

## Editorial

Ville et Aéroport notes that if the principle of subsidiarity prevails, disparities between the Member States remain and insufficient legislation for certain big European airports is the result. Should the futur European legislation on night flights exist without calling into question the principle of subsidiarity?

What should be the new proposals to expect from European institutions ? Apart from the European level, the question is how to define legislation on a local level, negotiated between the various actors.

The sleep of over ten million European residents is disturbed by night flights (550.000 movements per year). It is the nuisance most felt by residents. Only the restriction and mitigation of nuisance from night movements will allow people living around airports to accept the development of air transport. Development of air transport needs to reconcile economic requirements, environmental constraints and safety requirements in order to be sustainable. Noise levels during the night evoke a legitimate fear among elected members and residents.

Ville et Aéroport is proposing alternative solutions for night flights. Platforms in sparsely populated areas could be used and new legislation going from restrictions on exploitation (silence period during the night) to a total curfew between 23.00 and 6.00 could be defined.

One of the main priorities of ARC (Airport Regions Conference) is to find a way to grow and develop the aviation business for the benefits of all. The main concern is to find the balance between economic benefits and environmental impact. For night flights this means that both their competitiveness impact as their disturbance impact need to be taken into account. Noise nuisance from night flights is a local problem. Furthermore, aviation is a global industry that cannot function without night flights. Night flights form a highly complex issue that need to be looked at from different angels. Cost-benefit analysis, technical improvements in aviation, safety, health and environment are elements that should all be part of the decision making process.

ARC beliefs airport regions are essential for realising the aims of the Lisbon Strategy and the Cohesion policy. Accordingly, night flights are sometimes unavoidable. Regional and local authorities need to deal with it the best they can and they should always be responsive to residents. Proper mitigation schemes should equally be in place. ARC is the only organisation that exchanges practices of different local authorities in Europe. ARC beliefs the balance between economic and environmental impacts should be dealt with on a regional level as regions are responsible for the wellbeing of their residents. Therefore, possible future European legislation on night flights should involve this level.

Jean-Pierre BLAZY, President of « Ville et Aéroport »  
 Anne DEVITT, President of Airport Regions Conference



Association "Ville et Aéroport"  
 66 rue de Paris 95500 GONESSE  
 Tel/Fax/Rep: 01 39 85 95 96  
 E-Mail: contact@villaeroport.org



West Sweden House,  
 rue du Luxembourg, 3  
 B-1000 BRUXELLES  
 Tel : 00 32 (0) 2 501 0835  
 Email : s.de.groot@westsweden.se

Night flights in Europe : towards legislation ?

EUROPEAN CONFERENCE

## BRUXELLES EUROPEAN CONFERENCE



### Night flights in Europe : towards legislation ? Inventories of fixtures and proposals

Conference chaired by

**Jean-Pierre BLAZY**

President of Ville et Aéroport association

**Anne DEVITT**

President of Airport Regions Conference



**Anne DEVITT**

President of Airport Regions  
 Conference (ARC)  
 Councillor – Fingal County  
 Council (Ireland)



**Jean-Pierre BLAZY**

President of  
 Ville et Aéroport association  
 Deputy-Mayor of Gonesse  
 (France)

EUROPEAN CONFERENCE

**NIGHT FLIGHTS IN EUROPE :  
TOWARDS LEGISLATION ?**

INVENTORIES OF FIXTURES AND PROPOSALS

**ACT PUBLICATION**

(June, 2nd, 2005)

Conference chaired by

**Anne DEVITT**

President of Airport Regions Conference (ARC)  
Councillor – Fingal County Council (Ireland)

**Jean-Pierre BLAZY**

President of Ville et Aéroport association  
Deputy-Mayor of Gonesse (France)

with support of the Committee of the Regions  
**COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS – BRUSSELS**



## **THANKS**

Anne DEVITT and Jean-Pierre BLAZY thanks the Committee of the Regions for having agreed to accommodate this European conference and to contribute to its organization.

Their recognition is also addressed to M. Julien DELANNAY, to Mrs Fanny BELGUISE (Ville et Aéroport Association), Mrs Sietske DE GROOT (ARC) which organized this conference.

Also thanks to Mrs Audrey BELGUISE who took part in the transcription of the acts

They thank also all the speakers whose interventions contributed to the quality and the success of this day.



## PROGRAM

- p. 9 **Introduction**  
Anne DEVITT  
President of Airport Regions Conference (ARC)  
Councillor at Fingal County Council (Dublin Airport)

Jean-Pierre BLAZY  
President of Ville et Aéroport association  
Deputy-Mayor of Gonesse (Roissy CDG Airport)

- p. 25 **Opening statement**  
Lucio GUSSETTI  
Director of consultative works  
Committee of the Regions

- p. 29 **First session**  
**Night Flights in Europe :**  
**inventories of fixtures**

Chairman: Louis CERCLERON  
Mayor of Notre-Dame-des-Landes  
Member of Ville et Aéroport association

Daniel CALLEJA  
Director « Air transport »  
DG Transports and Energy (TREN)  
European Commission

Martin KESSEL  
President of UECNA

Michaël DOOMS  
Master in Management Engineering  
University of Brussels

- p. 55 **DEBATE**

- p. 61 **Second session**  
**Case study :**  
**Roissy Charles-de-Gaulle,**  
**Frankfurt/am/Main, London-Heathrow,**  
**Brussels-National**

Chairman : Fons HERTOOG  
Mayor of Haarlemmermeer  
(Amsterdam-Schipol airport)  
Member of Airport Regions Conference (ARC)  
Member of Committee of the Regions

- p. 65 **ROISSY CHARLES-DE-GAULLE**

Michel-Claude LORRIAUX  
Chief of « Relations residents department »  
Aéroports de Paris (ADP)

