

# parliament

**23rd October 2001, Mr Todd, in a written question, asked the Secretary of State for Transport what assessment he had made of controls on night noise at UK airports.**

**Mr Jamieson replied,**

*'Controls on aircraft noise at night may be imposed voluntarily by the airport operator, in consultation with those affected. They may be subject of informal agreement, for example, with the relevant airport consultative committee, or of enforceable obligations under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or they may be the subject of planning conditions. At airports designated for the purposes of section 78 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982, controls may be set under that power: at present, only Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted are so designated.*

*In the consultation paper, "Control of noise from civil aircraft", published last year, we also proposed that the Secretary of State be given a new power to require a noise amelioration scheme to be made and*

*agreed with an appropriate local authority to address particular local issues. Responses to that consultation are being analysed and I hope to announce the outcome shortly.'*

**24th October 2001, Annabelle Ewing had asked the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport for a statement on her response to the recent judgment on late-night flights into Heathrow; what impact this decision has had on her Department's policy on bar licence hours; and what her policy is on late-night noise disturbance in city centres.**

**Dr. Howells replied,**

*'The Government is carefully studying the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of Hatton and Others v. the United Kingdom, and its possible implications for a range of issues including our policy on alcohol licensing hours. If appropriate, it will be carefully taken into account before a Bill to reform*

*the alcohol and public entertainment licensing laws is presented in Parliament.*

*Permitted licensing hours for licensed premises in England and Wales are set out in the Licensing Act 1964. Current policy on the reform of these laws provides that opening hours would be attached as a condition of individual premises licences. It also provides that local residents will have the right to object to the grant of a licence, or to apply for the hours of opening to be restricted, or to seek a review of an existing licence on grounds of public nuisance, including noise disturbance. Where the local authority denies such an objection, the objector would be entitled to appeal to the magistrates courts. In addition, on 1 December this year, we shall be bringing into force section 17 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 which provides new powers in England and Wales for the police to close instantly for up to 24 hours licensed premises which are causing disturbance to the general public as a result of excessive noise emitted from the premises.'*

**– more from parliament on page 32**

visit

**[www.multi-science.co.uk](http://www.multi-science.co.uk)**

**Serving Science & Technology since 1961**

**for more information on:**

**our latest offers  
our new titles  
our journals**

**cd-rom archives  
books  
on-line journals**

**ordering and subscriptions  
on-demand papers  
journal sample copies**

## logan airport

Boston's Logan Airport will shortly start assessing fees to airlines, rental car companies and bus lines to fund emissions reduction programs, becoming the nation's first airport to impose such a measure and leading the way for others around the country. The airport cannot ask airlines to reduce their nitrogen oxides because of Logan's notorious noise problems; less noisy airplanes emit higher rates of nitrogen oxide.

9. *Private Communication with Dr. Zhang Jiping, Environmental Protection Institute of Zhang Province, China.*
10. *National Standard for Occupational Noise, NOHSC-1007, 1993, Australian government Publishing Services, Australia.*
11. *National Code of Practice for Management and Protection of Hearing at work, NOSHC-2009, 1993, Australian Government Publishing Service, Australia.*
12. *Unfallallverhütungsvorschrift larm der berufsgenossenschaften, 1 December 1974, Verordnung über Arbeitsstätten, 20 March, 1974, Federal Republic of Germany.*
13. *Ontario Regulations for Industrial Establishment, RRO 1990, Regulation 581, Section 139(5), Ontario, Canada.*
14. *The Occupational Exposure Limits for Chemical and Physical Agents, 1998, The Ministry of labour, Republic of Korea.*
15. *Vietnam National Standard TCVN-3985, Noise – Allowable Levels at workplaces 1985, Vietnam.*
16. *US Department of Labour, Occupational Safety and Health Standards, Vol. 39, No. 125, Part-II, 1974, USA.*
17. *Vietnam National Standard (Draft) TCVN-3985 (1999), Acoustics – Allowable Noise Levels at Workplaces Vietnam.*

