



**Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise  
10th BOARD MEETING**

Wednesday 22 January 2020 at 2.00pm  
**Hilton Hotel, Gatwick Airport**

**Board members present:**

Robert Light, Head Commissioner  
Simon Kahn, Commissioner  
Simon Henley, Commissioner  
Howard Simmons, Commissioner  
Colin Noble, Commissioner  
Sam Hartley, Secretary to the Commission

**Other ICCAN staff in attendance:**

Stephen Cooke, Head of Communications and Engagement  
Andy Ginever, Business and Finance Manager  
Sheila Honey, Chief Analyst  
Emma Mead, Chief Analyst  
Emma Strahan, Private Secretary and Business Support Officer (Minutes)  
Stuart Dick, Analyst (presenting)  
Katherine Prentice, Analyst (presenting via Skype)

**Apologies:**

None

Item No	Agenda Item	Minutes	Actions Agreed
1	<b>Approval of previous minutes and matters arising</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Previous minutes formally approved.</li> <li>- Actions from last minutes all completed.</li> <li>- Declarations of interest: SK has been asked to carry out some work on the changes to the NEC arena and Birmingham Airport is a stakeholder that will need to be considered. The board agreed that this did not constitute a conflict of interest.</li> <li>SK was involved in the work on the consultation document for noise insulation offered by LHR. Board agreed that further discussion needs to be had about SK's involvement in the decision points about ICCAN's insulation work. As the item considered today was background and context only it was agreed there was no conflict of interest.</li> </ul>	

2	<b>Project Update: Insulation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SD presented his progress so far and plans going forwards for his work on insulation. The project is still ongoing and so there are no emerging or formal recommendations at this point.</li> <li>- RL noted that he feels that it was important that there was a consistent approach or best practice for everyone affected by aviation noise, no matter where in the UK they live. However, every airport has a different number of houses in their noise contours and consequently the cost will vary significantly.</li> <li>- RL also suggested that the ability to fund insulation could be one of the factors when decisions are made around expansion or growth at an airport.</li> <li>- Discussion held around where noise overlaps with planning regulations, specifically the Agent of Change Principle which was introduced in July 2018. RL expressed that it would be helpful to have some clear examples of where legislation applies and where it doesn't in different scenarios. This will help to make it clear to the communities and businesses around airports when people are entitled to insulation and from whom.</li> </ul> <p>Board discussion about the potential implications for developers if we were to make recommendations about the standards of insulation required for properties in the noise contours of airports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SD presented his expected outcomes from the project. SH(c) noted that we have to be careful to not recommend specific products as we could stray into commercial territory. SK suggested that we talk about product standards rather than specific products or their attributes.</li> <li>- CN suggested that we could say that the cumulative effect of all areas of household insulation should achieve a specific outcome/effect for the internal environment.</li> <li>- SK added that he feels the project outcome should set an approach or a performance standard around noise insulation. In addition, the project could produce guidance around where people should be eligible for noise insulation and at what level.</li> <li>- SH suggested that ICCAN could make recommendations around the assurance or governance of the scheme being offered, rather than asking questions around the certification of the person installing the product.</li> <li>- CN noted that we could follow existing ideas such as guidance to describe standards/assurance rather than products and certification (such as from Warmer Homes scheme).</li> </ul>	<b>None</b>
---	-----------------------------------	---	-------------