Charles de COURSON  
French Deputy  
President of parliamentary group of studies  
« Night flights and harmful effects airport

Simone NEROME  
President of ADVOCNAR Association  
President of UFCNA

- p. 81 **DEBATE**

p. 83 **DEBATE : FRANKFURT/AM/MAIN**

Thomas SCHAEFFER

Senior executive manager masterplanning  
Frankfurt airport (FRAPORT)

Régine BARTH

Coordinator Environmental Law division  
Okö Institute

p. 93 **DEBATE : LONDON-HEATHROW**

Rob GIBSON

Councillor, London Borough of Hounslow,  
Brentford Ward

John STEWART

President of Hacan ClearSkies

p. 97 **DEBATE : BRUXELLES-NATIONAL**

Sabine VAN DE POELE

Regulatory Affairs Officer – DHL

Peggy CORTOIS

UBCNA



p. 115 **Third session**  
**Night Flights in Europe,  
towards proposals ?**

**Opening statement**

Roger LERON  
President of ACNUSA

Bernard GARANDEAU  
Secretary general of Ville et Aéroport association

Bengt CHRISTENSSON  
Secretary general of Airport Regions Conference

p. 133 **Conclusions**

Jean-Pierre BLAZY  
President of Ville et Aéroport association  
Deputy-Mayor of Gonesse (Roissy CDG Airport)

Sergi ALEGRE-CALERO  
Vice-Mayor of El Prat de Llobregat  
Member of ARC

p. 139 **Final Statement**

Ales KUTAK  
Councillor Transports at the Ministry of Environment  
Czech republic



# Anne DEVITT

*President, Airport Regions Conference  
Fingal County Council (Dublin Airport)*

Councillor Anne Devitt was elected as ARC president by the ARC General Assembly in June 2003. Anne Devitt has been the political representative of Fingal County Council to the ARC since Fingal joined in 2001. Since then she has been an active member in the ARC political board, the Executive Committee.

She was Chair of the Fingal Development Board from its inception in March 2000 until July 2004.

I am Ann DEVITT, president of A.R.C. I am very happy to be here as a guest of M. BLAZY to discuss this very important motion or topic of night flights.

It is my pleasure to be speaking first. I understand it is due to the good manners of the French that they will always allow the lady to speak first. So, I thank you very much.

## **Origin of Airport Regions Conference (ARC)**

Let me tell you first about Airport Regions Conference. A.R.C. started about 10 years ago as a small group of local authorities with major airports at/in their region.

We had common concerns. We were aware that passenger numbers were growing and that air traffic in general was growing throughout Europe. The airlines had somebody to represent them at the European Union, at the commission, at council. The airports also had somebody representing them. But there was actually no group representing the communities around airports who were seriously affected by the general activity of airports.

So we represent the communities around an airport, the workers, the communities that are affected by airports, and the communities that benefit from airports.

We came together and our objectives were then to explore what was best practice to share the experiences from airport to airport, from region to region. We came to lobby the European Union in relation to change that we might like to see in legislation, in setting down standards that we wanted for our communities.

These priorities are still the same priorities at the heart of A.R.C. but we have grown in numbers since then. We have now taken in new members from our new E.U. partners and they too have brought the same concerns that we had when we set out. But the balance sometimes shifts.

### **Balance between economic development and environmental impact, different according to the area considered**

It's always trying to find a balance between economic development and environmental impact. And depending on where you are in your country, what stage of economic development you are, that can influence the emphasis that you will put on to economic development or the emphasis that you will put on to the environmental effects.

Due to the fact that we have so many members, we are very conscious that we are in a global business. We represent, as I said, the interest of all of the people affected by both the business people and the residents living underneath flight paths.

The local decisions we know that we make, whether we make a decision at Heathrow and Dublin, that local decision has global effect because of the fact that we are dealing with planes. We are dealing with people that are travelling long distances. We know we're dealing in a global business. So, we know that the decisions that we make will have a global impact.

And we sometimes have to remind ourselves, those of us who represent communities around airports, that that airport has brought a major economic benefit to the area. The very first thing that affects the lives of people when the airport is thriven is the fact that it creates employment. That employment creates wealth and that wealth improves the living standards of the people.

So the first impact on people as a result of an airport, believe it or not, is an improvement in the health of people because of the improvement in their way of life or in their living conditions. But then, as we know, that improvement can then move back to be a disimprovement: you can get too much of a good thing, you can get to much wealth.

You can get too much wealth, you can get too much traffic congestion, you can get pollution, you can get air pollution, you can get flooding, you can get global warming. And it is trying to find that balance between the economic benefit and the environmental impact that A.R.C. have concentrated so much of their studies and their work.

### **ARC in some figures**

#### **ARC's representation in Brussels.**

#### **Two strategies : Lisbon and Gothenburg**

A.R.C. represents 29 regions, which host over 30 major airports, generate 420 million passengers a year. So we represent 100 million European citizens. So we do have a voice. We do want to take part in the decision making in Europe and we do take part in the decision making in Europe, and at national levels.

We are very conscious of the changes and controls that will affect the aviation industry and affect our people whether they are living beside the airports or whether they use airports.

As Europeans we are very conscious of the two strategies:

**1) The Lisbon strategy** which promotes economic growth for all of our regions. And in order to get economic growth you have to have markets, and in order to have markets you have to have access to other markets as well, all the European markets and global markets. And to get that access you need airports. So the regions that need to grow do realize that they need to grow their airports and that they also need to have access to the already large airports within Europe. And that has implications for slot allocation, and it also has implications for night flights.

