

Environment Committee

Scrutiny of the Mayor's Draft Noise Strategy

October 2002



Chair's foreword



I very much welcome this strategy as a brave first step at tackling such a complicated and important area. Noise in various forms affects a great many people in the capital. One survey has estimated that 44% of all London households have experienced problems with noise – in other words, a significant proportion of Londoners.

Ambient noise is the background hubbub that forms the backdrop to city life. Many things contribute to it: road traffic, building sites, railways and aeroplanes are some of the main culprits. In this report, we concentrate on three areas: road traffic noise, aircraft noise and noise from late night entertainment.

We all know that a certain level of background noise is the price we pay for the convenience and excitement of living in one of the world's busiest cities. But noise can have a dramatic and damaging effect on our quality of life. Living near a busy road can cause sleepless nights and increased stress levels. Some recent studies even suggest that children exposed over long periods to severe noise pollution can perform less well at school. Noise can get in the way of speech, concentration and social activities.

In tackling noise, we recognise that the Mayor will need to work with local councils, airports and airlines, railway companies, developers and others to agree a joint programme for monitoring, controlling and (where possible) reducing noise disturbance levels in the capital. Some councils are already tackling these issues head on: Camden with entertainment noise, Bexley with traffic noise and Hounslow with aircraft noise. I applaud their efforts. Tackling the issue of resources was evident in their work. Coordinating the current and future resources available is vital. I consider the idea of Entertainment Management Zones and environment funds to support them to be of merit and I hope the Mayor will take this work further at the next step of this Strategy.

My main criticism of the Noise Strategy is that it does not describe which measures will have the best effects and, crucially, which measures should take priority. This is not the first time that the Assembly has had to remind the Mayor of the need for tough decisions on priorities. My colleagues on the Assembly Environment Committee will be pressing for a more detailed action plan on ambient noise. The current draft Strategy – not much more than a wish list at the moment – is little use without one.

We would like to thank all those who helped in the formulation of this report with special thanks to those who let us into their homes so we could hear first-hand the noise they experience every day.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Samantha Heath'.

Samantha Heath
Chair of the London Assembly Environment Committee

The Committee

The London Assembly agreed at its meeting on 8 May 2002 the following membership for its Environment Committee in 2002/2003:

Samantha Heath (Chair)	Labour
Roger Evans (Deputy Chair)	Conservative
Brian Coleman	Conservative
Nicky Gavron	Labour
Darren Johnson	Green
Graham Tope	Liberal Democrat

At the 10 April 2002 meeting of the London Assembly, the Environment Committee's terms of reference were agreed:

To examine and report from time to time on -

- the strategies, policies and actions of the Mayor and the Functional Bodies
- matters of importance to Greater London

as they relate to the environment and sustainable development in London

To examine and report to the Assembly from time to time on the Mayor's Air Quality, Biodiversity, Energy, Noise and Waste Strategies, in particular their implementation and revision

To consider environmental matters on request from another standing committee and report its opinion to that standing committee

To take into account in its deliberations the cross cutting themes of: the health of persons in Greater London; and the promotion of opportunity

To respond on behalf of the Assembly to consultations and similar processes when within its terms of reference.

Executive Summary

The Mayor has prepared the first draft of a Strategy designed to minimise the impact of ambient noise on those living and working in London. We consider the Strategy to be comprehensive and well researched. The range of noise issues reported and the relative importance of each are fairly presented in the Strategy.

This report concentrates on issues in four areas:

- Prioritisation, implementation and funding
- Road traffic noise
- Aircraft noise
- Neighbourhood and entertainment noise.

A summary of our findings in these areas is:

Prioritisation, implementation and funding

- The Mayor should expand the advice given in the Strategy on setting priorities so that more guidance is given on which noise abatement solutions are most appropriate in particular contexts
- The Mayor must work with London Boroughs to share best practice and to work effectively to obtain any funding flowing from the National Noise Strategy
- The Mayor should ensure that the GLA coordinates the initiatives to be undertaken by different Boroughs and that adequate monitoring is carried out so that the effectiveness of the measures can be compared and the results reported to all of the Boroughs.

Road traffic noise

- The Mayor should look at the noise impacts of the Congestion Charging Scheme as part of his environmental monitoring of the initiative
- The Mayor should ensure that residents and Boroughs are fully consulted by Transport for London (TfL) on the noise implications of bus routes and the location of bus stops
- The Mayor should encourage more active enforcement by the Metropolitan Police to reduce excess noise from vehicles, and in particular motorcycles
- The Mayor should ensure that noise reduction is included in TfL's Business Plan and that there is separate budget provision identified for noise implementation measures
- The Mayor should ensure that TfL provides sufficient funding for the implementation of road noise reduction measures so that Londoners who experience road noise are treated equally with those living in the rest of the country.

Aircraft noise

- The Committee will support the Mayor on the current work regarding the possibility of banning night flights and in the meantime is against any increase in the number of night flights
- The Mayor should work with Boroughs to seek to impose strict conditions on residential development to minimise exposure to noise for residents
- Greater clarity is required in the Strategy to show how the London Area Environment Fund will operate alongside other schemes
- The Mayor and Assembly should consider the impact the various options for airport expansion in southeast England would have on noise levels in London, when responding to the SERAS Study. This should include the improvement of aircraft design, the angle of approach of aircraft, the easterly and westerly direction of flights and the location of aircraft being stacked in the sky before landing
- The Committee would urge the Mayor to support the European Community's Directive 2002/30/EC regarding aviation noise management and lobby the Department for Transport and British Aviation Authority to implement the provisions in the Directive
- The British Aviation Authority should invite representation from the Assembly on the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee.

Neighbourhood and entertainment noise

- We support entertainment management zones as proposed in the draft London Plan and the Mayor should proceed with this proposal
- The Mayor should discuss with the Association of London Government (ALG) and other stakeholders the possibility of setting up a local Environment Fund, with contributions from licensees, to assist with the implementation of Entertainment Management Zones.