<p><b>Project Update: Insulation (cont)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SK noted that we have to avoid duplicate guidance or language from BS or ISO standards.</li> <li>- Both RL and SH(c) noted that when talking about noise insulation what we are looking for is products that deliver insulation to a standard that meets our assured outcomes.</li> <li>- RL noted that it was also important that we understand what the cost per airport would be of any recommendations we make and be prepared for the potential challenges that might come back from each airport.</li> <li>- SK noted that we need to be clear how any ICCAN standards were to be implemented i.e. with money, whole perimeter insulation, semi perimeter etc.</li> <li>- CN noted that we should also make it clear that if money was the preferred offer then the money goes to the property not the householder and all money spent must deliver insulation.</li> <li>- SH(c) noted that the potential cost implication for insulation will impact on business cases and so will bring the discussion around the impact of noise to the forefront.</li> <li>- The whole board agreed with the additional outcomes suggested by SD during his presentation.</li> <li>- RL added that he feels that each airport should hold a register of properties that have received insulation/compensation and that this register should be publicly available to search as this would be useful for people buying a house near an airport.</li> <li>- RL summarised the overall discussion by directing that the work around insulation should focus on standards for insulation.</li> <li>- SK suggested that we could perhaps partner with the Building Research Establishment (BRE) who could then issue standards or guidelines alongside our work.</li> <li>- RL recommended that we invite all UK airports to engage with our work on this.</li> <li>- RL also noted that we should be thinking about who is the most appropriate body to enforce our work and ensure that it is implemented.</li> <li>- SK requested that a risk be added of lack of satisfaction from stakeholders of our final recommendations.</li> <li>- RL asked if ICCAN can form an opinion as to whether we agree with the communities that aviation industry has to bear the cost of all of the insulation or if some of the responsibility for the cost would lie with another body. There is a clear risk that if aviation bears all the cost it will inevitably result in the cost per ticket being increased.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>None</b></p>
---	---	--

	<b>Project Update: Insulation (cont)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- RL requested that we add to the project risks that the ICCAN recommendations could potentially change the viability of an airport and therefore generate significant challenge for us.</li><li>- RL noted that we need to reflect on publication date due to these potential implications. Do we have time to test ideas/hold stakeholder focus groups perhaps?</li><li>- SH stated that this piece of work is intrinsically linked to our piece of work on regulation and so we will need to publish them at the same time.</li><li>- RL asked if ICCAN recommends a suite of noise metrics in our other project work then what will this mean for our work on insulation? Will it affect the outcomes? Board agreed that it shouldn't affect the outcomes, we just need to ensure we are clear in our final publications.</li></ul>	<b>None</b>
--	--	---	-------------

3	<b>Project Update: Noise Metrics</b>	<p>- KP presented her proposed recommendations for the project to the board.</p> <p>- These were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Noise metrics</i>            ICCAN is likely to recommend the continued use of LAeq. In addition, we are likely to recommend the use of supplementary Single Event metrics to enhance our understanding of noise annoyance e.g. Nx.            Suggestion for future ICCAN work: research into developing a suite of metrics to feed into future works e.g. NED design with airports (Heathrow).</li> <li>• <i>Noise monitoring and recording</i>            ICCAN will suggest that airports allow communities to request temporary noise monitoring.            Suggestion for future ICCAN work: produce best practice guides / tool kits for noise monitoring in partnership with credible partners and stakeholders. This guidance should be tailored to airport size, so costs are proportionate.</li> <li>• <i>Data Availability and Transparency</i>            ICCAN will support full data transparency at all levels including sharing of noise data with CAA, noise data published online, generated outputs (e.g. noise maps) to be shared online and online tools for exploring data e.g. postcode lookup tool            ICCAN will recommend that data should be published annually, especially data generated in relation to airspace change.            Suggestion for future ICCAN work: create a best practice guidance, which is scalable to airport size, covering data sharing and transparency plus publishing and communicating results</li> </ul> <p>- Full board agreement to all of these recommendations and the plans for future work.</p> <p>- RL suggested that we could run a workshop where we can allow the public to see how using different noise metrics with the same set of data produces different measurements and maps.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>None</b></p>
---	--	--	--