**2) The Gothenburg strategy**, however, means that any development and economic development must be sustainable. You cannot destroy the quality of lives just for the sake of economic growth. You have to balance between the Lisbon Strategy and the Gothenburg Strategy. I believe is what we're here about today, to try to find that balance. By increasing our economic power and development we remain competitive in the global economy.

### **The Irish example**

I, coming from Ireland, know the problem we had not ten years ago when, because of a lack of economic development, we had a huge number of our workers leaving Ireland and going abroad seeking jobs in other countries, perhaps taking those jobs at lower rates. This is a topic which has been very much in discussions in Holland or in France over the last few weeks. But now in Ireland, as a result of economic growth, our people are not emigrating any more and in fact we now have inward migration because of economic growth. So if economic growth is to be spread through the rest of Europe, we have to allow those regions particularly our new countries. We have to allow for their economic growth. That means allowing for them to do business with us.

## **Legislate on night flights in Europe?**

So the central question to this conference is whether night flights should be subject to European legislation.

In the first place, night flights, I think I've said, is a global problem because it affects the people who are immediately underneath the flight paths. They are the ones who are woken up at night. So that's a local issue.

But restricting night flights will have a regional effect, and a national effect, a European and global effect. So the decisions about the aspects relating to night flights can depend on how the locals view it.

### **Definition of the night**

What is your night? If you're in Northern Europe your night might be long. If you're in Southern Europe it might be from 12.00 to 6.00. It can depend on the time of year: a night flight at 8.00 on a Sunday morning is far worse than a flight at 6.00 on a Wednesday morning.

So it can depend: the length of your night, and then the second question is 'Whose night is it?' When it is 7.00 in London, it's 9.00 in Warsaw. Am I right? Yes.

If you want to be at a meeting at 9.00 in London, what time do you have to leave Warsaw? What time do you have to leave Athens?

So, these are issues when we are talking about what time night actually is. So, there is a case to be made that the local impact of a night flight is something that should be dealt with locally; and dealt with by the region authorities, the local authorities who are the ones who are first responsible. The local authorities are first responsible to their citizens.

## **Air transport : a global industry**

Second, as I said, aviation is a global industry. We are discouraging short flights. We are asking people to change from short flights to high speed trains. So, therefore, we are encouraging that the aviation industry is going to be long distance flights. If they're long distance flights they are coming from other time zones.

That global industry has an impact on tourism, on business, and probably primarily on freights. We have all got very used to getting our fruit from Africa and our vegetables flying in from all over the world. I don't think you can turn Irish people back to just eating carrots and peas and cabbage from their own season. They now have the variety and they will insist on getting it.

I suppose the most difficult issue is whether or not we can have European legislation, because it's not a matter of yes or no. At the moment the European airports differ quite considerably in their economic interests. In their physical structures, some airports, you can approach the airport from straight over the sea. Some airports you can approach them from over empty land. So their physical structure is different. Then, can we make common decisions for all airports? The social structure, the decision making, the competitiveness and the position that airport has in the country and indeed in Europe.

So, on the one hand, night flights are warmly welcomed in their regions which are seeking out greater economic growth. An example would Lombardy where there is a strong positive relation between employment and night flights. They have 20 night flights per night employing 850 people. Stop those night flights and what do you say to those 850 people who are in jobs?

Preventing the development would mean missing a chance to realize the goals of the Lisbon Strategy.

But on the other hand there is the question of health and environment and our member from Hounslow who sits right outside Heathrow, he will tell you the effect on the citizens that live around Heathrow. On whether that affects their economic activity, as to whether they can actually go to work in the morning because they haven't been able to sleep at night. So, again, the conflict.

We have to look at cost/benefits analysis. We have to see what technical improvements are happening in aviation. We have to see how you can manage approaches and departures from airports.

### **Which tolerance level the resident can support at night?**

We may have to look at the type of aircraft and the noise levels that we will allow between what I think we would all recognize as a real night period which definitely goes from midnight until 5.00 in the morning. I don't think any of us would disagree with that. It's how it stretches beyond those two points that we might discuss.

But from A.R.C. point of view, the most important thing that we have to do is listen to the residents. And I know from what I, talking to my constituents, they would like to see that there a European standard that they can point at to say: 'I should not have to be subjected to a noise level higher than this. And I am being subjected to a noise level higher than this I can seek redress through my local government, through my national government or through Europe.' Certainly, I think, from talking to colleagues, that will be an issue that they want at least to know that there is some protection, some standard that they can point to; that they can say 'this far, and no further.'

So, different stakeholders are here today I look forward to the debate. I know that everything I have said, even by



looking out, does not sit easily with many of the people that are here. I look forward to listening to the discussion, and contributing to it and I wish you a very successful conference today.



# Jean-Pierre BLAZY

*President of "Ville et Aéroport" association  
Deputy-Mayor of Gonesse*

Aggregate professor of History and Geography, Jean-Pierre BLAZY is mayor of Gonesse

(city bordering of the airport Roissy Charles-of-Gaulle) since 1995 and Deputy of Val d'Oise since 1997. He was a president of the national Council of the noise of 1998 to 2002.

He was the author of the parliamentary report "To reconcile airport development and urban environmental quality" (1999) and rapporteur of the law creating Controlling authority of the Airport Sound Harmful effects (ACNUSA) in 1999. He is a president of the national association of elected officials "Ville et Aéroport" since its creation in February 2000.

Ladies and gentlemen, I first would like to thank the committee of regions for welcoming us and inviting us to Brussels, so that we can participate here today.

My thanks goes to all participants for being here coming from your different countries. So that we can take a look at a major problem, a very topical problem which is the question of night flights. I'd like to thank Mrs Devitt, president of Airport Regions Conference (ARC), for organizing this European seminar with our association Ville et Aéroport.

