usually involves enjoying heightened sensitivity of EG colours smells natural sounds, amongst the natural quietness of woodlands. There are well established health benefits from experiencing such time spent in woodlands in terms of relaxation, blood pressure, mental health, etc. beyond mere exercise. Because of this natural quietness and heightened human sensing of it, noise harming the sense of loss of these benefits occurs at a completely different thresholded noise level compared to urban or home environment. The noise contours noise modelling so far are sadly, utterly inappropriate for gauging the amount of harm or what is an acceptable level of noise or an acceptable number of flights. Before all these health and mental health benefits are degraded or lost. The harms are widely dispersed over a large number of people. And such widely dispersed harm seems to be ignored, even though the cumulative total can be very substantial. For example, if we at Heartwood forest where I, which I represent the users of if we have at least 100,000 visits per year, then the total numbers of visits to all the woodlands surrounding the airport could be millions or 10s of millions annually or more. And the scale of this cumulative total of widely dispersed time should be assessed not ignored. Thank you.

48:17

Thank you, Mr. cuff. Does the applicant have any comments on the thresholds as applied to woodland areas versus urban areas?

48:26

Dr. Sharpe for the applicant, the thresholds that we've used for the aircraft noise assessment, as we've discussed are based on survey of noise attitudes, which takes into account community response. So it doesn't just apply to people as within their homes, it applies to people and their experience

48:45

indoors and outdoors enjoying outdoor space.

48:49

And we therefore think it is appropriate to apply that criteria. There is no other standard metric or criteria or threshold in any policy or guidance which which applies to

49:04

Woodland receptors, for example.

49:07

And of course, in terms of all the aircraft noise controls that are in place, they are to reduce the noise exposure from the airport as a totality that would benefit outdoor spaces woodland spaces, in exactly the same way it would benefit residential receptors.

49:27

Thank you. So you, I'm sure you will have it in mind but in chapter 16 of the yes there was that descriptive section on tranquillity from page 61 as paragraph 16.5 70 point 70. So 16.5 70 which is the discussion of the issues surrounding surrounding tranquillity as its

49:51

as the point is usually sort of headlined if I can put it like that. Thank you

49:56

and

49:58

move on to Ms.

50:00

Sir Any other matters on noise Mr. Cup Have you still got your hand up is that just a legacy hand

50:10

yes that was just a legacy sorry

50:30

just going to pause briefly while the applicants team switch over for the item unhealth?

51:45

Miss clubby once you've

51:48

sorted cells out if you wouldn't mind introducing yourself in the in the team just for the record

52:06

as well, good. Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Miss Rebecca clutton. I'm a barrister representing Luton writing the applicant. You're going to have me for the next few hours, I think until we get to climate change when Mr. Humphries will come back

52:22

to my left, I've got Miss Jenny Dunwoody, who is our health lead. To her left I've got Miss Ortega and Ortega who is our community lead. And then obviously, Dr. Sharpe, you obviously familiar with already from the noise session this morning. To my right, of course, Mr. Henderson.

52:41

Thank you.

52:44

Before we get going on on my items, there was a carryover item from the compulsory acquisition hearing yesterday, relating to the A sandwich bar, which I believe Mr. Allen was going to just pick up.

53:00

And I'm very aware that we're sort of already running a bit behind schedule. So I may just roll this over to a written question. But effectively, there was the a sandwich bar was highlighted within the compulsory acquisition as something that was going to be potentially be provided because of the community benefits to that went along with it. But in the latest submissions, which I don't, unfortunately have to hand because they're in yesterday script.

53:27

There was an indication that actually having we looked at that there was they found very similar facilities in and around the area, and therefore there wasn't a potential to provide. I just wanted to know what the implications were for the assessment on that, because obviously, it had originally been assessed as having a limited significant effect. Yes, Rebecca clutton for the outcome, we have clarified that looking at the various different reps, it seems to us that in fact, in all cases, it is it is, as you say, identified as a minor adverse effect, which is not significant, and that there is therefore no requirement to mitigate, however, provision or that has been made within the capital allowances. So from a compulsory acquisition perspective or relocation strategy perspective, we are looking to read provide, but it's not necessary for the purposes of the assessment. So we don't think there's any impact on any of our assessments anywhere from that it's, it's something that we're doing because it's the right thing to do. It's best practice, but it's not required in terms of the assessments. Thank you for clarifying that.

54:33

So if we can just start with a basic point, the assessment of significant health and community effects in the US chapter 13, was amended to remove a significant perception effect or perception and uncertainty effect during operation

54:47

as the effects would be realised at this point in time. The revised chapter in the examination library still retains multiple reference to an effect in operation in at least section 13.9 That

55:00

One point 11 And table 13.20. Since this is going to be a certified document, can the applicant confirm that all references to that effect in operation will be amended, and an updated version of the chapter provided? Rebecca Clark with the applicant? Yes, we'll take that away and ensure that Stan, thank you.

55:21

The

55:23

examining authorities first written questions asked that the host authorities meet with the outcome to discuss the authorities request for local datasets and health strategies to be used to inform the health and community assessment. And I see from the Atkins comments on responses to written questions by interested parties at deadline five, that these meetings have happened but the applicant doesn't intend to update the s. On the basis the information contained in the s is both proportionate and adequate.

55:50

Can the applicant confirm whether this still remains the case or whether discussions are still ongoing in any fashion? Rebecca Clark with the applicant I'm going to hand over to Mr. Dunwoody for these questions.

56:09

Jenny Dunwoody for the applicant. Yes, meetings took place with central beds Hartfordshire authorities and Luton Borough Council in October and November. And at those meetings, we explained to them in detail the rationale both for the

56:27

determining the local and wider study area for the assessment and the datasets used in each of those study areas. And we believe that they were happy and agreed to the fact that the datasets were both consistent with their jsna data and appropriate for the assessment. And we haven't yet closed those out within the SOC G's because the host authorities asked for some additional information, which we've sent to them. So that was a comparison of our datasets with geonet jsna datasets, for example. But we do believe that that will be closed out in the socg is deadline six.