## parliament

**19th November 2001, In answer to a written question on guidelines for the maximum level of background noise in school classrooms,**

**Mr Timms replied,**

*'The Education (School Premises) Regulations 1999 state that*

*Each room or other space in a school building shall have the acoustic conditions and the insulation against disturbance by noise appropriate to its*

*normal use.'*

*For new school buildings, the Department has published Building Bulletin 87 "Guidelines for Environmental Design in Schools" in which*

*(a) Table 1a gives the recommended maximum background noise levels, from adjacent areas, ventilation and traffic noise, for various types of spaces found in schools. The figure quoted for*

*general teaching, seminar and tutorial rooms and classbases is 40 dB LA;eq, 1hr.*

*(b) In specialist accommodation for pupils with hearing impairments, in special schools and in special units in mainstream schools, the maximum background noise level should be at least 10 dB lower than the figures given in Table 1a.'*

# parliament

## – parliament continued from page 11

## – more from parliament on page 37

2. Infrasound radiated by the impeller with axial blade has obvious directivity along its axis. In other words, the radiation is beamed forward.
3. The infrasonic energy radiated by axial impeller increases according to the increment of rotational speeds of impeller. At low rotational speeds, infrasonic energy in higher frequencies increases greatly with the increment of the rotational speeds; whereas at high rotational speeds, accordingly as the increment of speeds, infrasonic energy in lower frequencies has an obvious increment.
4. The blade trail edge thickness of the impeller does not have significant influence on the general infrasound pressure level, whereas the alteration of the trail edge thickness may affect on the frequency construction.
5. The axial impeller with radial blades is helpful for infrasound reduction.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is supported by national key projects of China (Grant No. PD9521909).

## REFERENCES

1. Augustynska D. *Infrasonic noise emitted by flow machines. Its sources and reduction methods. Journal of low frequency noise and vibration. Vol.8, No.1, 1989.*
2. Backteman O. *Infrasound-Tutorial and review, Part 4, Journal of low frequency noise and vibration. Vol. 3, No.2, 1984.*
3. Huang QuBai. *Theory about blade rotation mechanics aerodynamic infrasound and acoustic features. HUST postdoctoral research reports, 1996.*

# parliament

## – parliament continued from page 32

### 20th November 2001, In the debate on Heathrow (Terminal 5)

The Secretary of State, Mr Stephen Byers said,

*'I am today publishing the inspector's report into Heathrow terminal 5, as well as my decision letter. Copies of both have been placed in the Library of the House. My decision and the reasons for it have been set out in the decision letter itself.*

*After considering the inspector's report and taking into account all the relevant considerations, I have today given my approval to the development of terminal 5 at Heathrow airport. Such a development is in the national interest. It will enable Heathrow to remain a world-class airport, and it will bring benefits to the British*

*economy. At the same time as giving my approval to the development, I have imposed conditions in order to protect the interests of those living in the vicinity of Heathrow airport.*

*First, a limit on the number of flights each year has been set at 480,000. The limit has been imposed on a precautionary basis, and because of the inspector's concerns about noise. It was recommended by the inspector himself. Last year, Heathrow handled some 460,000 flights and just under 65 million passengers. Even with a limit of 480,000 flights, the inspector adopted a figure of 90 million passengers each year as the capacity of Heathrow if terminal 5 is built – an extra 25 million passengers at Heathrow each year.*

*Secondly, the noise effects of terminal 5 will also be limited by a condition restricting the area enclosed by the 57-decibel noise contour to 145 sq km as from 2016. A gain, this follows the inspector's recommendation.*

*The inspector recommends stricter controls on night flights. I recognise that there is considerable concern about night noise, but I am not legally entitled to change the night noise regime without consultation. I shall consult on extending the night quota period when I next make proposals for the night noise regime for the BAA London airports. I have decided that the consultation will take place by 2003 at the latest.*

*The House should also be aware that we have already announced a change to the system of so-called westerly preference at*



Heathrow to reduce the number of night flights over built-up west London. That is in line with one of the inspector's recommendations. We have also announced a major research study to reassess attitudes to aircraft noise. That will permit a fresh look at the present LEQ noise index on which the inspector commented.