Table of contents

		Page
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Prioritisation, implementation and funding	2
Chapter 3	Road traffic noise	4
Chapter 4	Aircraft noise	9
Chapter 5	Neighbourhood and entertainment noise	15
Annex A	Recommendations	18
Annex B	Strategies in other countries	20
Annex C	Health Impact Assessment of the draft Noise Strategy	24
Annex D	Evidentiary hearing and site visits	25
Annex E	Written evidence	26
Annex F	Further information, orders and translations	27
Annex G	Scrutiny principles	28

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Under the GLA Act 1999 the Mayor is required to prepare a Strategy to address the problem of noise in London and seek to minimise it for the well being of those working and living in London. This Strategy, the Mayor's London Ambient Noise Strategy, considers noise from sources that can be broadly categorised as arising from transportation and from industrial processes. The Mayor's Strategy is part of a Europe-wide move towards more active management of urban noise, particularly as ongoing outdoor noise is a problem in much of London and in many other major cities. The Strategy can be downloaded from the Internet via: <http://www.london.gov.uk/approot/mayor/strategies/noise/index.jsp>
- 1.2 The Strategy will be useful in informing the Government's forthcoming national noise strategy. The Strategy will, in turn, need to be reviewed in the light of the completed national strategy. The London Borough of Camden, which has prepared its own noise strategy, is concerned at the slow timetable proposed by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) for the development of the national noise strategy and hope that the development of the Mayor's Strategy will help accelerate national policy development.¹
- 1.3 The Mayor issued the Assembly and Functional Bodies Draft of his Ambient Noise Strategy in July 2002. The Mayor is currently consulting the London Assembly and the Functional Bodies on his draft Noise Strategy. He will take account of their comments before issuing a further draft of the Strategy for public consultation between January and April 2003. This report is the London Assembly's response to the Strategy.
- 1.4 In conducting its scrutiny of the Mayor's draft Ambient Noise Strategy, the London Assembly's Environment Committee interviewed the Mayor, gathered written evidence from a wide range of organisations including the boroughs, and went on three site visits to discuss with local authorities and residents the problems associated with noise:
- From road traffic on the A2 in Bexley
 - From entertainment in Covent Garden and Soho
 - From aircraft above Hounslow, near Heathrow airport.
- 1.5 The Mayor's Strategy refers to "ambient" noise as environmental noise. It looks at long term noise emitted by road traffic, rail traffic, air traffic, water transport and from sites of industrial activity. However there are sections in the strategy that also cover neighbourhood and entertainment noise. The scope of the strategy as defined in the GLA Act is to minimise the impact of noise.
- 1.6 The Committee would like to thank those who provided evidence whether in writing or in person, the residents and local authorities involved in the three site visits, and the consultants Arup Acoustics who provided technical advice to the Committee during the course of its scrutiny.

¹ Memorandum – LB Camden

2. Prioritisation, implementation and funding

Setting Priorities

- 2.1 The Strategy contains a large amount of advice on best practice for the control of noise, but not all such best practice will be appropriate for a particular situation. Any local noise control strategy must be appropriately directed to target the most significant problem areas. Boroughs may need further guidance on how to select the most effective approach from the variety on offer. The London Borough of Bexley informed the Committee on its site visit to Bexley that the Mayor and Transport for London should set priorities and provide more guidance on which noise abatement solutions are most appropriate for different sections of a major road, such as the A2.

Implementation and Funding

- 2.2 The implementation of the Mayor's Strategy will require communication between the GLA and national government, and the GLA and boroughs. The GLA will encourage local government to consider the advice contained in the Strategy, but there will need to be further support provided to the boroughs to implement the measures.
- 2.3 Both the London Boroughs of Brent² and Newham³ have stated in their evidence that they would like to see a timeframe for the implementation of the policies and defined performance measures and actions for the Strategy so that progress can be properly monitored and reported locally and London wide.
- 2.4 As supported in the comments made by the Association of London Government, there would seem to be great benefit in securing funding for pilot projects designed to test initiatives to minimise various noise problems. The London Borough of Newham points out that the Strategy does not set out the level of resources to be allocated to boroughs or an indication of costings. Many of the proposals set out schemes which require boroughs to lobby the Government for extra finance. Significant resources will need to be allocated to both Planning and Environmental Health departments in Boroughs for successful implementation. The GLA would have a role here, not only to obtain funding for pilot projects, but also to coordinate the initiative to be undertaken by different participating boroughs and ensure that adequate monitoring is carried out so that the effectiveness of the measures can be compared. At the end of the trials, the GLA would assimilate the success of each initiative and report the results to all of the boroughs. Noise-mapping information would assist in this monitoring process.
- 2.5 It is important that the Mayor works effectively with boroughs to secure any funding from Government as a result of the National Noise Strategy.

² Memorandum – LB Brent

³ Memorandum – LB Newham

2.6 Camden Council is also adopting a Noise Strategy which takes a similar approach to the Mayor's. The aims of their strategy are:

- To reduce people's exposure to noise as much as possible, using the ALARA principle - As Low As Reasonably Achievable;
- To give priority to those experiencing highest levels of noise or at most antisocial times;
- To achieve Noise Directive/WHO limits as minimum standards for exposure;
- To encourage noise prevention wherever possible rather than trying to cure problems that have already occurred;
- To raise awareness of noise issues amongst local residents and businesses;
- In parts of the Borough where noise levels are low, to preserve the tranquillity of such area;
- To reduce noise levels in open spaces to minimise effects of noise on wildlife.

Recommendation 1:

The Mayor should expand the advice given in the Strategy on setting priorities so that more guidance is given on which noise abatement solutions are most appropriate in particular contexts.

Recommendation 2:

The Mayor must work with Boroughs to share best practice and to work effectively to obtain any funding flowing from the National Noise Strategy.

Recommendation 3:

The Mayor should ensure that the GLA coordinates the initiatives to be undertaken by different Boroughs and that adequate monitoring is carried out so that the effectiveness of the measures can be compared and that the results are reported to all of the Boroughs.

3. Road traffic noise

3.1

Site Visit 1: Road Traffic Noise from A2 Bexley

The Committee visited five locations on the A2 in Bexley with representatives from the London Borough of Bexley, the A2 Noise Action Group and local residents. The Committee witnessed at close hand some of the problems faced by local residents living in close proximity to the A2 and discussed the issues with Bexley Council and the Noise Action Group.

The Committee were informed that Transport for London (TfL) had introduced a 50mph speed limit, the inside lane was reserved for local traffic and the quieter road surfacing programme had begun. Bexley had also written to the Department of Transport (DOT) regarding the implementation of noise barriers.

TfL⁴ have acknowledged that they do not have any separately identified budget provision for addressing noise. They work to address noise amelioration through a number of projects and noise impact is considered in the planning, development and operation of the transport system. It is important that they prioritise the work that is required. It was suggested that they should begin with sections of the TfL Road Network that are the busiest and have houses close to the road. It was mentioned that it was important that a variety of noise reduction measures were used depending on the location and the amount of space available between the road and the houses. The measures would include quieter road surfacing, speed limits, noise barriers, fencing and the planting of trees and shrubs.

The Committee were told that the Highways Agency provided more funding per mile for noise reduction measures on the M20 in Kent than TfL provided funding per mile on the A2 in Bexley. It is important that the Mayor ensures that there is equity between the funding for noise reduction measures in London with the rest of the United Kingdom.