57:11

Just to provide a bit more explanation. So the local study area is a study area local to the proposed development where effects on health determinants are were considered to be likely to affect

57:28

specific known receptors, and therefore it's appropriate within the local study area to get detailed baseline data in order to assess receptor sensitivity. And we've done that, that assessed that local study area was defined at the start of the assessment. And for that reason, it remains flexible throughout the assessment. So if we were to identify any effects on known receptor locations outside of that area, we would go and get further additional information on those specific areas in order to assess the sensitivity, although actually, that didn't prove to be the case. So it wasn't necessary for us to do that. But that's the approach that we followed. And then in the wider study area, we're talking about a very large area, we're talking about the whole of Luton, Hartfordshire beds and bucks. So in the interest of proportionality, we didn't seek to get detailed baseline data across that whole area. The health determinants that are affected across that area are economic regeneration and employment. So you can't predict where people coming to the airport to work, for example are going to come from you can't link those effects to specific receptor locations. So really to get word level data for all of that area wouldn't inform the assessment.

58:51

But we do note that there is a wide variation in the nature of communities across that large area. And the qualitative narrative in the assessment takes account of that, as does mitigation. For example, the employment and training strategy

59:11

seeks to target the benefits of employment towards areas of higher social deprivation, for example, and unemployed people. So

59:23

it's not that we're ignoring that variation, but we can't actually be specific about where those impacts are going to take place.

59:31

And also, just to note that we did we were aware of the the joint strategic needs assessments produced by the authorities. We didn't use that data because that data is essentially taken from national datasets and we went straight to the national datasets, which allows us to just be sure that we're using the same data set consistently across the local authorities, that some of the information that we've provided to the authorities is a comparator

1:00:00

Some of the data that we have used against their JSON data just to give comfort that is, it's the same data. Although we haven't referenced that JSON, it's

1:00:11

gonna ask the local authorities, what their current position is, whether that's reflective of the current position. Yes. David Gertler, Luton Borough Council, we had a meeting as was stated with the applicant.

1:00:23

And LBC confirmed that we were satisfied with the approach by the applicant, which used ward level data. So they had detailed data from Luton Borough Council, which obviously, as expressed just now is slightly different to the wider area. So we were we were content with the approach they've taken. So that should be signed off in the socg. I haven't responded on the SSC geometry.

1:00:51

And from the Join host authorities, theatre OS for the Hartfordshire host authorities and similar positions. So we had the meeting, and we're satisfied that relevant data was used to inform the baseline and that an appropriate proportionate approach to assessment had been taken. So if that's not already reflected in socg, I think we expect it to be as to the point on receptors, I would need to just take that away to confirm.

1:01:29

Sorry, central Bedfordshire.

1:01:31

Thank you. Thank you. I'm Carolyn microteaching. For central Bedfordshire. We've also had meetings with the applicants, I think it was the end of October, some additional information has come through which our public health officer is reviewing and will provide some feedback, we've also got a copy of the

statement of common ground which we're again assessing as well. So we'll provide an update as soon as possible. Thank you,

1:01:53

and accuse you.

1:01:58

So I think we're going to come in on the third bullet if that's all right. Okay, thank you.

1:02:13

Sorry, Simmons.

1:02:17

Thank you.

1:02:19

I just like you to expand as the applicant could expand please on the measures to mitigate impacts on the health and wellbeing of local communities. And that can be sorely missed.

1:02:31

It will still sound ridiculous, but you do need to ask the question to me rather than direct to the applicant. Oh, sorry. Sorry. Could you ask the applicant, if they could expand on what measures to mitigate health and well being inches actually means?

1:02:50

Can I just clarify in terms of the general health and well, general health mitigation that's been provided? I'm thinking for instance, about night flights. And the impact that there has on a lot of people, not immediately, necessarily immediately, but quite distantly around the airport from night flights that keep people awake. And that has a big health impact on a lot of people. I also thinking about people who have mental health issues. And I think that is also impacted, particularly by night flights. So I would like to know,

1:03:25

perhaps a bigger better explanation about mitigation. In this particular case, maybe I'll I'll pass over to the applicant to respond on mitigation. I suspect this is one for Dr. Sharpe.

1:03:39

Sharpe for the applicant. Indeed, there's a host of nighttime noise controls, if we're specifically talking about noise and night flights. So within the green controlled growth framework, there is a noise envelope, which is a legally enforceable framework of limits and thresholds. There is a specific nighttime limit for the la que eight hour contour, which as we've discussed is what research shows is the best correlated metric with health effects at nighttime. There is also

1:04:12

a requirement to use court account budgets in the forward planning of slot allocation and capacity declarations. Again, that's a measure of noise impact of individual aircraft movements. There is a movement limit within the night quarter period, which is between 1130 and 6am. So there can be no more than 9650 annual movements within that period. There is also a quota count limit within that same period, which limits the total quota count that can fly within that period of 1130 to six in the morning. And there is also a ban on any aircraft with a QC value of two or greater operating within the night period. So there's a suite of controls which limits and controls the overall noise impact as well as movement limits.

1:05:00

had limits on individual noise levels of aircraft in the nighttime period.

1:05:05

Thank you,

1:05:07

somebody. As I understand that the health chapter largely refers to the other chapters for the detailed mitigation. Is there any health specific mitigation that you'd like to highlight in addition to the noise points that dot sharps race?

1:05:21

And not in terms of, oh, Jenny, Dunwoody for the applicant? Sorry. And in terms of mitigating noise? No, that's done through the noise assessment. There are specific health measures around

1:05:37

can community engagement, for example, set out in chapter 13? Yes.

1:05:45

And could you expand a bit on

1:05:48

what that community engagement would look like? And what the benefit would be in terms of addressing a concern like nighttime noise?

1:05:58

The Community Engagement details are set out in the code of construction practice. And that's

1:06:08

Do you want the reference for that? I don't think the reference. Okay.

1:06:13

And we've worked with the authors of that to ensure that there's a community there's a community engagement plan included in that the details of community engagement will be defined

1:06:27

at a later stage bye

1:06:31

bye by the applicant when that when that detailed plan comes to be produced, but it's ensuring that community engagement is embodied in in the approach taken to make sure that communities are in involved in the

1:06:45

both the construction and operational phases.

1:06:50

Thank you.

1:06:52

Mr. Pittman, you have a hand up.

1:06:55

Yeah, thank you, Chair. Yeah, Roger Pittman, North Hartfordshire, I just wanted to say particularly that the

1:07:01

flight numbers and in the north shoulder 6am to 7am may be particularly significant. And the limits for that period, because they are significant, may need to be looked at carefully. So I just asked that the noise controls for the noise, shoulder 6am 7am, which is a particularly sensitive period in the waking hours, are may be subject to review, it shown that there are particular significance, community responses for that period.