## **Problems of air transport and night flights in Europe**

So, as I was saying, for the whole of Europe, it's important to be able to discuss this as an overarching problem. You've got economic development in terms of air transport and environmental demands which are more and more to the forefront in our different countries, regions and cities. Taking stock of the situation regarding night flights in Europe, and the legislation that exists, the various rules and regulations in different member states, and also legislation in existence already at European

level; obviously there is still much to be done there. It's not that we have a blank page but it's pretty well blank; just a small amount of writing on it.

**Which impact of the measurements taken on a local scale? Three examples to be retained : Roissy CDG, Brussels National and Frankfurt am Main**

Of course we can try to see what cases can be dealt with locally, and I am going to give three examples: Roissy, Paris, Brussels, and Frankfurt.

So the question hangs in the air as to whether we really should be going for European legislation. Is that going to be the very best way of resolving this. We've got legislation. We've got local, regional, national legislation and then you have to look at the potential for European legislation. I'm not talking in terms of international legislation but I think we have to consider how we can move forward and what sort of "daring compromise" could be reached so that we can move forward.

We want to see sustainable development in air transport. There's a lot of talk about sustainable development. And how does this principle apply to air transport? It's something of a given now when one discusses various issues in France, that how can we better reconcile economic requirements with environmental requirements and needs?

So, we find a growing consciousness among those close to airports, of this problem. And it's true that we've seen international regulations and subsequently national regulations as well, to try to resolve the problems. We've had under various headings environmental recommendations and laws introduced so that you've got compensation and insulation for houses purchased/repurchased when necessary by the authorities.

## **Measurements taken aiming at compensating for the harmful effects undergone by residents remain insufficient**

But these things haven't really resulted in people feeling less unhappy about the situation. And the traffic over these areas is increasing especially night time traffic. Despite the fact that there's been a crisis, night flights have been increasing, mainly for fret not so much passenger traffic of course. But they have been on the increase despite economic slow down overall. Some countries are trying to limit the number of flights.

### **Growth of night's traffic**

If you take the example of Roissy Charles de Gaulle, Paris: we've got 160 take-offs and landings every night on average. So this would seem to be the worst airport used at night (between midnight and 5 a.m.). But the actual impact of what has been taken out and cancelled, there's something like 2 or 3 flights only in that main sleeping period. So that's a very small number. People do tend to go to sleep before midnight, but they don't particularly want to be woken up by 5. So you can see that whilst one is looking to make progress what has been made in terms of progress is still very limited indeed.

### **European legislation : the noise directive 2002/30**

Then, there was the noise directive: the directive of March, 26, 2002 regarding limits on the use of community airports during certain time periods. But, in fact, in real terms, this has not resulted in much change. And in May 2004, the transport and energy direction of the commission published a communicate: it showed that night flights were something like 10% of overall traffic, 80% of these being for fret. It was suggested that the nights be defined: of course this was just a report communicate

suggesting that the night be from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. So that's an extended period to count as night time. But of course that had to be talked through.

### **Need for putting a ceiling to the number of movements, and to plan a limited development of the airports under penalty of environmental saturation**

If you want to cut the source of the noise that way you're going to cut overall noise levels, you have to cut the number of flights. But whilst in the last 20/30 years we've improved considerably because the noise generated by planes is much less now. We're not seeing caravels flying anymore for example. But, nonetheless, we're now on something of a plateau in terms of noise generated by the flights which means that to cut noise further you have to actually cut the number.

To take account of the fact that environmentally we're at saturation point. I don't mean to say that airports can't handle any more flights but in terms of the environment, the people living in these zones are not prepared to accept anymore. They feel that the limit has been reached already. Therefore, we have to find sound alternatives or real improvements.

### **Growth of freight transport — More night flights**

The fact that the demand for more fret transport means a larger number of fret night flights, seeing an increase on the price of oil and the fact that energy resources are becoming more and more difficult to find. A number of serious studies have shown that in the next 10/15 years we'll probably have to see things from a very different angle, and that is bound also to affect the strategy of the shipping companies.

## **The “daring compromise” decides today**

But are we supposed to wait for a crisis to be up on it, so that a real solution is found which is not found to help those who are suffering in these areas, but just because of other reasons which oblige the companies to act differently?

We should be looking at this already now and we need to look at this together because obviously the sort of measure that will be introduced unilaterally could have adverse effects and we don't want the airports, authorities and the companies to start relocating their businesses. With the lots of jobs we've seen that's starting already in some cases. So, we don't just want to say that these airports shouldn't be there, because they generate wealth, they generate jobs. And we don't want to step them out but we have to make those involved in organizing air traffic, make them understand that there is a real problem with night flights and why there is a real problem, what it consists of precisely.

## **Two important aspects to treat : the definition of the night and the environmental cost due to night flights**

So there are two aspects: first of all, the definition of what is night time, where we need to really clarify the situation. You were saying, Mrs Devitt, that with a bigger Europe and time differences between various zones, things get even more complicated. But, I think night time shouldn't just be midnight to 5 a.m. The commission's suggestion (11p.m. to 7 a.m.) is not my idea. It was the commission that put it forward but it's just a report, not a directive or not yet certainly.

But what can we do, what should we say? Our preference would be for the definition of a night time. That's the first thing we need to be clear about. Because if we fail to define precisely what night time is, then of course our

position is not that solid. And another aspect that need to work through for ourselves and be clear on, because we've got reports, but we have to make a proper analysis of the real environmental cost of this.

The White Paper on the European transport policy does mention and state that some forms of transport do not pay for all the external costs that their form of transport involves. And one should therefore favour those forms of transport which have the least environmental impact. Of course, that's not just something which applies to air transport. But what is our stance in that regard?