The Committee subsequently questioned the Mayor on 5 September about TfL's budget for noise measures, their targets for delivering noise reduction, their priorities for noise implementation and the decrease in the number of speed cameras on the A2. The minutes can be read at:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/approot/assembly/envmtgs/2002/envsep5/envsep5mins.pdf>

- 3.2 The problem of road traffic noise can be divided into two categories: continuous traffic noise generated by large volumes of traffic, and specific noise events related to individual vehicles (acceleration, braking noise, body rattle noise etc). To control overall traffic noise the source noise might be reduced by limiting the volume or speed of the traffic, or by increasing the proportion of quieter vehicles. Alternatively, screening may be introduced to reduce the noise levels. To reduce the volume of traffic sufficiently to give a noticeable reduction in traffic noise would require radical measures. Significant speed reductions may be problematic on major routes, as this might impact on road capacity in some cases.

⁴ Transport for London - Memorandum

- 3.3 Low noise surfaces can have noticeable benefits, particularly on higher speed roads. Any opportunities for screening busy roads should be taken, either by use of purpose built noise barriers or by design of roadside buildings or other structures to offer continuous screening to protect noise sensitive areas behind.
- 3.4 The UK Noise Association is concerned that the traffic targets in the Mayor's Transport Strategy are unlikely to be tough enough to cut noise on main roads significantly. They also suggest that the Mayor needs to assess the implications of new road building on noise and in particular the proposed new river crossings in East London which could lead to an increase in noise levels in the most deprived areas of London.⁵

Measures for road traffic noise control

- 3.5 Paragraph 4A.7 in the Draft Noise Strategy lists the measures to be addressed to control traffic noise. We would suggest that tree planting is also included in this list. Although it is not stated that these measures are listed in order of relative importance, the order in which they are presented will inevitably imply this. It is suggested therefore that these items should be listed in order of typical importance (i.e. taking account of likely impact of the measure, practicability and cost). Of course the effectiveness of the measure will depend on the local conditions. However, in general terms, the order might be:

- Noise reducing surfaces*;
- Noise barriers, landform and structures*;
- Tree planting where appropriate*;
- Quieter vehicles;
- Traffic reducing, street space allocation and routing*;
- Quieter, smoother and safer driving;
- Better street works and street maintenance*;
- Spatial planning and urban design*;
- Building insulation;
- Area based noise reduction schemes (in neighbourhoods and town centres), the design of public space, and the promotion of other modes of transport (principally walking and cycling)*.

The measures marked with an asterisk are those for which the Mayor has responsibility. The measures not marked with an asterisk are the Government's responsibility.

- 3.6 The Committee's site visit to Bexley highlighted the need for TfL to prioritise the implementation of these noise reduction measures in different areas along the A2.

⁵ Memorandum – UK Noise Association

Congestion charging impacts

- 3.7 The Strategy states that the level of traffic outside the 07:00 – 18:30 congestion charging period is not likely to increase significantly (i.e. due to users avoiding the charge). There might be an incentive for other deliveries and collections to take place early in the morning or late in the evening. Given the density of residential and commercial premises in Central London, such ‘out of hours’ deliveries could cause additional disturbance.

Uneven roads and noise from buses

- 3.8 The Strategy makes the point that uneven road surfaces contribute to noise generated by buses. It should be noted that relative to commercial vehicles buses are in fact less likely to generate body noise which is more associated with commercial vehicles with loose body fittings and non-isolated steel suspension systems. Most modern buses are fitted with air suspension units and air braking system silencers are available. If these systems can be safely deployed on buses, the impact of this source of noise can be substantially diminished. High levels of impulsive air brake noise can be a significant issue for residents living close to a bus stop. We have heard from the London Borough of Greenwich, amongst others, who have confirmed that there is currently no consultation with local residents about proposed bus routes or bus stops.⁶ Assembly Members have also experienced this while conducting their casework. It is important that TfL consults with boroughs and residents on these matters.

Noise enforcement for motorcycles and other vehicles

- 3.9 The Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) has confirmed that “enforcement of non-life threatening issues is not amongst the MPS' priorities. The MPA is likely to support the Mayor's position in dealing primarily with noise reduction at source rather than enforcement and not calling for greater police action on the matter.”⁷
- 3.10 There is a particular problem with motorcycle noise. Measures to encourage motorcyclists to keep road-legal silencers on their machines are discussed in the strategy. Although there is clearly a valuable role for educating riders to be more noise aware, active enforcement by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) is also important. Motorcycle noise was ranked 8th of the 24 categories of noise associated with traffic identified in the BRE National Noise Incidence Survey (2000), with an estimated 13% of the Greater London population being bothered, annoyed or disturbed by motorcycle noise. Much of this problem is due to motorcycles having illegal or no silencers. Despite this, a relatively small number of penalty tickets are issued for this offence across London (see Box 20 of Strategy). For the period 1 November 1999 to 30 June 2001 only 21 fixed penalty tickets were issued in London for motorcycles with no silencer.

⁶ Memorandum – LB Greenwich

⁷ Memorandum – Metropolitan Police Authority

- 3.11 The London Borough of Bexley provided the Committee with the following information from a 1995 comparison of 24 hour traffic flows for the A2 in Bexley with those on motorways linked to the M25:

Road	No. of vehicles (24 hrs)
M1	100,000-130,000
M3	100,000-130,000
M4/A308(M)	100,000-130,000
M40	100,000-130,000
A2	95,000-100,000
M11	70,000-100,000
M23	70,000-100,000
M2	50,000-70,000
A1(M)	50,000-70,000
M20	30,000-50,000
M26	30,000-50,000

This table shows that the amount of traffic on the A2 can reach higher levels than traffic on some major motorways in Britain.

- 3.12 The Committee has highlighted that TfL should include noise reduction in their Business Plan and that they should also identify separate budget provision for it. Transport for London have been doing some work in this area and have included a section on ambient noise in their Environmental Action Plan 2002. They have said that they will help to reduce traffic and transport noise through:
- Working with the Boroughs and local communities living adjacent to the TfL Road Network to develop a plan to reduce traffic noise in the worst areas and produce a report on this issue by December 2002;
 - Making use of cost effective low noise road surfaces and vehicles, carrying out sample measurements of noise, designing traffic management measures and adopting cost effective operating techniques to minimise noise; and,
 - Promoting noise reduction on the rail network.

Recommendation 4:

The Mayor should look at the noise impacts of the Congestion Charging Scheme as part of his environmental monitoring of the initiative.

Recommendation 5:

The Mayor should ensure that residents and boroughs are fully consulted by TfL, in particular on noise implications of bus routes and the location of bus stops.

Recommendation 6:

The Mayor should encourage more active enforcement by the Metropolitan Police to reduce excess noise from vehicles, and in particular motorcycles.

Recommendation 7:

The Mayor should ensure that noise reduction is included in TfL's Business Plan and that separate budget provision is identified for noise implementation measures.

Recommendation 8:

The Mayor should ensure that TfL provides sufficient funding for the implementation of road noise reduction measures so that Londoners who experience road noise are treated equally with those living in the rest of the country.