1:07:44

Can the applicant respond on that? Are there particular sensitivities in that period of the morning?

1:07:52

Got a short for the applicant? I think we'll we've outlined a few times now that there's no evidence to suggest that movement limits within a particular period, whether that be six to seven or 1130 to 11, or or any period of the night has any additional impact on on the on the noise and health experience of communities. It remains that the guidance and researchers at the FAQ a tower is the appropriate mechanism for both assessing noise and controlling it. And we have the full suite of controls as we've set out. Could you comment on the whether there is a specific sensitivity at that period of the morning? I don't. I don't believe there's a particular sensitivity for that period over and above, for example, that the department called the deep night in the proposal, though sort of middle of the night when people are more likely to be sleeping and potentially awoken.

1:08:54

Mr. Boyd,

1:08:56

Pete white friends with Moorpark just an observation on the aspects of community involvement. The applicant says that they've taken data from Bloomberg counsel about the community how the community impacts work.

1:09:13

As a resident of Luton, it's implied on my behalf, that every resident of Luton is in favour of a development of the airport. So I'm just trying to point out that you can't pay put too much relevant on that data because the community of Luton as a whole has never actually been

1:09:35

given the open opportunity to express an opinion in any way on on airport expansion in any anything. So just just as I wanted to make that observation as a resident of Luton, that the information provided may be imbalanced because, as we've said on other occasions, the Council of Luton is in favour of the development the residents of luton

1:10:00

aren't necessarily it's implied they are and it's there's no actual chance for that resident to make a definitive yes or no decision.

1:10:09

Mr. White, can I just ask where are you in attendance at the Rio environmental information consultations, as part of the statutory consultation process of the airport? We were we made the observation at the time, that throughout all the documents, there was no simple box to say now.

1:10:28

Personally, at various local Ward meetings with our local councillors and representatives of the applicant and of Luton Borough Council, I stressed on at least three occasions, if you want a proper community input, why is there a box not just to say no to airport expansion? I never ever received an answer to that question. So the initial things were there, the initial documentation was there.

1:10:57

But you've never got the

1:11:01

the will never got the opportunity to just say no, thank you. I recognise this as a point that you've raised through your written representations as well. But is there something briefly the applicant might want to say by way of response?

1:11:23

Since

1:11:25

most Sorry, Tom Enders of the applicant, I think the brief answer is that

1:11:31

they are applicant has run multiple applications, substantial applications in the pre application period where there were

1:11:39

sorry, consultations in the in the pre application period.

1:11:43

There was substantial opportunities to comment on the scheme. Many residents expressed their objection to expansion and that was given due consideration and reported in the consultation reports you've seen. Thank you. Mr. Pittman, you've still got your hand up.

1:12:00

Apologies. I'll retract at no problem.

1:12:07

David Gertler, Luton Borough Council, I just want to clarify, I wasn't saying that Luton Borough Council is saying we support this that we've canvass residents on this. I was saying that the datasets that were used in terms of looking at the community health and well being were taken from water level, they completely non political information. It's got nothing to do with whether the council might be as supportive of the DCO itself or the adventure of the airport. That's that's understood. Thank you.

1:12:43

Atmos, Mr. Lambert, thank you. So Andrew level and ladder car, I wonder if I might just make a brief comment on their consultation, because

1:12:52

I think the purpose of this hearing was very much speak about health and community, I have read a number of your submissions already on the points of consultation. So I don't think I want to spend time on that. Now we understand the points. And we have read the submissions. It was fine. So thank you.

1:13:08

So Rebecca Clinton for the applicant, just wrapping up on the mitigation point we just wanted to draw attention to this is in relation to Ms. Timmons question about the mitigation identified, it's probably worth just drawing attention again, to the mitigation route map that's been provided as 047. That's got four pages, pages 44 to 48 of the PDF that's available, which identifies the specific mitigation we've identified in order to mitigate health and community effects. Hopefully, that's a useful resource.

1:13:43

Thank you.

1:13:57

Sir, string in an A Morris at this this point.

1:14:03

Miss Morris.

1:14:06

Hello, can I just check that my technology is working? Fine, we can hear you fine, we can see you. Right, good. I have actually got a series of five interrelated points which connect what's just been spoken about with the item on the agenda that I particularly wanted to look at. So I hope you don't mind that I go through all of them at once. And the first is simply to reiterate that the subject matter that we're interested in health assessment, relies on the property validated transportation data, which was a subject that you went through at length yesterday in the hearing. So I don't want to go back through that. But I do want to reinforce the strong interconnection of those two things. And the fact that we have actually spoken with the applicant about looking particularly at that very early period in the nights, which has been mentioned by others this morning, so before till sort of six, which is when we anticipate that people are trying to come to the earliest flight in that six to seven peak

1:15:00

We'll start to use the traffic network through Buckinghamshire. So that is a concern for us and we're looking for that to be captured within the health assessment. The second point that I want to make is tied up with a few observations I have that I consider to be limitations of the health assessment as it's currently drafted. Now, ISO seven, eight is the principle document that we're looking at. So the chapter 13 assessment, the purpose of that state in 13, point 1.2.

1:15:28

Bringing together the assessment of effects on people living close to which excludes Buckinghamshire or affected by which to our mind is very much including Buckinghamshire and others within the wider study area, the proposed development. So after that, in 13, point 1.3 A series of health determinants are expressed, four of those are particularly of interest to us. And then in 13.3, point 17 We have the health aspects, again, we've got five of those that are of interest to Buckinghamshire

1:15:57

in 13 Point 3.5 See the council is that the applicant has said that the effect will occur across the wider study area. Now if I then go through the reporting to look for an assessment of the wider study area, not just Buckinghamshire against the areas that I've just mentioned of interest, I can't follow that all the way through, I can't see that the evidence is fully there. So to my mind, there is a gap in what's promised in terms of the scope and then what's reported, I will be very grateful if the applicant is able to direct us to where that gap is filled, because I've not yet found it.

1:16:36

The third point that I wanted to mention is is a complicated one, and I appreciate that the applicant would have had to deal with it in the same way as others have. But I ima so the institute environmental management assessment in 2022 published two quite important documents in terms of health impact

assessment in environmental impact assessment, they are picked up in table 13.4 by the applicant as something that is expressed as being informing the methodology.