When we talk about air transport: you've got the greenhouse gases, as well as noise. The commission, in fact, focuses more on emissions of different gases. But there's also of course the noise factor which is a major factor in terms of environmental cost, especially the night time noise factor. So we have to see to what extent environmental costs are going to be factored in and the feasibility of taxing to encourage more environmentally aware approaches. So that's another aspect that we have to think about and position ourselves on. In a system such as ours, it's difficult to see in what manner we're going to best be able to move forward.

So those are aspects which I feel we need to thresh out. Obviously, there are a lot of other issues as well.

### **Principle of subsidiarity on the scale of the Member States**

And then, there's the principle of subsidiarity which has to be considered: what member states will decide for themselves what will be decided more locally. In France, it's the state, although recent reforms will bring decent realization and there's reform too on the status of the major French airport.

Often, negotiations take place locally and nationally as well. But I think that the negotiating root, if we're looking

to find a good compromise for town and country planning, to find the balance between development on the one hand and environment on the other, I think the solution needs to be based on a sound and thorough analysis in the first instance of what is possible.







# Lucio GUSSETTI

*Director of consultative work – Committee of the Regions*

Lucio GUSSETTI is a director of consultative work at the Committee of the Regions since November 2004. It is in particular charged to organize work of various Committees which prepare basic work within the framework of the consultation of the Committee. Previously, from September 2000 to October 2004, Lucio GUSSETTI was member of the Cabinet of the President of the European Commission, Mr. Romano Prodi. It was in charge with the relations with the European Parliament, the Council, the Mediator ; it was also in charge of energy and transport. He was member of the legal service of the Commission of 1990 to September 2000. Of legal formation, M.GUSSETTI is a lawyer specialized in the civil law and administrative.

Mrs Devitt, M. Blazy, thank you very much.  
Welcome everybody to the headquarters of the Committee of the regions. Here in this building, we've been trying to set up a forum where towns and regions of Europe can come and debate. If there's one topic which affects towns and citizens in Europe, then it is this one: the question of night flights in Europe.

## **The role of the Committee of the Regions**

We're looking at the links between national, regional and local levels. Here, we're talking about multi-level governance and the question of how we can resolve problems linked to this. We have a globalized industry here: the airline industry. And Europe has to deal with this problem. This is also a national problem. There are a number of economic questions at stake.  
There are also local implications because the impact of the decisions taken has an impact at local level. And local authorities have a role to play in striking a balance between the different problems that have been raised this morning.

### **Night flights : Europe is it qualified to control?**

The crux of the matter that we're dealing with today is whether we need to have more European regulation in this area. Obviously, I can't answer that question. But I could perhaps put forward some thoughts that have been debated here within the committee of the regions.

### **Three aspects to study : principle of proportionality and subsidiarity, development of regional poles, waste left in the environment**

We think there are three aspects to look at, M. Blazy mentioned this before:

1) There's the problem of proportionality and subsidiarity. We have to find a balance between European legislation and national legislation. We've often seen the effect of national interests at European level. We've seen this recently in the referendum in France. But also have to make sure that local interests are preserved. I'm not talking about competences here. But citizens should have specific responsibilities. Local authorities, regional authorities, district authorities, should have specific responsibilities. This is important because decisions relating to the town, the economy, and health require the involvement and participation of citizens.

I also mentioned the question of proportionality because we often debate questions of competences when the real crux of the question is best use of resources. We have to make sure that we don't do too much or that we don't do too little.

2) Second point now: the Committee of the regions has looked at related matters. We have drawn up a report on regional airports. I think this is linked to the territorial management of Europe. You have the same levels of governance in this area: you have European level, natio-

nal level and local level.

When you talk about night flights you have two tendencies: some people want to limit noise pollution to as few people as possible. And you have another tendency; I think we have to respect all opinions, people who say that we need to find a pragmatic approach. Not trying to share out or to spread out the noise, but to try and find areas where noise have the least effect. And this is a very complicated area.

The Committee of the regions have taken a virtually unanimous position: we want to develop regional poles. We think there is a problem of congestion linked to movement in European airports. We are extremely concerned about the huge increase in traffic but as yet we're not sure how we can curb this increase at short, medium or long term. We've looked at things over the next five years, but for 15/20 years, we don't have any solution at the moment.

3) Third point which I think is of extreme importance: that is the question of environmental dumping. Mme Devitt, talked about insuring specific guarantees for our citizens. So they are not used as pawns in this area. We have to do this through subsidiarity and proportionality. I don't think we can have complete harmonization at European level. We also have to look at the positive aspect of this: the two recent referendum setbacks we've seen over the last few days have shown that the European union mustn't just impose bans. I agree with Mrs Devitt's approach, i.e. that Europe must set safeguards because, obviously, there are people who sleep during the night, but there are also people who work in airports at night. There are people that use planes at night. That's just by way of an example, to show you how complicated this topic is.

I'll conclude now. I think over the course of the day we'll be able to come back to some of the questions that have been raised. You'll also have a lot of input to give.

If legislation is proposed, then I would imagine that the Committee of Regions will look at this very closely, that its members would want to be involved, they would want to give their opinion when the time came.

We are negotiating a corporation agreement with the commission which would enable us to be involved in the very early stages of the process, the preparatory stages.

We will keep an eye on this file and we will keep our members informed. And when necessary, we will see and ascertain what initiatives we can take.



## Louis CERCLERON

*Mayor of Notre-Dame-des-Landes*

*Vice-President of the community of cities "Erdre and Gesvres"*

*Administrator of "ville et aéroport" association*

Mayor of Notre-Dame des Landes since 2001, Louis CERCLERON is very implied by the airport questions. Indeed, a new project of airport for the great West was decided. Its establishment is envisaged on its city of Notre-Dame-des-Landes. It will be brought into service in 2012.