4	<p><b>Governance: Corporate Strategy Refresh</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AG presented a paper on the proposed ICCAN Corporate Strategy refresh, which will be a note of our progress against execution rather than a change in terms of direction.</li> <li>- SH(c) noted concerns that the nature of a strategy is that it sets a direction, it shouldn't change unless as a reaction to a major external incident.</li> <li>- SH noted that the document would be a reflection on what we have done so far, our plans for the future and some more transparency around our objectives and how we are meeting them.</li> <li>- SH(c) requested that we add a paragraph about our external context and the environment in which we are working.</li> <li>- Board agreed that in the publication timeline the updated strategy will be published last so we can say with absolute certainty that we have undertaken tasks such as publishing documents etc.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SC</b></p>
	<p><b>Governance: Budget Update</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AG presented the budget from this year and for the next financial year. ICCAN currently has a large underspend due to the delays in recruiting staff.</li> <li>- SH noted that the NAO might have to agree for us to carry over an uncommitted spend but DfT will try and assist us in progressing this.</li> <li>- Board discussion on how to address the underspend and if there was anything that should be included in this year's budget.</li> <li>- SH(c) asked if we could purchase some data sets from the CAA or airports which might help us with our work? In addition, SH(c) suggested we procure external agencies to do some areas of our work which would free up our capacity to progress our publications of recommendations.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>EM/SH(CAs)</b></p>
	<p><b>Governance: Risk Register Update</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AG presented the current risk register to the board.</li> <li>- The board requested the following amendments: Line 4 – need to increase the likelihood score for not delivering our work on time.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AG</b></p>

		<p>Line 7 – need to review the impact of if we don't deliver then we will suffer loss of credibility and potential loss of budget.</p> <p>Line 8 – need to lower the scores on this going forwards.</p> <p>Line 10 – need to add ringfenced monies to the mitigation and potentially remove the word insufficient as that suggests that we haven't costed our promised scope.</p> <p>Line 11 – amend mitigation column to 2020, do we need to develop a handling plan for our stakeholders, and do we need a plan for mitigating our reputational risk for when we start to challenge stakeholders?</p>	
5	<b>Communications and Engagement: Quarterly Comms Dashboard</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SC presented the communications and engagements update for the last quarter.</li> <li>- RL noted that we had gained good understanding of the work of ACCs by observing them around the country and asked if there is anything else to gain about their purpose/structure/best practice etc aside from increasing our knowledge on local issues? Should we concentrate on what the UKACC group are doing strategically across the UK?</li> </ul> <p>RL asked if we should be going to talk to some more community groups or are we seeing them at other meetings and this is not recorded?</p> <p>RL asked how do we increase our social media presence for those who aren't directly involved in noise work already.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The board asked for the commissioners to be provided with the list of MPs so that they can identify existing relationships that they can use.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion around holding an ICCAN reception where we invite MPs and discuss our strategic plans, highlighting the pieces of work that could have most impact or hold most interest for their constituencies.</p>	<b>SC</b>
6	<b>Heathrow NEDG – ICCAN Future Role</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SH noted that we had been observing the Heathrow Airport Limited (HAL) Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG) as observers, not as decision makers.</li> <li>- ICCAN will also provide an opinion on the process as a means of engagement and</li> </ul>	<b>SH</b>

		<p>consultation. ICCAN would also help to resolve any conflict by way of mediation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussions were ongoing with HAL on potential role for ICCAN in any scrutiny arrangements for the noise envelope, assuming HAL's application for expansion is granted.</li> <li>- RL and SK noted that it is important that we were mindful of ICCAN's potential future obligations of advising planning enquiries, ministers, and the SoS.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Board Forward Look and AOB</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RL noted that the board had a very positive meeting with the CAA board this morning and they were encouraged by the discussions.</li> <li>- RL noted that the Manston Airport decision has been deferred for a further three months but ICCAN ought to ensure that we are aware of the final decision that is made as this will be an influential DCO and there will be high interest in the outcomes and consequences.</li> <li>- SH gave feedback on recent meetings that have been attended: The European Commission meeting went well, there was interest in our work. The team have a very academic approach to their noise work, but good connections were made. ANEG meeting was noteworthy. Positive feedback received was received from both community and industry stakeholders about our SoNA report.</li> </ul>	
		<b>Date of next meeting: 26 February 2020 at 2pm, Woking office</b>	

Signed

**Robert Light**  
Head Commissioner

Actions Table

Item Number	Action	Owner
4	Add paragraph into Corporate Strategy about external environment context	SH
4	Purchase data from CAA and other sources	EM / SH (CAs)
4	Update Risk Register	AG
5	Provide the list of MPs to the commissioners	SC
6	Provide opinion on NEDG for its final report	SH