1:17:03

But it isn't clear to me how this has actually been accommodated within the assessment that I've read. And for example, at 13 Point 5.6 It's quite clear that the assessment uses two or more significant residual effects before it's even considered an impact on neighbourhood quality. And at 13 Point 5.3 the document says that its health assessment is based on who do who ASU and Ay ay ay ay ay ay methodologies, there's no mention of the IEMA. So to me, it seems that this substantial shift that has been promoted through Amer as best practice to look at a much more multi layered approach, which would actually pick up some of the points that Mr. Cut forth was talking about. And some of the points that were raised by another one of the people this morning around community anxiety, the methodological change put forward by Ema is really pushing towards that much more multi layered consideration rather than a simple metric of do we have two or more significant residual effects. So I feel that it's weak in that respect. And actually, particularly those authorities that are outside the immediate localised study area that Miss Dunwoody has talked about, are not receiving as much analysis or explanation of what the thinking behind the applicants responses, and in turn their mitigation actually is. So in short, I suppose that the threshold is set too high in terms of of catching those effects.

1:18:30

As an example, you could look at what's in table 7.2 of the significance effects guidance, which is referenced is 13 point 28. In the applicants document, we've also got experience and I know you can't just say are on the call.

1:18:45

In liaising with them through health impact assessment on other topics, and I believe in their relevant representation for this. They've made the point that noise changes below the threshold that will be reported in the actual noise assessment, which is what this health assessment has actually relied upon, can lead to substantial detriments to health. And I feel that this assessment is not capturing that it's not capturing that nuance, and for us in particular, for that anymore. Morning peak, that is irrelevant.

1:19:14

So leading on from that, I have a comment to make on the irata report, right 536 It's proposing a change to table 13.6 To delete a whole row.

1:19:26

If we were to accept that as an errata, it strikes me as inappropriate because essentially it is removing

1:19:39

the statement that there could be any environmental impacts affecting the wider study area, which goes against this comment that they have in 13 Point 3.5 C and also in that particular irata. The justification is environmental impacts from the construction operation of the airport are not relevant for the wider study area, which is something that Buckinghamshire Council is not in agreement with

1:20:00

I don't know if others have had the chance to look at that noting it's the deadline five document. And then I suppose finally, I have one final point about mitigation, if I may, which I know is the topic. Okay. Quick, I'll be very quick. Yep. key measures are mentioned in 13 Point 8.3. There's four of those that a very relevant to Buckinghamshire,

1:20:20

I'm just going to pick up ATS because it's come up this morning. So the employment and training strategy is identified as item K. In that mitigation list.

1:20:29

We consider that to be a key measure, it seems to me that is identified as a key measure within the chapter. And yet, if you go to the response in rap 552, against the question that you raise the examining authority in SC 1.4, it's suggested that it's a non consensual enhancement. So there's some misunderstandings and lack of clarity to me as to what is considered health

1:20:56

mitigation that's essential, and what is considered enhancement, and it seems internally consistent. Thank you for your patience with me, I just want to get the word across to him. One, we will follow it up with written material, I was just going to say it would be very helpful if you could submit that in writing for the applicant to respond to but with the Applicant like to make an initial response now.

1:21:18

Jenny Dunwoody for the applicant.

1:21:20

Yeah, so taking hopefully some of the main points in turn.

1:21:27

In terms of the scope of the health assessment, it's a very broad assessment, it's covering a large number of different determinants of health.

1:21:36

The established principles of health assessment is to look at the wider determinants of health. That's the social, environmental and economic impacts on people and then in turn to look at how are any changes to those determinants affect health outcomes at the population level, specifically, so you're not looking at a health effect on an individual receptor, you're looking at health effects on a population.

1:22:03

Another point a general point to make is that the health assessment doesn't try to duplicate health effects that are assessed elsewhere in the environmental statement. So for example, effects of noise on quality of life and health, our effects are assessed in the noise assessment. And the health assessment doesn't try to duplicate that.

1:22:27

The health assessment scope is designed to pick up additional health effects that are not covered elsewhere in the Yes. And in in terms of the

1:22:39

looking at more than one significant health effect. That's when we look at the quality of a neighbourhood. And we're basing that on the in combination effects of more than one environmental effect. So noting that those those effects are experienced collectively, and that those joint joint effects on for example, visual and noise can affect people's perception of the quality of their living environment and their well being that is based on having more than one significant sorry, that's based on significance. And in combination effects. We don't believe it's appropriate to look at effects below the significance level, because there's no clear framework for how we would make that judgement. And where we would draw the line on that those judgments have been made.

1:23:35

Taking into account effects on human receptors already in the respective topics.

1:23:42

Also to note, that health assessment is driven to a large degree by the outputs of other topics. And so we sort of follow the effects where they go and assess them. And we can't always define in advance where where health effects on health determinants are going to take place. Because we're not doing that assessment, we're then looking at, in turn, what that means for health outcomes.

1:24:06

And so, if we haven't got effects on health determinants that are scoped into our assessment taking place within the wider study area, then we have nothing to assess, essentially.

1:24:19

And that's, I suspect the case in Buckinghamshire to some extent, however,

1:24:27

I do want to point out that the wider economic effects and employment effects do cover the whole of the Buckinghamshire area and also on the employment and training strategy just to note that that strategy isn't an optional thing. It's secured through section 106, I believe.

1:24:50

And it contains a commitment to engage with the local authorities on goals and initiatives to maximise employment benefit. So

1:25:00

across the whole of the ETS study area, and that study area does explicitly include Buckingham share as well.

1:25:08

And there was also a point on

1:25:12

below threshold level effects. So this is about

1:25:18

the impacts of, for example, noise below the significance thresholds. As I said, at receptor level individual receptor level, we leave that to the noise assessment that has the assessment there is based on impacts on human receptors. And we don't duplicate that, however, there is a quantitative assessment at population level of exposure to noise. And that takes into account the whole of the study population within the noise contour. And as such, that includes all exposure to noise. So that includes below threshold below significance threshold level exposure, and that's done at a total population level. So we're not saying that there isn't

1:26:09

an impact there.