Louis CERCLERON is Vice-Président of the Community of cities of "Erdre and Gesvres" of which it chairs the Commission Airport and President of the Inter-city Trade union of Studies and Development of the Sector Airport Vocation of Our-injury-of-Moors.

He is an administrator of Ville association and Airport since 2004.

I am mayor of Notre-Dames-des-Landes, which is close to Nantes (France). An international airport is to be sited there. We're still carrying out preliminary studies. There's going to be a survey of the general public to get their views, and I'm sure that will be fairly impassioned.

### **Example of creation of a new airport in Europe : Nantes Notre Dame des Landes. Process of dialogue and regulations to be defined before the startup of the airport in 2012**

3 700 hectares is the area of this borough. And I, in fact, cover 12 boroughs and also chair an inter union group which seeks to counter various harmful effects such as noise pollution. So, I'm very much involved with new rules to be drafted for rules governing flights, because of the consequences of fallout of these.

So, how are we to deal with night flights? What sort of limits are we going to introduce? We've got Daniel Calleja, who's going to be speaking first. He's from the European commission (DG TREN) ; Michaël Dooms from Brussels University ; and Martin Kessel who is president of the UECNA.

So when they have given their introductory statements, we'll open the debate.



# Daniel CALLEJA

*Director of Air Transport – European Commission*

M. CALLEJA joined the European Commission in 1986, following Spain's accession to the European Community. M. CALLEJA is Director of Air Transport in the European Commission since November 2004. Since September 1999, he is Head of Cabinet of the Vice-President of the European Commission, Mrs Loyola de Palacio, in charge of Transport and Energy and Relations with the European Parliament. During this period, M. CALLEJA advised Mrs De Palacio in the formulation and definition of the main principles of the Commission's Transport Policy, and in particular, he contributed actively to the preparation and adoption by the Commission of the White Paper of EU Transport Policy.

## **The common European transport policy : a complex question**

Subjects we have approached are complex, technical matters. As was rightly mentioned in our introduction, there are matters that have to do with sustainable development, which is a fundamental objective of the treaties, it is a fundamental objective of the European common transport policy. They have also to do with the principles of proportionality and subsidiarity, and I will come back to this in my intervention, but they have to do with aviation as a global industry, as a global mode in a global world where we also have to take into account international rules. And this is why it is so important to have a very very important discussion on these matters.

Regional and economic development are crucial matters and the problem of congestion which we are facing and which we have addressed in the Commission's White Paper, in which we say that congestion is going to become more and more important. In the next 20 years, we expect that traffic is going to increase over 250 % in Europe. So we are going to face very important problems in terms of traffic.



There are issues of competition, of environmental standards, which we have to take into account.

On behalf of the commission today, I would like to do two things: first of all, describe very briefly the European legislation.

### **The existing European legislation**

As regards the European legislation:

The European commission has been concerned about aircraft noise “since” many years. And there has been a certain number of initiatives that have been taken. Already in 1992, in order to cut down the level of harmful effects from air transport, the European Union adopted Directive 92-14, which was based on an ICAO agreement to ban the noisiest aircrafts from European airports. These aircrafts, which are what we call chapter 2 aircrafts, were no longer allowed to operate and have been banned in the EU after April, 1st, 2002. This is because of European legislation on the basis of ICAO standards.

Second, in September 2001, the ICAO Council adopted a new noise certification standard, which is what we call chapter 4, that will be enforced from 2006 for newly designated aircrafts. So, this means that from 2006, the standards will be stricter as regards the noise of the aircrafts that can operate in Europe.

It is true that most of the new airplanes that are being produced are already compliant with chapter 4, but this will not be sufficient to improve the noise situation around airports.

### **European directive 2002/30**

So to safeguard the environmental protection after 2002, the European Parliament and the Council, upon a proposal from the commission, adopted Directive 2002, to

which our Chairman referred at the beginning of the session: Directive 2002-30, establishing the rules and procedures with respect to the introduction of noise-related operating restrictions at community airports. This Directive implements, in Europe, the balanced approach to noise management. The idea is to integrate 4 main elements:

- First of all, reduction of airplane noise at source.
- Second element, land planning and management measures.
- Third point, noise reduction, operational procedures.
- And fourth point, operating restrictions.

So there are 4 means and procedures to tackle these measures.

The purpose of this Directive is on the one hand to try to improve and to safeguard environmental protection around airports.

Secondly, to do so in a way that is compatible with the internal market. Europe has an internal aviation market, and we have to make this aviation market work properly, and we have to do this through common rules and procedures.

The Directive has put in place a harmonized definition of marginally compliant airplanes. And the Directive contains common rules on how to carry out noise assessment which are mandatory, prior to introducing noise-related restrictions. This means noise-related action that limits or reduces the access of airplanes to an airport. So these are operating restrictions which aim to withdraw from operations "of marginaling aircrafts".

And, on the other hand, it also takes into account operating restrictions of a partial nature according to time periods. This is the night bans; they are also covered by this legislation.

## **Revision of the directive 2002/30**

I would like to tell you that this legislation is going to be examined by the commission. And the Parliament and the Council have asked the commission to report no later than March 2007. We will have to make a report on how this Directive has been applied. This report shall be accompanied, if necessary, with legislative proposals for our revision. And we will have to assess if the Directive has been or not effective in its implementation.

In order to do this report, we are already working in the commission by carrying out a certain number of studies in order to assess what is the noise situation in community airports.

What are the possibilities of doing this at European level, to establish noise limits? What are the problems, environmental, and socio-economic impacts?

### **How to establish noise restrictions at the European level ? Which would be the environmental and socio-economic impacts?**

We are also conducting right now a study on the economic benefits of night flights – specifically dealing with night flights, with a view to provide guidance to member states and airports envisaging the introduction of night flight restrictions.