4. Aircraft noise

4.1

Site Visit 2: Aircraft Noise, Hounslow

The Committee met at Hounslow with representatives from the Heathrow Association for the Control of Aircraft Noise (HACAN Clear Skies), local residents, the London Borough of Hounslow and Alan Keen MP to discuss the issues of aircraft noise in southwest London. They discussed issues such as night flights, the measurement of aircraft noise, alternation of flights and the Government's consultation on the expansion of aviation services over the next thirty years.

HACAN emphasized that they were not against Heathrow airport but did not want any further expansion there. They would like to see a ban on night flights, they are opposed to a third runway at Heathrow and they feel that it is essential that the alternation of flights from both runways at Heathrow continues. They also said that the published noise readings were an average figure which included quiet periods. Therefore, they claimed that the actual noise problem was worse than the average noise reading suggested. They agree with the Mayor that the Government should look into finding better methods of measuring noise. The Aviation Environment Federation has also supported a review of noise measurement and how it is used in their written evidence to the Committee.

It was mentioned that the Department of Transport only measured noise from aircraft during the hours of 7am-11.30pm. However, a significant amount of aircraft land between 6am-7am and the noise generated from this was not included in the measurements. As far as we could establish, the DOT has not provided any satisfactory reasons for this practice. Therefore, it is important that the Mayor seeks clarification on this from the DOT when responding to the Government consultation.

It was also mentioned that residents would suffer from increased road traffic noise as well as aircraft noise if Heathrow airport were expanded.

- 4.2 We understand that there is a need for economic growth but this should not be at the expense of quality of life, which is essential for Londoners. We have taken into account a lot of evidence on this matter and we need to ensure that there are tougher regulations in place at London's airports to reduce the effect of aircraft noise on the large population of London.
- 4.3 Of the five London airports, Luton, Stansted, Gatwick, London City and Heathrow, it is the last that most directly affects the noise environment of the Capital. The DOT has published figures of the areas and numbers of people exposed to noise from aircraft to Heathrow, based on an average 16 hour day (0700-2300). In 2000, they state that 603,000 people, mostly in London, were exposed to aircraft noise of 54dBL and 307,000 were exposed to aircraft noise of 57dBL. The 57 dBL contour is the level used by DOT for annual monitoring of noise at the three designated airports (Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted). DOT typically refers to 57dBL as the 'onset of significant community annoyance'. A 3-year Government-funded study is in progress, which includes examining its current validity. The level of 57 dBL is also used as one of the thresholds in Planning Policy Guidance Note 24.

Some argue for 54dBL, referring to the World Health Organisation (WHO) Guidelines for Community Noise, in which 55 dBL is the threshold for 'serious annoyance, daytime and evening' and 50 dBL is the threshold for 'moderate annoyance, daytime and evening'. The WHO Guidelines do not themselves specify 54 dBL as a value to be used in connection with aircraft noise. In the current SERAS study, 54 dBL contours are included as a sensitivity test. There are a number of complicating factors in comparing values for different purposes, such as ground reflection effects, which are different for aircraft as opposed to road or rail. It is, of course, necessary to bear in mind the wide variation in individual responses. There are some people well outside either a 54 dBL or 57 dBL contour who would report annoyance.

Setting of priorities

- 4.4 The Mayor sets out his intention to urge all parties to reduce the overall impact of aircraft noise on affected communities. It is very important to be clear about how this reduction in overall impact is to be defined. Is it to be just a measure of reduction in noise exposure of an area, or is it the number of dwellings and people actively exposed in an area that is to be considered? There is then the question of equivalence of exposure. That is to say, is a saving of 100 people in the higher noise zones of greater 'value' than an increase of 500 people in a lower exposure value?

Increasing demand for air traffic

- 4.5 The context of the relationship of Heathrow and London is illustrated well in the Mayor's draft Strategy. 60 million passengers and 1.1 million tonnes of freight passed through the airport in 2001. A fifth terminal will be built which will allow growth to 90 million annual passengers. However, limitations have been put by the Government on this growth, flights will be limited to 480,000 per year and the area contained within the 57dBL contour is not to exceed 145 square kilometres by 2016.
- 4.6 In planning terms this contour delineates the area outside of which the noise from aircraft would not be a planning issue (PPG24 Annex 1). Within this contour aircraft noise would progressively become more of a consideration when determining planning action in relation to new residential development. It is at this level of exposure that annoyance with exposure to aircraft noise begins to be felt.
- 4.7 Some recent studies of UK airports identify the need for a significant increase in the capacity of the London facilities and suggest that an additional runway is required at London Heathrow. Such an increase would, all other things being equal, increase the size of the area exposed to landing aircraft noise and, by virtue of the density of population to the east of the airport, increase the population exposed to aircraft noise. A similar situation would arise from aircraft departing from Heathrow even though the flight paths may not be so constrained.
- 4.8 Heathrow has its permission to develop Terminal 5 and also has an upper limit placed upon the extent of the noise footprint that the airport generates. The Inspector at the Inquiry said that the total number of aircraft movements at Heathrow must be strictly controlled and a realistic contour cap imposed together with effective controls on movements at night. He did not believe that banning all night flights except for emergencies was a realistic solution in the short term. In his view, a progressive improvement in the night noise climate could be achieved through the existing system while working towards the long-term objective of removing the need for night flights.

- 4.9 The angle of approach of planes, easterly and westerly direction of flights and location of planes being stacked in the sky before landing, all have an impact on the noise experience by people at ground level. Up until now any changes to flight patterns would have been seen as detrimental to aviation in the south-east. This needs to be taken into account by the South East Regional Air Services (SERAS) study before any decisions by Government are made on aviation.
- 4.10 The Mayor has confirmed that he would like to see a ban on all night flights, a view which is supported by HACAN Clear Skies⁸ and the Association of London Government (ALG)⁹. The Civil Aviation Authority¹⁰ (CAA) argues that there are benefits and costs involved in the operation of night flights but feel that the Mayor's strategy has not provided a justifiable reason for banning night flights. This Committee would support the current work regarding the possibility of banning night flights. In the meantime the Committee would be against any increase in the number of night flights.
- 4.11 HACAN Clearskies is concerned about the Mayor's support for airport expansion in and around London and suggests that he commissions an independent study into the economic need for such expansion. The British Aviation Authority¹¹ (BAA) supports the Mayor's wish to see an equitable balance between the impacts of the aviation industry and the benefits that it brings to London and the UK.
- 4.12 The London Assembly will be responding to the SERAS Study, which is part of the Government's consultation on the expansion of aviation services over the next thirty years, by the end of November 2002.
- 4.13 The Committee has been informed about the work of BAA's Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HACC). The Mayor has a representative on the Committee. The Environment Committee feels that it is important for the Assembly also to be represented on the HACC so that they can discuss aviation issues and raise concerns on behalf of Londoners.