1:26:12

And just to make the point that that same principle applies to air quality as well. And there's also a population level assessment of air quality impacts on health, which also includes all exposure at all levels. And just in relation to the point about the IMO 2022. Lens. Can you just expand on how that has been taken into account or accommodated? Yes, it, it has been used in the assessment. There's a the IMO guidance came out in 2022. So during the course of the assessment, it didn't fundamentally change the approach that we were using. It's based on looking at the sensitivity of receptor populations and the magnitude of impacts on health determinants, which we were already doing. And it's, we were already sort of using criteria similar to what were in the IEMA guidance. However,

1:27:17

that guidance was referred to to make sure that the approach that we're already taking was consistent with the IMA approach. And we believe that it was

1:27:27

it also is worth noting that the IEMA guidance

1:27:32

expects professional judgments to be made. In the application of the sensitivity and magnitude criteria. They're not really criteria in terms of being thresholds, there are a list of

1:27:47

things to consider really at each at each level. So

1:27:53

they're expected to be a framework really for making a professional judgement.

1:28:02

Thank you.

1:28:06

Oh, and they the errata as well came up didn't Yep. I'm

1:28:13

trying to remember what the

1:28:15

lady was doing that.

1:28:21

Oh, this is about is this about the

1:28:26

perception and uncertainty. Now if I Anna Morris, for the for Buckinghamshire Council, it was about the removal of the row directly beneath your scope of what you're considering in the wider area is essentially a blanket removal of this consideration of any environmental impacts from the construction or operation of the airport aside from employment.

1:28:49

To me, it's not an errata item. It's larger than that.

1:28:56

We can come back in writing on that. But I

1:28:59

do think that our judgement at the time would have been that it's unlikely that we would have impacts on specific known receptors, impacts on health determinants on specific known receptors that would be likely to result in a population level health effect. And I do think probably, if we were doing this, again, we would not include those effects in the wider study area at the outset. And as I explained when I was talking about local and wider study area, if any specific receptor populations were identified outside of the local study area that we considered likely to be affected. We would look at them individually in response to information that we get from our colleagues looking at things like traffic and noise and so on, but that hasn't been the case. And if I can just pick up on one point in terms of the approach to assessing community effects

1:30:00

If, from an in combination perspective, rather than from an individual perspective

1:30:08

is there not potential for

1:30:12

degradation of

1:30:16

the immediacy of an environment through just single effects,

1:30:23

particularly noise on say Parkland dissuading people from using parkland, because actually it becomes less pleasant to be in that environment. And so people have to find other locations and reduces the immunity value of that space.

1:30:39

First, I'd like to just, again, draw attention to the tranquillity assessment that's been undertaken in chapter 14, and landscape and visual of the IES, which does look specifically at the effects on people's perception of the quality of life, outdoor environment, and tranquillity and

1:31:01

how pleasant that that environment is, in terms of in terms of perception. So that's not duplicated in health assessment.

1:31:09

We have looked specifically at Wigmore Valley Park, in terms of how the change in noise would affect health. And just to explain how that assessment has worked. So what we do is we look at the health determinants, the ways the pathways through which you actually gain a health benefit from using the park, and whether those are likely to be materially affected. So

1:31:39

access to green space,

1:31:42

and recreational value,

1:31:46

social interaction, children's play physical activity. And we've considered whether the change in noise is likely to actually either prevent people from accessing those benefits or to materially reduce the health benefit derived from using the park. And taking into account the fact that Wigmore Valley Park is already exposed to noise. So it's not that that's a factor in terms of the way people will perceive the change. And it's a

1:32:22

judgement that while there is a adverse effect on tranquillity is not likely to actually manifest in a change in health outcomes, people we think will still use the park and still derive health benefits from doing so.

1:32:40

Thank you.

1:32:42

If I can ask you to come back and writing to miss Morris's written submission. I think it will be very helpful. Miss Morris, do you have any comments?

1:32:53

Thank you, Anna Morris for the booking in Chicago. Now I will put everything else into writing rather than take more time in the hearing. Thank you very much.

1:33:02

Just in relation to local health, health dataset, sorry, as well as the joint strategic needs assessment data sets, There was reference to an absence of consideration of index of multiple Multiple Deprivation scores, and income deprivation data. I think that was from the central Bedfordshire local impact report. Have those issues being addressed through the current engagement? Or is that still an outstanding matter?

1:33:31

Caroline macro region, central Bedfordshire. I'll need to take that away and discuss with our public health officer if that's okay. I'll be providing responsive deadline six. Thank you. Thank you.

1:33:43

social benefit share also recommended use of the healthy airports checklist. I was just wondering if you could very quickly explain what the checklist does. And what benefit there would be to using the checklist at this particular point in time.

1:33:58

I'm aggregation central beds again, I'm going to have to take this away and speak to our public health officer and because it's based on his comments, and so again, responded deadline six. Thank you. Thank you.

1:34:10

Before we move off that item, does the applicant have any comments on the healthy apples checklist and its applicability to this scheme.

1:34:19

Jenny Dunwoody for the applicant and I can't give specific comments. We did look at the checklist at the time.

1:34:27

And I think

1:34:29

our impression was the to the issues in there were quite high level and that it wasn't likely to have been useful or to change our approach to the assessment but

1:34:41

when we receive information deadline six we can have another look and respond in more detail. Thank you

1:34:54

in response to the examining authorities question HVAC 1.4 about the future

1:35:00

baseline the Applicant provided commentary on the evolution of baseline for the wider study area. Do the councils have any comments on this information?

1:35:16

For us for the Hartfordshire has authorities apologies only to take that one away. Thank you, if you could please.

1:35:23

And just the outcome if when you're revising the chapter 13 For resubmission if you could include that information within the essay, that would be helpful thinking.

1:35:37

And the health and community assessments includes information on awakenings. Can I just confirm that the awakenings relate to the above 80 decibel las Max contour?

1:35:50

Sharp for the applicant? We've set out the methodology for calculating Awakening's in the health chapter and it's appendix. It is based on the WHO guidance from 2018. So it takes into account the number of aircraft movements and their la Max levels, it doesn't just look at 80 DB. That's one of the limitations of course with an N above contour is it only takes into account levels above a certain threshold? It calculates the LE max level of every single overflight

1:36:23

and adds them together in a in a formula that is derived from that from that research paper, which is referenced in the in the appendix.

1:36:31

So is this the Basner? Reference? Yes, right. Yes. Are you able to provide that reference to the examination? In terms of the actual paper or the reference details? We'll have to check whether it's a it is a research paper, there may be publication limitations, but we'll provide it if we can. Obviously, from my perspective, the the s references the methodology and says it's in this document that I can't see we understood if we if we're not able to provide it in four, we can provide the extracts that are that are relevant in terms of how we've done the calculation. Yep. Thank you.

1:37:10

Can you just confirm, sorry, which deadline you'd be able to provide them by? We can do that for deadline six.

