

[redacted] He said that it was important to get the fleet mix correct; A320s had little noise or AQ impact and capacity could potentially be filled up with these aircraft. A320s were also more efficient per passenger. Jonathan Moor said that the solution would be a balance of movement levels and size of aircraft.

He also mentioned that, in terms of NO_x emissions, if a narrow body aircraft represented 1.5 units, a twin-engine aircraft would represent 8 units and a quad 12 units. He said that the industry trend was towards twins, rather than quads, and the airport could further influence this trend.

It was agreed to arrange a further workshop in a few weeks' time, when further data was available.

Action: DfT

ITEM 5: PROJECT PLAN

12. Michael Jackson presented paper HPB(07) 05.

13. Jonathan Moor said that we could not make the final decision on timing until we had seen the next set of model runs.

said that the London Plan Examination in Public was due to run from 18 June until 20 July and would involve a debate on the Air Transport White Paper, [redacted]

the technical problem. Road traffic modelling was now proceeding to timetable. The status of risk 1.3.6 (lack of clarity over approach to exceedences on SRN) had been reduced to Medium following a high level meeting. An update would be provided under item 7.

5. [Redacted]

[Redacted] added that ERCD had thought they were proceeding with a final scenario and needed urgent confirmation of the scenario they should be working to if they are to deliver noise modelling in time. The same was true for MM.

Action: BAA

6. Dean Dyer asked whether more detail should be added to the Consultation risks, such as 2.1.5 (consultation poorly handled). Jonathan Moor suggested that responsibility for these risks should be transferred to APD, who should examine them to ensure they reflected the need to improve on SERAS.

Action: DfT

7. [Redacted] referred to risk 2.1.1 (inconsistencies with London Plan etc.) and said that the Mayor was known to be strengthening his opposition to Heathrow expansion. He said there was a need for GOL to develop 'lines to take' with DfT ahead of the Examination in Public (EIP), starting in June. GOL are meeting with BAA this week and DfT (DG and NW) on 25 April to discuss the EIP. It was also agreed to keep HA in the loop.

How Office for London

Action: DfT/GOL

8. Jonathan Moor referred to risk 2.1.2 (loss of housing) and the issue of social housing. [Redacted]

Action: BAA

ITEM 4: ASSESSMENT WORK PROJECT PLAN

9. Natalie Wirth explained that the project plan showed [Redacted] She said that the AQ modelling part of the Gantt chart did not allow any contingency for potential problems and, as such, reflected the earliest possible delivery dates.

10. [Redacted] said that he had drawn up a preliminary programme for the [Redacted] but that this required further work. [Redacted]

He said that it would be necessary to hold the next [Redacted] workshop for R3 in early May to agree the way forward (DfT to set up). Ahead of this, BAA would look at the existing model outputs and the rules of thumb arising from these; examine [Redacted] consider mitigation options [Redacted]

Actions: BAA

ITEM 6: MODELLING RESULTS AND NEXT STEPS

(i) Paper HPB (07) 10

17. David Gray presented paper HPB (07) 10 which detailed the key AQ exceedence areas and mitigation options being investigated. Jonathan Sharrock asked whether it was possible to assign costs to the mitigation options. David Gray said that this would be possible once we began to narrow down the options. Some would be nil cost. It was agreed to add a consideration of costs in further papers on mitigation options, where possible.

Action: DTT

(ii) Progress on Quality Assurance of Road Traffic Model

Action: BAA

ITEM 7: EXCEEDENCES ON THE STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK

19. David Gray presented paper HPB (07) 11. Jonathan Moor said that it was his understanding that HA did not always find out about developments near to motorways and so would not always be able to stop them proceeding. He also said it was important to note that the Luton test case involved only a handful of properties and so may not necessarily be helpful in a Heathrow context.

20. [REDACTED]

Becky Wood said that buses and coaches had a longer lifecycle than lorries, but that the LLEZ would accelerate turnover. Paul Harwood said that the HA was assuming that roads vehicles would be unproblematic in AQ terms by 2020.

Really?

21. Becky Wood outlined the recent discussion over inclusion of trunk roads in the LLEZ.

22. Becky Wood said that the scheme would be implemented for large heavy vehicles in early 2008. She said it was still based on PM₁₀ emissions. TfL wanted NO₂ to be included and this was an option for later versions of the scheme, pending resolution of technical issues. She said that operator preference appeared to be for speeding up fleet replacement, rather than retrofitting and thus there could be NO₂ advantages even with a purely PM₁₀ scheme.

ITEM 8: CONSULTATION DOCUMENT (Paper HPB (07) 12)

23. David Gray said that comments had been received from BAA and would be included in the next version of the condoc presented to the Project Board. He said the document now contained a fairly comprehensive list of key issues, but still required much work on the drafting. Jonathan Moor suggested that the June meeting would be the time to focus heavily on the consultation document.

25. [redacted] said it was crucial to make clear at consultation that we were pursuing an option that meets environmental constraints and is credible, rather than the option. Jonathan Sharrock volunteered to offer further advice on the ruling of the High Court regarding positive lessons that could be drawn from the SERAS consultation.

Action: DfT

ITEM 9: AOB

26. Roger Worth asked about the rationale behind the 10% margin for uncertainty in meeting AQ limits, quoted in paper HPB (07) 10. David Gray said that this was merely illustrative at this stage.

[redacted]

ITEM 10: Date of next meeting

Friday 18 May 1430 - 1630

AED3 April 2007

<Natalie.Wirth@dft.gsi.gov.uk>
"Roy Martin"
<Roy.Martin@dft.gsi.gov.uk>
Subject
PSDH workplan

We did not have the chance to go through [redacted] workplan in any detail last Tuesday. That is now a key priority, informed of course by any further thinking since our discussions. (An obvious point being why the delay of 4-6 weeks for RRTM2 (if I have got that right) seems to mean we would not have final MM assessments before March 2007).

Fortunately, Ministers here have agreed that there should not be a consultation on mixed mode this year, but a combined consultation on MM and R3/T6 in 2007. But that does not mean we can slacken the pace. We need to press on as fast as we can with the enhanced modelling, and we need to agree a new timetable to which we are all committed, and which I can submit to our internal Programme Board. In particular, I remain under instructions to get results for a core scenario for MM in 2015 and R3/T6 (ideally in 2020) as soon as humanly possible. I will reflect that in a note to follow on model runs.

}
By David Gray

As a first step I would welcome the opportunity to have an early discussion with you on the timetable, in advance of any wider discussion with [redacted] /Martin Capstick and others (though you might want to involve [redacted]).

As it happens, our colleagues in the Government Offices are seeking a meeting here to discuss the surface access issues and interface with the London Plan and SE Plan. In that context they would quite like to get into some of the detail behind the modelled scenarios, although they appreciate this is very much at 'feasibility' level. Again, [redacted] may need to be involved in that. They have offered 2 November as a possible date (suggested start time 11am). If that were convenient, we might follow on with a discussion on the programme and timetable. Could you please get in touch to discuss/agree? Thanks.

David Gray
Project Manager
Project for the Sustainable Development of Heathrow
Aviation Environmental Division 3
Department for Transport
Zone 1/33 Great Minster House
76 Marsham Street
LONDON SW1P 4DR

T: 44-(0)20-7944-4961
F: 44-(0)20-7944-2189