And to ensure the transparency and a wide debate on these issues, we have also decided to create a working group. The working group has its first meeting in July, it is composed of independent experts, and they will provide advice to the commission on the technical problems related to noise restrictions.

We also would like to tell you that in the past, the Commission had also tabled legislation on noise charges which was raised also in the introduction to this discussion. And we proposed a Directive trying to give some

predictability on noise charges, some transparency, some fairness, and we wanted to give incentive to use less noisy airplanes by modulating noise charges on the basis of the noise characteristics of the aircraft.

This Directive was discussed by the European Parliament, but I have to tell you that it was not discussed by the Council. The Council of ministers showed no interest in this Directive. So the commission had to withdraw the text but you see that we have also thought about this possibility.

### **Which European policy on night flights?**

I would like now to come to the point of night flight restrictions.

What is the European position on night flight restrictions? The first point is that the commission is well aware of the growing concern of the citizens against noise caused by night flights. This is very important and we acknowledge this problem.

We think that on the basis of Directive 2002-30, member states have a framework to make the best possible use in order to take into account this problem.

If an airport has a real problem, it is confronted with unacceptable noise problem, it can following the Directive, introduce a certain number of measures.

### **There is no unilateral answer**

But we have also to take into account that the noise problems are not the same at all the EU airports. There exists no single answer to this question.

Our speaker, M. Gussetti said at the beginning: "it is very difficult from Brussels to do full harmonization and to say from Brussels, this is how we are going to settle this issue." It is extremely difficult. This has to be done on a case by case basis, and this is why it is mandatory to examine the situation in each and every different airport.

Who should do this analysis? Should we do it from Brussels?

I would like to have enough officials already to do many things, but I can tell you we have not the means – even if there was a political agreement – we have not the means to do this analysis.

### **Member states, qualified to evaluate the situation with individually**

This is why both the European Parliament and the Council of ministers decided that member states are best placed to examine the specific noise annoyances at a particular airport in the territory. And this is in line with the principle of subsidiarity and proportionality which is in the text of the Directive. And when I say member states I don't mean the central authorities. It is also a matter for the competent authorities, the local authorities, the regional authorities.

### **Europe gives the hot line, the criteria of regulation**

What we can do at European level, what we have done up until now, is to provide a framework whereby we know that all the member states are going to act according to certain criteria, according to certain rules that are also in line with international rules, because we have also to respect the ICAO rules in this matter.

### **Relations between Europe and ICAO**

And you know this is not the first time Europe has had some problems in ICAO. We even had to face a major crisis with the United States who took us to the ICAO on the hushkitts. And there was a procedure in ICAO against Europe for taking action which according to the US we should not and we had to fight that case. So we have also to respect our international obligations.

We know that there has been a request to the commission to propose a general ban on night flights throughout Europe. We think that there should be some reflection in order to discuss whether a general and unconditional ban throughout Europe would be in line with the international and the European legislation. And we have also to examine the situation of the different airports. Because as was said by our speakers at the introduction, there are also economic and social impacts that have to be evaluated when going in this direction.

The situations of the airports are not the same and the particular socio-economic situations in each region have also to be addressed.

### **The Commission privileges the balance approach**

In that light, the commission considers that it is important to ensure a fair balance, and at the end of the day it is a very delicate balance between the general economic and social interests and the problems of noise nuisance. This was precisely the message from the European Court of human rights, which on July, 8th, 2003, effectively ruled that there has to be a reasonable balance between the interests of those who are affected by airport operations and the interests of those who operate and use air services. It is a very delicate balance that has to be ensured.

I will conclude by saying that the European Commission is now reflecting on how we should act in the future. We are conscious that we have to give an appropriate response to the problems and concerns of our citizens. We are also conscious that we have an internal market which has to operate and that we have to discuss what is the most efficient level of dealing with this problem? Is it the European level, is it the national level, is it local level? This is a big discussion which is on the table.

Which is the best level to give the added value to solve these issues?

### **To define the various levels of regulation**

What we have in place now is a first step. It's a common framework of procedures. It is not the end result. We will have to see, on the basis of the studies, on the basis of the reports, on the basis of the contribution that we hope we will get also from this conference which is going to be very useful for our analysis. But I think at this stage, what we intend is to closely monitor the application of this process, we will evaluate the situation and then we will issue a communication to decide what is the way forward.

We think, as I said at the beginning, that there are very important principles and very important issues to take into account and I look forward to having a discussion with you on these matters.

# Martin KESSEL



*President of UECNA.*

## **History of the UECNA**

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. I thank you for the invitation to speak here today for a European organization that has been already founded in 1968, in a time when the word “protection of environment” was not yet a political word in this world.

So this organization that I represent today is a very early organization taking care of the problem of noise of air traffic.

We coordinate the work of other NGOs: I personally come from the Frankfurt Movement of against the Airport Expansion and engaged more than 25 years of my life in this question. And I live still 3 kilometres from Frankfurt airport. It's the place where I was born and where I grew up, and still the place where I live.

So you see, it's part of my life to be engaged today in this question and not only the Frankfurt problem but the similar problems of other airports all over Europe.

The source of night flight noise is the source of other noise as well: of starting planes, of landing planes, of ground movements. The engine testing as well is a very important question for the people who suffer from the noise. The ground services make noise as well as fret and trucks.

You see, it's not only the landing and taking off, it's not only the machinery that is flying. But all around the airport there are other noises that are created by this activity. Just to give you an example, we have 56 db without any flying activity at our town, at the border of our because of Frankfurt airport. 56 every night. It's measured for one month. That's the noise that we have without any



flying activity, without any movement, but the ground noise was existing.