1:37:17

Thank you.

1:37:20

At previous deadlines common was made by the host local authorities on the need for additional mitigation in relation to health and community effects. Can I just confirm whether this was purely in relation to the potential for operational mental health effects, which has now been identified as an irata? And that there's no other further requirement for mitigation identified?

1:37:44

funerals for the heart for each of us devices. If I could ask Roger Pittman to comment, please.

1:37:51

Yeah, hello, Roger Pittman, North Hartfordshire.

1:37:57

The item that I wanted to speak to really was

1:38:01

related to the points made under under this item, which is that

1:38:07

the Hartfordshire, authorities have suggested there's an opportunity for more active approach to engagement, and also impacts during operation on the mental well, being of local community members hasn't been identified as significant.

1:38:24

Putting those two items together.

1:38:28

I reflected on the comments that were made in rep four, two or nine by the UK Health Security Agency, or they've made reference to ongoing study projects by the Department of Transport, measuring noise, annoyance, and in summary,

1:38:46

they're suggesting that these studies could form the basis of a suitable proportionate surveys designed to actually measure

1:38:58

community impacts. And this could be done at regular intervals. I don't wish to go into their reporting detail, but just to say that they have provided a mechanism that could provide some quantity of evidence that would actually give light on what the level of significant community health impacts are. And they're suggesting that this could be done at intervals, specific intervals through the development of the expansion if it goes ahead, and I would like to propose that that is adopted and developed.

1:39:35

So I think there's a need essentially for there to be a more active response rather than a passive response just by saying ongoing discussions with the local authorities. I think there needs to be an active proposals such as the ones made by the UK health security agency to develop an evidence base upon which mitigation will be based on

1:40:00

evidence from the community that will be assessed in a, in a, you know, in an accepted manner.

1:40:08

Can I just clarify in this department? You've talked about more active engagement and the the monitoring but you effectively saying that that would be the more active engagement. Yes, I'm suggesting that a the adoption of these type of surveys that have been used certainly at Heathrow Airport and and considered as as a measure of local impact will be a very useful item to adopt in this area.

1:40:40

Thank you. That does take us on to the next item unconscious, it's now five past one.

1:40:49

We'll get well if people are okay, we'll push on through this item.

1:40:54

So at at deadline for the UK health security agency recommended that future health effects monitored and suggested that Civil Aviation Authority, aviation noise attitude surveys and as the aviation noise effects and project and Heathrow pilot study on the quality of life and health effects, their noise insulation scheme could be used as a basis for designing proportionate surveys.

1:41:19

UK HSA suggests that such monitoring could inform amongst other things, the rate of deployment of the noise insulation scheme, the geographical coverage of the scheme and whether alternative ventilation measures need to be provided, and also provide evidence to inform future applications for for expansion. And so if I can just ask the UK HSA to confirm is this request consistent with the requirements of regulation 21 C of the infrastructure planning ei regulations, namely that it wouldn't duplicate any existing monitoring or monitoring arrangements carried out by any organisation and in accordance with any other UK legal obligation? That was my first question.

1:41:59

Good afternoon, Dr. Fennec from UK health security agency.

1:42:05

I'm not immediately familiar with the document you just qualified, but it was helpful for you to qualify what the requirement is. So yes, our proposal wasn't to duplicate the ongoing research, which is being carried out by the Civil Aviation Authority and others. It is very much project specific in line with

1:42:30

in the environmental impact assessment regulations to consider whether monitoring will have a benefit to the scheme. And our position is, as you've been hearing today, but obviously throughout the documentation, there are a lot of uncertainties.

1:42:48

I'm focused on the noise aspects.

1:42:52

Mr. Nitin, who's also online looks at the broader health and well being aspect. And in our registration of interest, we've kind of like summarised that for example, 38,000 people will be exposed to daytime aviation noise levels above 51 decibels where we know adverse effects can occur 63,000 will be exposed to nighttime aviation noise levels,

1:43:22

half of which will be due to the development. This is

1:43:27

with all the restrictions which Dr. Sharpe was outlining which the control limits etc. So there will be addressed effects. There are uncertainties.

1:43:38

And for example, noise insulation, which is the key mitigation strategy for noise. It's well documented that there's very little evidence whether it works whether it actually improves health and well being. So, of course, we know that in a laboratory getting good, better noise insulation will reduce the decibel level. We have very little information, what it means in people's homes, how people use it, does it have a detrimental effect on indoor air quality, risk of overheating in terms of rate of deployment, whether certain subgroups of the population needs to be prioritised. Meet and monitoring will provide the data to inform these decisions throughout what is quite a long period. I'll stop there and pass over to Mr. Nitin for his comments.

1:44:33

Yeah, thanks. So I didn't know it's important office for health improvement and disparities. So just to say it in the in the in the responses from the UK to say they are combined responses from office for health improvement and disparities and UK to say so, they are combined responses are though being sent through ukgc. So as Mr. finish our view on this is we look at the wider determinants of health and the wider health improvement aspects rather than environment

1:45:00

to hazards.

1:45:01

So I just wanted to start off with, obviously, the health chapter. So ASC seven, eight. And obviously, we've already talked about the perceptions and issues on uncertainty which have been assessed as moderate adverse, therefore significant.

1:45:15

And as Mr. dunwoody's already said that good community liaison engagement is one of the key sort of mitigating factors for that. And obviously, that links to mental health well being and the three protective factors, so enhancing control, building resilience and community assets and facilitating participation and inclusion. So a vital aspect of of mitigation, particularly mental health and well being, as Mr. Bennett sulfenic said, there were many variables and assumptions, a lot of those had been just discussed today, and I'm sure in previous meetings and future meetings. And also, we are trying to project these out for 20 years,

1:45:49

it's already been outlined that there are potentially lots of in combination effects, particularly for the very local communities that reside in around the airport, those local impacts are can be quite complicated. And also, we need to be aware of the potential for unintended consequences, particularly for for some of the mitigation measures or any unforeseen issues that might arise particularly as we're trying to project out for so so many years,

1:46:16

the local population is sensitives. And that was highlighted in the Luton relevant representation. And obviously, it's, again difficult to project out to 20 years what the future population health and sensitive sensitivity will be and what the local population characteristics will be in those future years.

1:46:35

We can monitor clinical health presentations and or Co Op provider lots of national data down to down toward level. But obviously, it's difficult, more difficult to collect sort of the highly local granular detail around local communities around the airport, particularly in relation to self reported illnesses and sort of practical implications of living in and around in and around the airport.