Development controls

- 4.14 The responsibility for overall aviation policy lies with the UK Government. The Mayor's power over new airport facilities within the GLA area relates mainly to strategic development control and in securing more sustainable surface access arrangements. However, the GLA Act requires any provider of an air navigation service to consult with the Mayor on specified alterations or additions to routes or procedures which would have a significant adverse impact on noise.
- 4.15 Within the constraints and conflicting demands set out above, Policy 38 sets out the Mayor's intentions to urge the decision makers, ranging from the Government to local authorities in their planning roles, to work to minimise the impact of aviation in London. The Mayor should work with boroughs to impose strict conditions on residential development to minimise exposure to noise for residents.

⁸ Memorandum – HACAN Clearskies

⁹ Memorandum – ALG

¹⁰ Memorandum – CAA

¹¹ Memorandum – BAA

Quantification of aircraft noise

- 4.16 The issues that are included in the reduction of noise impact are not all within the control of the Mayor or indeed any one national government. The issue of quieter aircraft and the reduction of aircraft numbers can only be addressed on an international basis. Noise abatement and operational procedures are the responsibility of the CAA. The question of restrictions on aircraft usage would not be a matter for the Mayor. However the Mayor has included these matters into his policy so as to add his support and encouragement for the development of quieter aircraft. Similarly the Mayor would urge those involved with the regulation of Heathrow to use incentives and penalties so as to encourage the use of quieter aircraft. The ALG and London City Airport¹² supports the “polluter pays” principle which has been successfully applied at that airport since 1987. Airbus have stated that these issues are being actively addressed at both the EU level and internationally through the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), which is to establish new more stringent standards, revised operating procedures (in the case of noise) and to consider charging schemes to provide an incentive for the use of more efficient products.
- 4.17 The Strategy suggests using proceeds from “Polluter pays” levies or charges to establish a London Area Environment Fund. This would be used for noise mitigation and/or compensation, and other environmental action. However, London City Airport is not clear how the establishment and funding for the “London Area Environment Fund” will interface with other established and privately financed Noise Management Schemes particularly at that airport. The ALG is also not sure about the purpose of the London Area Environment Fund.

Quieter aircraft and aircraft numbers

- 4.18 The draft discusses the manner in which aircraft noise is quantified and the relative weighting that should be applied to the noise level. The energy averaging method currently employed results in a 1 dB reduction noise exposure for a 25% reduction in flights. Criticism is also levelled against the present method in that it averages the energy exposure over the 16 hours between 07.00 and 23.00 and could be said to ‘dilute’ the effect of single noisy events. The Assembly agrees with the Mayor (Policy 41) that there is merit in reviewing the aircraft noise index presently used in the UK. The review should encompass issues related to sleep and be periodically reassessed. It should be noted that changes in a noise index would not reduce actual noise exposure.
- 4.19 It is important that the environmental performance of aircraft is improved to reduce air and noise pollution. HACAN made the point that they believe that there would be very little improvement in the technology to produce quieter aircraft over the next twenty years. However, Airbus¹³ have mentioned in their written evidence that the requirement to reduce noise levels around airports has been a major driver for most recent aircraft designs and they expect that it could significantly influence future designs. We believe that the South East Regional Air Services Study (SERAS), as part of the Government’s consultation on the expansion of aviation services, must be an important driver for seeking to improve aircraft design.

¹² Memorandum – London City Airport

¹³ Memorandum – Airbus

European Union Directive – 2002/30/EC on the rules and procedures for introducing noise related operating restrictions at community airports

- 4.20 On 28 March 2002, the European Parliament Directive 2002/30/EC regarding the rules and procedures for introducing noise related operating restrictions at community airports came into force. Member states, including the United Kingdom, have until 28 September 2003 to implement the provisions in the Directive. The Department of Transport (DOT) will be considering, after consultation with other organisations, how best to implement the detailed requirements of the Directive.
- 4.21 The Directive establishes an EU-wide approach to the control of aircraft noise at and around airports. The directive also establishes a common approach to the assessment of the current and future noise climate and of the possible effects of a range of measures with the goal of providing environmental benefits in the most cost effective way. Where necessary, airports may require marginally compliant aircraft [i.e., those that meet the "Chapter 3" noise certification standard by a margin of 5dB (decibels) or less] to be withdrawn from service to that airport over a period of not less than 5 years.
- 4.22 The Directive repeals the "hushkits" Regulation 925/1999. This removes the cause of a dispute between the EU and the United States over the use of hushkitted aircraft in Europe. This EU action had the effect of restarting negotiations in ICAO which culminated in the agreement on a new stricter certification standard "Chapter 4," a process for recertification, and an ICAO Resolution on the airport-by-airport approach to withdrawal of the noisiest aircraft.
- 4.23 The Directive introduces this international Resolution into EU law and allows airports suffering a noise problem to introduce a range of operating restrictions including the phase-out of the worst performing (marginally compliant) aircraft. Special provisions are included in the Directive to reduce the economic impact on services by operators from developing nations, while providing safeguards to ensure that this facility is not abused.
- 4.24 The Environment Committee fully supports the EC's Directive and would urge the Mayor to lobby the DOT and BAA to implement the provisions within the Directive as soon as possible to ensure that tougher restrictions are placed on noisy aircraft.

Recommendation 9:

The Committee will support the current work on the possibility of banning night flights and in the meantime is against any increase in the number of night flights.

Recommendation 10:

The Mayor should work with Boroughs to seek to impose strict conditions on residential development to minimise exposure to noise for residents.

Recommendation 11:

The Mayor should make clear in his Strategy how the London Area Environment Fund will operate alongside other noise management schemes.

Recommendation 12:

The Mayor and Assembly should consider the impact the various options for airport expansion in southeast England would have on noise levels in London, when responding to the SERAS Study. This should include the improvement of aircraft design, the angle of approach of aircraft, the easterly and westerly direction of flights and the location of aircraft being stacked in the sky before landing.

Recommendation 13:

The Committee would urge the Mayor to support the European Community's Directive 2002/30/EC and lobby the DOT and BAA to implement the provisions in the Directive.

Recommendation 14:

The British Aviation Authority should invite representation from the Assembly on the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee.

5. Neighbourhood and entertainment noise

5.1

Site Visit 3: Neighbourhood/Entertainment Noise, Covent Garden and Soho

The Committee were taken on a visit around Covent Garden and Soho on a Friday evening by the Covent Garden Residents Association and the Meard and Dean Street Residents Association to experience and discuss the noise issues facing residents living in the West End during the day and night. The main causes of noise came from groups of people, late night bars and clubs, mini-cabs, unlicensed street vendors, air conditioning systems, ventilators, buskers and alarms.

The Laws are currently in place to deal with these noise disturbances but they are not adequately enforced by local authorities and the police due to a lack of staff and financial resources. Local authorities also find it difficult to enforce the law against unauthorised new shop fronts because it takes about two years to process each case. These new shop fronts open their windows and doors fully, which allows much more noise out and this has an adverse effect on the local residents. Local authorities do not have the resources to manage and control entertainment effectively. It was suggested that some Licensees do not abide by the regulations and the Local Authorities needed to concentrate on prosecuting them.