Secondly, Members will know of the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights, delivered on 2 October this year, in the case of *Hatton and others against the United Kingdom*. The case concerned night noise at Heathrow, and the court held by a majority that there had been an infringement of the European convention on human rights. I am considering that judgment, which will not become final until at least three months after its delivery. Quite apart from my decision on terminal 5, I will of course wish to ensure that the night noise regime at Heathrow complies with the convention.'

## **7th February 2002, In answer to a written question on Government plans to reduce noise pollution in the UK, Mr Meacher replied,**

'Much has been done to address noise from transport and industry: reducing the level of noise generated by individual vehicles and aircraft; traffic management schemes; resurfacing roads with low noise surfaces; and addressing noise at the planning stage of new noise generation or noise sensitive developments. Such action has considerably reduced the output of noise from individual sources but has often failed to reduce the overall ambient noise because of other factors, such as the growth in the number of vehicles on our roads. We are developing a strategic approach to build on the progress already made. A consultation seeking views on the first steps towards an Ambient Noise Strategy in England was launched on 20 December last year. A significant part of this strategic approach will be an exercise to build on the noise mapping already carried out of the major transport and industrial noise sources across

England. The first stage of this exercise, for which £13 million has been set aside, will start later this year. The strategy will also act as a foundation to the implementation of the forthcoming European directive on the assessment and management of environmental noise which will address ambient noise across the whole of the UK.'

## **11 February 2002, In response to a question from Mr Wray to the Secretary of State for Transport,**

**Mr Spellar answered,**

'Aircraft noise "at source" is regulated according to the certification requirements of the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO). Operational noise is subject to rules and procedures set by each airport. Controls available to airports include noise preferential routes for departures, departure noise limits, approach procedures, night restrictions and noise-differentiated charges.

The Secretary of State has powers to designate an airport under s.80 for the purposes of s. 78 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982, under which noise controls can be set. At present, Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted airports are so designated. He may also specify an aerodrome under s.5 of the 1982 Act, requiring the CAA to have regard to environmental factors in its licensing functions; hitherto no aerodrome has been so specified.

The air transport White Paper, which we intend to publish later this year, will deal with the future direction of policy on aircraft noise regulation.'

## **12 February 2002, Margaret Moran had asked the Secretary of State for Transport to set out the Department's policy on noise insulation for schools in respect of areas where (a) noise insulation regulations apply and (b) noise barriers are to be installed in a discretionary scheme by the Highways Agency.**

**Mr Jamieson replied,**

'the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 apply to dwellings and other buildings used for residential purposes that are affected by a new or substantially altered road. Schools do not fall within this definition of residential use. However, residential accommodation belonging to schools may qualify for insulation.

The criteria for the Highways Agency to apply in considering the need for additional noise barriers that could be provided under the discretionary powers within the Highways Act was answered to the House in a written answer on 22 March 1999, Official Report, volume 328, columns 50-51.

The assessment of need in these cases has been based on the number of residential properties affected, in order to remain consistent with the application of the noise insulation regulations to highway improvement schemes.'

## **26th February 2002, Speaking in support of the National Aviation Capacity Expansion Act, Illinois Representative Mr Lipinski pointed out that his proposal not only envisaged modernisation of Chicago's O'Hare International Airport, but also construction of a new south suburban airport and keeping Chicago's downtown general aviation airport open for another 25 years.**

**He added,**

'This agreement also addresses traffic congestion along O'Hare's northwest corridor, including western airport access, and maintains the quality of life for residents near these airports. Clearly, the environment and airport noise should not be afterthoughts as this agreement will reduce by half the number of people impacted by noise, and it includes \$450 million in funds for soundproofing. In addition, as the U.S. aviation system completes its move to quieter Stage 4 aircraft, airport noise will be reduced.'