1:46:57

And obviously, although the we need to be

1:47:01

aware that the airport does also do a lot of I'm sure pretty good community engagement. But again, there will be a proportion of the community that won't engage with that level of formal consultation. And I believe from the survey methodology from the other other schemes that these can be anonymized.

And therefore, you might start to engage with some of the elements of the communities that are already engaged in the more formal processes that that are brought forward by the by the Applicant.

1:47:33

Thank you, both for you.

1:47:36

Just in relation to imposing a monetary requirement of this nature, are you aware of any similar requirement has been placed on any other airport or I should say condition because it won't necessarily have come through a requirement.

1:47:52

Doctor from UK health security agency, I'm aware of one which was around Euston station for high speed too.

1:48:01

That wasn't in relation to the construction noise, because because of the duration.

1:48:09

The issue was discussed for other airports, but I'm not aware of any similar conditions. But we have to acknowledge also that different planning applications may have different scales of impact. And obviously, the the current application is for a significant increase in a number of movements. And there will be a significant increase in the number of people exposed to noise where we know adverse effects can occur.

1:48:39

Thank you.

1:48:45

Yes, would you be able to submit a copy of the HS two condition?

1:48:53

I will do my best to find it out with Yes. Yeah. Would you be able to do that my deadline? Six?

1:49:00

Yes. Apologies. What date is December? December the eighth?

1:49:07

Yes, we'll do that. Thank you. Thank you.

1:49:15

Do you have any suggestions as to what the specific wording of a requirement would be?

1:49:25

Right, so, Dr. FANUC, from UK health security agency.

1:49:30

In our written evidence, we suggested two aspects of monitoring one in relation to the noise insulation, and one in relation to a broader quality of life slash health well being survey.

1:49:48

We feel that it's very important that that kind of monitoring is designed with a range of stakeholders including local stakeholders.

1:49:58

Appreciate that from your person.

1:50:00

activ you would need something which is enforceable in terms of wording.

1:50:09

We haven't got a form of wording here, we can have a think

1:50:15

after this meeting and whether we can provide something in writing. But an important aspect of that would be

1:50:24

to allow the flexibility of the design of the study. But also what happens with the results of this study? Because we are talking about such a long frame of time.

1:50:37

I don't know if Mr. Doesn't want to add to that.

1:50:41

Yeah, I think we need to bear into the wording. Some mentioned in terms of frequency and what that frequency would would look like whether that sort of three to five years or at sort of key points in in the sort of phased development of the scheme.

1:50:56

And yes, you know, really important point is, if you're going to ask a question, what do you do with the answer? So we need to sort of frame some wording about what we deal with in terms of the findings from that. And also, I think, important how we disseminate that, you know, I mentioned the point that good committee, good community engagement is part of sort of the protective factors for mental health. So we need to make sure that the results of the survey are cascaded to the community, and in a way that's accessible to the community.

1:51:23

That was going to be my follow up question was just in relation to doing a survey of this nature.

1:51:31

It's all very well doing survey, but what do you do with the outcome of that? So does it lead to some form of remedial action requirement in the future?

1:51:45

Yeah, I think if we find some sort of certificate issues that are raised, and obviously it's, you know, there will be a moral duty to try and mitigate that as best as possible at the time, given that we don't know what the potential future mitigation options will be unclear, we also need to be sort of aware of

1:52:05

those issues that are under the direct control of airport those issues that are under the potential influence at the airport and those issues that are outside the

1:52:14

outside the scope of control from from the airport. And clearly we need, we'd need to look at the survey results and then decide

1:52:22

where it's relevant for the airport to intervene and mitigate. But it's difficult to think ahead of results of a survey that we don't know yet know what the survey results will tell us. But we do need to mitigate that if we find significant issues.

1:52:36

Thank you. If I can pass over to the applicant. Now,

1:52:40

I suppose in providing a general response to the point. Could you also just set out whether the source of the data that the UK HSA is proposing to collect would in any way be provided in any other form of study?

1:52:53

So that there isn't that duplication? Yes. Rebecca clump for the applicant. I just want to deal with the legal point before I pass over to Miss Dunwoody under regulation 21. Three see that you refer to the monitoring, the existing monitor arrangements referred to in that section are ones that are carried out in accordance with an obligation under the under UK law. As far as we're aware, with the exception of the HS two

1:53:20

condition that's just been referred to which obviously isn't, there would be no duplication there because that's dealing with another matter. We're not aware that any of the other studies that have been referred to in the UK Health Security Agency's response are existing arrangements carried out Yeah. So I don't think if if we find out something different, we'll let you know. But I don't think regulation 21 three C would

be engaged in that respect. But our position is nonetheless that they remain in appropriate for reasons that is Dunwoody will go on to thank you

1:54:04

Jenny Dunwoody for the applicant.

1:54:07

First, I just want to distinguish between engagement and monitoring because both were mentioned. So just quickly on engagement, we recognise absolutely that control and participation in decision making is a protective factor for mental well being and that engagement is one of the best ways to mitigate adverse effects on mental well being.

1:54:33

I want to just draw attention to some of the engagement activities that are existing

1:54:41

and that the operator is currently responsible for delivering, such as the Luton Airport Consultative Committee, which has representations from all host authorities, the noise and track subcommittee, which has representation from community groups and host authorities and also community

1:55:00

Noise surveys which are in person or sorry, community noise surgeries,

1:55:06

which are delivered in person regularly throughout the region, to engage directly with communities on the effects of aviation noise.

1:55:19

So,

1:55:22

to talk about monitoring,

1:55:26

first, I just, I want to make the point, first of all, about proportionality within EIA.

1:55:34

And the complexity of monitoring

1:55:39

health outcomes of any kind and attributing that outcome to a specific cause.

1:55:46

That's

1:55:48

there's a very big jump up from monitoring the determinants of health. So noise itself, to monitoring outcomes, and health outcomes.

1:55:59

And you have to have a very clear reason for doing that. Because it's,

1:56:04

it's going to be very resource intensive, and not necessarily proportionate. So that's the first point.

1:56:16

I'd also like to make the point that the airport operator is currently supporting existing studies, existing national monitoring. So for example, the DFT is aviation night noise effects study.

1:56:30

The community around Luton is part of the study group for that, and I believe also for other national studies.