Internal and external insulation levels

- 5.2 Noise is not always a problem. Indeed it can contribute to the character of the city. The Mayor recognises however that a quiet place for rest and relaxation is also a basic need. Policies 73-76 of the Strategy aim to support this provision. Government action in the regulation and control of internal and external noise insulation will be encouraged. We note that the Mayor is particularly supportive of the implementation of pre-completion testing procedures as part of the revision of the Building Regulations. The UK Noise Association has suggested that a noise insulation audit could be undertaken of properties in London.
- 5.3 The Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH)¹⁴ has said that the strategy should be urging greater use of natural ventilation to reduce the use of air conditioning plant, which can raise levels of ambient noise.
- 5.4 The lead that the Mayor is taking in expecting the London boroughs to include policies to minimise the adverse impacts of noise in their Unitary Development Plans can be taken as a positive indication that the GLA will act as a co-ordinating force in noise management for London. Both the London Borough of Harrow¹⁵ and the UK Noise Association strongly support the Strategy's proposed provision of a London Domestic Noise Fund to reduce internal and external noise especially in poorly converted flats.

¹⁴ Memorandum - CIEH

¹⁵ Memorandum – LB Harrow

Mixed usage

- 5.5 Everyone enjoys a night out but laws need to be upheld to protect residents who live in central London and town centres within London. The Draft London Plan promotes mixed usage of city centre areas but recognises the potential conflict that may arise. Mixed usage can offer noise benefits, as when retail frontages to busy streets can protect dwellings in rear courtyards and gardens. The Mayor intends to approach this situation by urging the Government and London boroughs to provide a framework for high density mixed use and town centre development. This will include funding for noise reduction and management, and an indication by the boroughs in their UDPs as to how to avoid potential conflicts between late night entertainment noise and housing.
- 5.6 Some Boroughs are already implementing work in this area. For instance, the London Borough of Barnet¹⁶ has an “Out of Hours Noise Service” which deals with noise nuisance issues. Barnet objects to the renewal of the alcohol licence for premises where there is ongoing noise nuisance and works in partnership with the police.
- 5.7 The London Borough of Greenwich has suggested that London Boroughs include in their UDPs a requirement that new noise sources in mixed areas do not cause an increase in the existing ambient background level. This effectively means that any new noise source introduced must be 10 dB below the current background level.
- 5.8 In his draft London Plan, the Mayor is proposing to manage the impact of evening and night time entertainment activities in Central London, city fringe areas and major town centres through policies for Entertainment Management Zones (EMZ), which will be controlled by Local Authorities. The Boroughs will need to ensure that planning, licensing, policing, transport, and street management issues are managed through these designated Entertainment Management Zones. The Mayor is proposing that planning applications for housing within an EMZ should be accompanied by noise mitigation measures.
- 5.9 The Committee supports the Mayor’s proposal in his London Plan for entertainment management zones. This would provide the real focus that many communities need in order to enjoy life in their homes.
- 5.10 Although EMZs will be controlled by Local Authorities, it would be unfair to expect them to find all of the resources and funding for it themselves. Some local authorities may have a problem with recruiting Environmental Health officers. The Committee met with residents from Covent Garden and Soho who proposed that licensees should contribute to the cost of managing, policing and cleaning up these entertainment management zones. We would support an increase in their license fees to pay for this. This money could go into a locally managed Environment Fund. The possibility of setting up this Fund could be explored further by the Mayor, Association of London Government (ALG) and stakeholders.

¹⁶ Memorandum – LB Barnet

Recommendation 15:

We support entertainment management zones as proposed in the draft London Plan and the Mayor should proceed with this proposal.

Recommendation 16:

The Mayor should discuss with the Association of London Government (ALG) and other stakeholders the possibility of setting up a local Environment Fund, with contributions from licensees, to assist with the implementation of Entertainment Management Zones.

Annex A – Recommendations

Prioritisation, implementation and funding

1. The Mayor should expand the advice given in the Strategy on setting priorities so that more guidance is given on which noise abatement solutions are most appropriate in particular contexts.
2. The Mayor must work with London Boroughs to share best practice and to work effectively to obtain any funding flowing from the National Noise Strategy.
3. The Mayor should ensure that the GLA coordinates the initiatives to be undertaken by different Boroughs and that adequate monitoring is carried out so that the effectiveness of the measures can be compared and the results reported to all of the Boroughs.

Road traffic noise

4. The Mayor should look at the noise impacts of the Congestion Charging Scheme as part of his environmental monitoring of the initiative.
5. The Mayor should ensure that residents and Boroughs are fully consulted by Transport for London (TfL) on noise implications of bus routes and the location of bus stops.
6. The Mayor should encourage more active enforcement by the Metropolitan Police to reduce excess noise from vehicles, and in particular motorcycles.
7. The Mayor should ensure that noise reduction is included in TfL's Business Plan and that there is separate budget provision identified for noise implementation measures.
8. The Mayor should ensure that TfL provides sufficient funding for the implementation of road noise reduction measures so that Londoners who experience road noise are treated equally with those living in the rest of the country.

Aircraft noise

9. The Committee will support the Mayor on the current work regarding the possibility of banning night flights and in the meantime is against any increase in the number of night flights.
10. The Mayor should work with Boroughs to seek to impose strict conditions on residential development to minimise exposure to noise for residents.
11. Greater clarity is required in the Strategy to show how the London Area Environment Fund will operate alongside other schemes.
12. The Mayor and Assembly should consider the impact the various options for airport expansion in southeast England would have on noise levels in London, when responding to the SERAS Study. This should include the improvement of aircraft design, the angle of approach of aircraft, the easterly and westerly direction of flights and the location of aircraft being stacked in the sky before landing.

13. The Committee would urge the Mayor to support the European Community's Directive 2002/30/EC regarding aviation noise management and lobby the Department for Transport and British Aviation Authority to implement the provisions in the Directive.
14. The British Aviation Authority should invite representation from the Assembly on the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee.

Neighbourhood and entertainment noise

15. We support entertainment management zones as proposed in the draft London Plan and the Mayor should proceed with this proposal.
16. The Mayor should discuss with the Association of London Government (ALG) and other stakeholders the possibility of setting up a local Environment Fund, with contributions from licensees, to assist with the implementation of Entertainment Management Zones.

Annex B - Strategies in other countries

This annex provides information on noise strategies that are being implemented in New York, Paris and Victoria (Australia). It may be useful for the Mayor, his policy advisers and policy officers to consider these initiatives and see if any best practices can be adopted in the London noise strategy.

1. New York

The overall aim of the New York noise code is stated clearly in the first sentence of the declaration of policy; 'to reduce the ambient noise level in the city, so as to preserve, protect and promote the public health, safety and welfare, and the peace and quiet of the inhabitants of the city'. The code is largely concerned with enforcement of policy and is not, as such, a strategy document. Having laid out objectives and given some general acoustic definitions, the code then goes on to discuss new powers given to the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection. Essentially, for any given noise source that the Commissioner considers is in violation of this code, the Commissioner can require that tests be carried out to prove the device is within the limits of the code. The test has to be approved by the Commissioner and any off site measurements have to be carried out in an approved laboratory. This section also covers issues of inspections, and enforcement.

The code categorises noise sources as follows:

- *Prohibited Noise Sound Level Standard* – (sets out clear definitions and limits on noise for associated time periods and times of day)
- *Prohibited Noise Unreasonable Noise Standard* – (sets out indications on what noises are 'unreasonable')
- *Tunnelling* – (covers most construction related digging likely to cause vibration issues).

Prohibited Noise Sound Level Standard

This section contains criteria for the following noise sources:

- Motor vehicles
- Aircraft
- Railroads
- Air Handling Units
- Refuse Compacting Vehicles
- Motor Vehicle Claxons
- Emergency Signal Devices
- Paving Breakers

Prohibited Noise Unreasonable Noise Standard

This section contains criteria for the following noise sources:

- Sound Reproduction Devices
- Sound Signal Devices
- Animals
- Emergency Signal Devices
- Construction Activities
- Construction Devices
- Containers and Construction Material
- Exhausts
- Schools, Hospitals, Courts.

Tunnelling

This section mainly contains conditions for applying for or renewing tunnelling licences. It covers conditions of permit removal and certificates for equipment. These limits are enforced with heavy fining for offending and heavier still for re-offending.

The legal and enforcement powers of the relevant bodies such as the Commissioner are explained in full, stating procedures for being notified of a violation of the code and time limits for payment of fines.

2. Paris

The Paris noise initiative takes a very positive approach to reducing noise in the city. A noise monitoring unit has been set up to keep track of the situation and devise methods of further reducing noise and tackling any noise issues which arise.

This has three components:

- *Purchasing Policy* – (purchase of the quietest community vehicles such as refuse collection vehicles)
- *Interventions on the ground* – (drivers trained in clean and calm driving techniques, noisy activities are limited to certain periods of the day and away from densely populated areas)
- *Equipment* – (many buildings are designed in a more acoustically conscious manner, design of new equipment in building such as schools to replace older and noisier equipment. Also being more conscious of sound insulation issues and carrying out acoustic correction work).

The noise monitoring unit within the Mairie de Paris ensures that regulations are complied with. They have developed partnerships with various organisations such as the Civil Aviation Directorate and Aeroports de Paris. A charter is being drawn up with the Paris Building Federation as well as existing charters with organisations like the Regional Public Works Federation. There is also close collaboration with the Police giving various noise abatement powers within Paris.

Noise abatement is incorporated into all major town planning projects and the Mairie have gone to great lengths to limit traffic noise. This has been done by improving the acoustic performance of road surfaces. 13.4 km of 'anti-noise screens' and 13,500 sound insulating windows have been erected along one of Paris major roads. The Mairie publicly promotes quieter means of transport by changing regulations in ways that favour pedestrians, cyclists, electric vehicles and public transport. A programme is underway to designate 10 new quiet neighbourhoods every year. Work is also being done to look into making public transport quieter.

The Mairie is also keen to promote noise awareness, both in the public domain and in industry. Construction sites for example can be given sound absorbing frontages to erect around the site similar to those on motorways. Pamphlets are published to encourage the public to think about noise issues and also to answer common noise related questions. The public are encouraged to take a more caring approach to avoid making excessive noise, to be considerate and to be conscious of noise. The Mairie urges neighbours with noise issues to talk to one another and to resolve any conflict without legal action.

Proper sound insulation in the home is greatly promoted by the Mairie. Since 1996 all new houses/apartments have had to meet strict acoustic standards. Services are provided to advise on acoustic issues in homes, such as how to insulate walls/ceilings, and when it is appropriate to do so.

3. Swiss-German Noise Agreement at Zurich Airport

Zurich Airport is Switzerland's main international gateway, situated less than 20 kilometres from the border with Germany. Most aircraft landing at the airport fly over territory in southern Germany.

Germany and Switzerland signed an agreement in October 2001 to end a long-standing dispute over noise pollution at Zurich Airport. Its aim is to reduce the number of flights over Germany, following complaints about noise pollution. The deal includes a ban on night flights and a reduction of flights over the weekends.

The agreement, which replaces an existing one signed in 1984, is aimed at using the flight lanes of Zurich airport in a more geographically balanced way.

4. Victoria (Australia)

Victoria's Road Traffic Noise Strategy is in the process of being drawn up, it is currently at a stage where targets and ideas can be outlined, but nothing precise or final has been written. They will be gathering responses and general feedback on the proposed strategy from the citizens of Victoria. The proposed strategy will contain a wide range of tools such as setting up a state environment protection policy (SEPP) and national processes for the development of noise reducing regulations and programs. It will be split into 3 main elements;

- Reducing noise from motor vehicles.
- Reducing noise from roads by reducing traffic flow and employing quieter road surfaces.
- Reducing the noise to sensitive buildings such as people's homes.

The programs designed to mitigate noise from traffic will differ depending on the type of road. New techniques and ideas are being encouraged in the design of new roads in order to make them

quieter. Techniques already employed as standard on new roads include quieter road surfaces, noise barriers and the use of speed limits.

The following strategies currently in place in Victoria, have had a positive effect on the reduction of noise:

- *Reducing Vehicle Use* – Encouraging the use of bicycles by expanding the cycle network. Encouraging people to walk through the walking strategy
- *Making Vehicles Quieter* – Updated noise standards for new vehicles, updated noise standards for in service vehicles, Programs and regulations to reduce truck engine brake noise, ensuring vehicles are maintained in good mechanical condition
- *Operation of vehicles* – Information to truck drivers about the impact of noisy braking in residential areas, promotion of regular vehicle servicing
- *Roads* – Development of road traffic policy, reducing noise to residents by encouraging compatible land use next to major roads, limiting traffic noise from new arterial roads, retrofitting noise barriers on older freeways, noise level monitoring, traffic management strategies
- *Noise Receptor* – Promotion of acoustically minded design and construction of homes and buildings.

Annex C – Health Impact Assessment of the draft Noise Strategy

The health impact assessment workshop on the Mayor's draft noise strategy was held on September 18th 2002. Around 30 people attended, from a wide range of organisations.

Participants felt that there was much to be supported in the draft strategy. They suggested that the policy proposals directed towards ensuring that boroughs make full use of their powers to minimise the adverse effects of noise, were likely to be of particular benefit to health.

Concerns were raised over the difficulty of controlling noise in the context of the mixed-use high density development outlined in the London Plan and major noise-producing activities which are not covered by the Strategy – e.g. construction noise.