1:56:44

So to establish an association, or cause causality between a specific impact such as aviation noise,

1:56:56

and health outcomes, requires very complex study design

1:57:02

to eliminate things like bias and

1:57:06

confounding.

1:57:08

And the applicant considers that this is best done at a national level for a number of reasons. Firstly, study population size is a key factor in the reliability of results.

1:57:24

And obviously, a national study is going to give you a larger study population.

1:57:30

Secondly, an airport specific study may not

1:57:36

provide general information that could be used to inform national policy and guidance on noise mitigation, which is really the the end goal, I think, as we've said, you know, there's no point doing the study, unless you're going to

1:57:53

be able to act on the results. And it's more valuable to have a general national approach in that regard that can influence national policy and guidance.

1:58:04

There's also potentially a risk that by handing out surveys to the community affected by aviation noise around Luton, you might be reaching some of the people who are already involved in other surveys.

1:58:23

And finally, we don't yet have the results of either the Heathrow study the study or other studies. So until we know what those studies say, we can't really comment on what if anything might be done with that information?

1:58:41

Oh, sorry. Yeah, just to clarify, um, so receiving more than one survey base, basically, there's an issue with potentially receiving conflicting questionnaires.

1:58:53

And

1:58:56

that could undermine that could cause confusion, basically, and undermine the results of both studies, potentially. So that's a risk, we just want to sort of highlight.

1:59:08

Yeah, so in terms of

1:59:12

what we actually do with the findings,

1:59:15

there's a reference to triggers for remedial action in the question. Clearly, we can't speculate on what specific triggers there might be for remedial action because we don't know yet what the studies are going to tell us. However, we just like to note that the studies of Nash, the findings of national studies could inform noise mitigation policy and guidance and of course, that is then carried through into the operators, practices and mitigation. Just in terms of the point relating to monitoring of mitigation deployment. I mean, clearly, that is

1:59:56

something that is very tangible, measurable and is entirely within the gift for the applicant.

2:00:00

To

2:00:02

carry out

2:00:04

and given that

2:00:06

noise and health effects related to it are probably the main area of concern for the local community. Would it be unreasonable to do monitoring in respect of that particular issue, which the UK says suggesting monic monitoring of deployment of mitigation as in monitoring and health effects relating into deployment of

2:00:28

the mitigation, which is my understanding?

2:00:31

Dr. Finish, you've got your hand up. So if you want to come in.

2:00:37

Yeah, Dr. faneca health security agency, I wanted if I may, to provide some responses to those points, which we try to address in our written response. So the first one is about proportionality and the complexity of linking

2:00:53

health affects to the wider determinants of health. And that's absolutely right. If you're looking at, for example, if we say increased cardiovascular risk increase in hypertension, because there are so many risk factors. But if you're looking at noise, annoyance, and noise, sleep disturbance, which are recognised health outcomes by the World Health Organisation, they are noise specific, and they are specific to the source of noise we are talking about. There's no ambiguity. If you have this social research, where you have questions about annoyance, and sleep disturbance, which are standardised questions, there would be no ambiguity about what's causing that increase in health outcome. Similarly, if you look at sleep disturbance from noise, it would be unambiguous unambiguous that it's related to noise. So that's one important point.

2:01:48

There was a comment that

2:01:51

of the benefits of an airport airport specific study in terms of informing national policy. Well, what we're discussing today is a specific scheme and the national policy. For many perspective, it differs decisions

to individual operators because it recognises that every airport is different, and that's the right way. So the benefit of a local survey is very much to inform local mitigation, which what works for Luton may not to work for Heathrow or for Stansted, or for other airports. So that's another big benefit of the kind of mitigate monitoring sorry, which we're proposing in terms of risks of multiple surveys. Conflicting, we're talking about a period of 20 years here. So there wouldn't be too much effort in liaising with other people like the Civil Aviation Authority who may be

2:02:51

planning a survey that would be discussed with the airport beforehand. So timing could be sorted out. And in terms of we don't have results from these surveys, which were mentioned, well, that doesn't matter. We know that noise affects health, there shouldn't be any doubt it's well captured in the documentation for the environmental impact assessment.

2:03:13

So we know there's an effect, what we're talking about is, in light of all the uncertainties which we've been discussing, which are highlighted,

2:03:22

we feel that monitoring would give value to both the operator and to communities. For example, given the benefits of employment and contribution to the local economy, these surveys could find that there aren't actually there is a positive effect. And that will give confidence to communities. But on the other hand, it could find that there are disproportionate impacts, some subgroups of the population are benefiting, some are having an adverse impact. Again, these can only be identified through monitoring. Thank you.

2:03:59

Thank you.

2:04:01

I'm very conscious of time and people are probably wanting to break for lunch. Mr. Moody, if you'd like to come back in but otherwise, what I would propose would be for the applicant and UK HSA and I had to have a separate conversation to discuss this matter in more detail and potentially come back with a solution or at least it sort of finalised position on this point, if that's acceptable to both parties.

2:04:31

If we could do that, I think deadlines six might be challenging, but deadline seven possibly. Yes. Deadline seven Rebecca Klump. The applicant? Thank you, sir. Well, we'll take that point away. Mr. Conway, did you want to respond? I was going to respond on one of those points

2:04:48

around the attributing of sleep awake awakenings and annoyance directly to the specific aviation noise source which I is

2:05:00

is clearly Correct. However, there's still a lot of potential for bias. People know who's asking the question.

2:05:09

And therefore, the responses

2:05:13

can display bias in terms of

2:05:17

these are all self assessed responses. So it's people telling, telling us how annoyed they feel or attributing their way awakenings to,

2:05:29

to aircraft movements. And, you know, they know it's the airport asking the question. So there's a lot of the lot goes into the study design in the way that questions are framed, and repeating questions in different ways to try and eliminate that bias. And that is, so it's just to make the point that it's not as simple as simply asking the question, understood.

2:05:52

Thank you.

2:06:04

Think that was all the questions I had on health at this point in time, if we can, if the parties can follow up on that actions deadlines, seven. Were there any other comments from the local authorities in relation to the health assessments?

2:06:19

Fiona Ross for the Hartfordshire host authorities, I think it would echo what UK HSE has been saying in that regard.

2:06:30

And did anyone else have any other comments or observations on the matter of health before we break for lunch?

2:06:39

In that case, we'll adjourn it's now 126. And if we come back in half an hour.

2:06:47

Well, if we make it until two in that case,