Suggestions for strengthening the draft Strategy included:

- focusing on improving the use of vehicles by organisations in the public sector – e.g. greater use of electric vehicles, reduction in journeys, research on less noisy and more effective sirens;
- strengthening links between the Strategy and planning and design – especially in relation to the London Plan;
- ensuring that major noise-creating activities not covered by the Strategy are dealt with satisfactorily elsewhere;
- Mayor to support boroughs in carrying out a noise audit of existing properties and link this activity with UDPs;
- ensuring that health impact assessments on major developments cover the issue of noise.

Annex D – Evidentiary hearing and site visits

5 September 2002: Evidentiary Hearing

Ken Livingstone, Mayor of London
Max Dixon – Policy Officer, Noise Strategy
David Hutchinson – Policy Officer, Environment/Energy Strategies

23 August 2002: Site Visit to A2, Bexley

Councillor Chris Ball – Leader of Bexley Council
Councillor John Shepherd – Bexley Council
Councillor Margaret O'Neill – Bexley Council
Councillor Joel Briant – Bexley Council
Councillor Val Clark – Bexley Council
Councillor Pat Cammish – Bexley Council
Councillor Sylvia Malt – Bexley Council
Richard Hawkins – Bexley Council
Rob Falconer – Bexley Council
Wyn Shearn – Bexley Council
Jon Fox – Bexley Council
Ian Lindon – A2 Noise Action Group

30 August 2002: Site Visit to Covent Garden and Soho

James Tait – Covent Garden Community Association
Mark Gilkes – Covent Garden Community Association

David Bieda – Meard & Dean Street Residents Association
Glen Suarez – Meard & Dean Street Residents Association

17 September 2002: Site Visit to Hounslow

John Stewart – HACAN Clearskies
Monica Robb – HACAN
Richard Hendin – HACAN
Michael Stott – HACAN
Virginia Godfrey – HACAN
Nina Baven – HACAN
Cheryl Hounslow – HACAN
Alan Keen MP
Rob Gibson – Hounslow Council

Annex E – Written evidence

Airbus
Association of London Government
Aviation Environment Federation
Barking & Dagenham Council
Barnet Council
Brent Council
British Aviation Authority
Camden Council
Chartered Institute of Environmental Health
Civil Aviation Authority
Environment Agency
Greenwich Council
Harrow Council
Heathrow Association for the Control of Aircraft Noise (HACAN ClearSkies)
Highways Agency
London City Airport
Newham Council
Metropolitan Police Authority
Railtrack
Transport for London
Trees for London
United Kingdom Noise Association

Annex F – Further information, orders and translations

For further information on this report or to order a bound copy, please contact:

Richard Davies
Assistant Scrutiny Manager
London Assembly Secretariat,
City Hall, The Queen's Walk,
London SE1 2AA
richard.davies@london.gov.uk
tel. 020 7983 4199

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or Braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call 020 7983 4100.

আপনি বা আপনার পরিচিত কেউ এ রিপোর্টের সারসর্ম ও প্রস্তাবের কপি বিনামূল্যে বড়ছাপা বা ব্রেইল, অথবা তাদের নিজের ভাষায় চাইলে 020 7983 4100 এ নাম্বারে ফোন করুন বা ই মেইল করুন এ ঠিকানায়:
assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

જો તમને કે તમે જાણતા હો તેવી કોઈ વ્યક્તિને, આ અહેવાલમાંથી કાર્યકારી સંક્ષેપ અને ભલામણોની નકલ મોટા અક્ષરોમાં છપાવેલી, બ્રેઈલમાં કે તેમની પોતાની ભાષામાં વિના મૂલ્યે જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને ફોન દ્વારા 020 7983 4100 ઉપર અમારો સંપર્ક કરો અથવા આ સરનામે ઈ-મેઈલ કરો assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Se você, ou alguém de seu conhecimento, gostaria de ter uma cópia do sumário executivo e recomendações desse relatório em imprensa grande ou Braille, ou na sua língua, sem custo, favor nos contatar por telefone no número 020 7983 4100 ou email em assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਜਾਂ ਕੋਈ ਤੁਹਾਡਾ ਜਾਣ-ਪਛਾਣ ਵਾਲਾ ਇਸ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਦਾ ਅਗਜ਼ੈਕਟਿਵ ਸੁਮਾਰੀ ਅਤੇ ਸੁਝਾਵਾਂ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ, ਬ੍ਰੇਅਲ ਵਿਚ ਜਾਂ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਵਿਚ ਮੁਫਤ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨਾ ਚਾਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕ੍ਰਿਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਡੇ ਨਾਲ 020 7983 4100 ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ਤੇ ਸਾਡੀ ਈ-ਮੇਲ ਕਰੋ।

Si usted, o algún conocido, quiere recibir copia del resumen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones relativos a este informe en forma de Braille, en su propia idioma, y gratis, no duden en ponerse en contacto con nosotros marcando 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico:
assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

اگر آپ یا آپ کا کوئی جاننے والا اس انگیزیکٹوسمری اور اس رپورٹ میں سے سفارشات کی ایک کاپی بڑے پرنٹ میں یا بریل پڑیا اپنی زبان میں بلا معاوضہ حاصل کرنا چاہیں تو براہ کرم ہم سے فون 020 7983 4100 پر رابطہ کریں یا assembly.translations@london.gov.uk پر ای میل کریں۔

Ta ba ri eniken ti o ba ni ife lati ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won, ki o kansiya lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk. Ako ni gbowa lowo yin fun eto yi.

Haddii adiga, ama qof aad taqaanid, uu doonaayo inuu ku helo koobi ah warbixinta oo kooban iyo talooyinka far waaweyn ama farta qofka indhaha la' loogu talagalay, ama luuqadooda, oo bilaash u ah, fadlan nagala soo xiriir telefoonkan 020 7983 4100 ama email-ka cinwaanku yahay assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Annex G – Scrutiny principles

The powers of the London Assembly include power to investigate and report on decisions and actions of the Mayor, or on matters relating to the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, and on any other matters, which the Assembly considers to be of importance to Londoners. In the conduct of scrutiny and investigation the Assembly abides by a number of principles.

Scrutinies:

- aim to recommend action to achieve improvements;
- are conducted with objectivity and independence;
- examine all aspects of the Mayor's strategies;
- consult widely, having regard to issues of timeliness and cost;
- are conducted in a constructive and positive manner; and
- are conducted with an awareness of the need to spend taxpayers' money wisely and well.

More information about the scrutiny work of the London Assembly, including published reports, details of committee meetings and contact information, can be found on the GLA website at <http://www.london.gov.uk/approot/assembly/index.jsp>

Greater London Authority

City Hall

The Queen's Walk

London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

Enquiries **020 7983 4100**

Minicom **020 7983 4458**