### **Air harmful effects and health**

The air traffic noise will double, so the problem of the night flights will increase the health problems. There is no doubt, and there has been a lot of studies about the health issue of flight noise. And we will hear more about this later today. There is no discussion that there is an influence on the health of the population who suffer from noise, who have more health problems. People can even have diseases that could cause death. So the problem is very serious and has to be taken seriously. It's not just a problem of life quality, of life style, a question of having a little bit more or less noise than somebody else living at some distance of the airport. The worst of this noise is the night flights noise.

### **10 million Europeans undergo the air harmful effects**

Out of our research we could find that more than 1/3 of the European citizens suffer from noise, all types of noise. And more than 10 million people have noise of planes. That's not only the figures that you find in official studies. But if you look at long distance, you might find that people who live 50 kms away from an airport still have noise of airplanes. And whoever lives around an airport knows that it's like this. If you go far away from an airport you still have noise. And if you look at the map of the airports in Europe you will have problems today to find a place where is no noise of airplanes at all.

Try to find it; it's very difficult to find a place where there are no more planes today.

So, you see, it's a very big problem that we take care of. And the expansion of the air traffic will increase this problem. And the fret is one of the reasons, the travelling

way of life is one of the issues that make this noise problem.

The night flights are the worst thing on this and if we look at the studies that have been published in December 2004, and if we look at the study of the noise, not only economic study, we could see that we have about 10 to 12 airports that are the noisiest airports in Europe at night. So that's the main problem today, tomorrow it could be different.

And those 10 or 12 airports, if you look what activity takes place there you will see that you have the scheduled flights, you have the charter flights, you have the fret, the normal scheduled fret, the express fret, and you have the mail. That's the basic things that happen at these airports. If you look deeper you will see what happens there and why it happens there.

### **The “Wild West” of noise activity**

Then I come to what I call the “Wild West” of noise activity: that is no planning at all. That means if somebody like an express fret company, like DHL, UPS or somebody else, is going to look for a new place where they start their activity or do well for a long term, they ask to an airport if they could do it. We have the story some year ago: they went from Baden-Baden to Strasburg, from Strasburg to Metz and finally they found in Metz somebody who gave them an airport to work at.

And then comes again the story that Mrs Devitt started this morning: to say yes, if we didn't have certain flights, what would we tell to the people who work there ? (The jobs, the question of work and welfare about the jobs that comes as well with the jobs.)

The question is: how to do this ? If you start a business activity today, let's say you want to make a bakery shop in Brussels, or if you want to start a transportation company, you could not want this company middling town of

Brussels because of certain regulation, because your activity makes noise and has a certain impact on the environment.

So we have to say : why do we have this situation of noise, this chaotic and organized airport situation ? Because it's not helpful for both sides : it's not helpful for the population who suffer from the noise, and it's not helpful for the companies who want to develop in the long term in investment, and try for a long term planning the security to develop their business. It doesn't help, if we look at the problems that we have had in Brussels for years and years, you could see that it's not very helpful for DHL to have such a public debate about the activity there. And not only the debate, but the activity itself which could not expand.

#### **Four European airports for the express freight which knows an uncontrolled growth**

So we have to ask why we have 4 airports which make the freight activity : it's Roissy, Brussels, Cologne, and Liege where we have the hobs of 4 big companies, which are not – if you look at the map – too far away one from another. But we have all these problems because they are airports which are well situated for passenger transport, close to the cities, well developed over years in these places.

So we have to see there is no planning, they have developed over years and years and there has to be a planning in Europe. It's a demand on the commission; it's a demand on politicians, to find a planning on air transport.

#### **Defense of the night to sleep - Human right - Eight hours**

So we demand 8 hours of sleep, and the respect of health for this planning of airports. It will be helpful for both sides.

Here, I send you again the picture of what type of activity we have and coming back to the story of this morning, 30 flights per night and the 850 db .

I don't like this black and white picture that is always going to be implemented by a lot of interests because it doesn't help for a discussion together.

If there is not a night flight at 3 o'clock, the transport will be at 5 or at 6 or at 7 o'clock. So the goods are still to be transported later. That means that a flight that is not taking place today at night will be in the daytime. A charter flight will be in the daytime possibly as well. There is no need for somebody to fly at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning to a holiday place. They could fly at 7 in the morning as well and they will be happy about the 7 o'clock flight because they had to wake up at 5 o'clock to go to the check in.

So, you see, the activities which take place today : we really have to be careful about what is behind it and if it is really needed.

### **Necessary regulation of the express service - Typological expertise on night flights**

There is one activity which really has a problem: that is the express service. That means that's a special service that has a certain impact on being done at night. So we have to see that for this service, there has to be a special place where it could take place without hurting the others. It's like running a truck company out of town, in an industrial area where you can run the trucks.

So, we have to look at each type of night flight and each sort of night noise that we have and to see if necessary how we could deal with this and what we could find as a solution that is helpful for both sides.

I'll just give you an example that I repeat again and again: why should 200 people fly this morning from Brussels to

Warders at 4.30 and 200 000 people around Brussels airport could not sleep 2 hours more? They go 2 hours earlier because it's cheaper to fly, maybe they paid 20 Euros less for this flight this morning, and it's one activity that they do once a year. That's their holiday, that's their great day. They wake up early, they go there, they like it's their holiday. Even if they didn't know that they would have to wake up at 4.30 when they booked the flight, because they got the information later.

Try to book a flight, you'll never get the information that you have to wake up at 4.30. You will find out the last week before you go to the airport.

But the 200 000 people have this disturbance every night. They don't wake up like this once a year for holidays. They have this noise disturbance every night. So they can't sleep night after night and they have, every night, the charter flights going from Brussels to one of the Mediterranean places.

The same as UPS – excuse me for the other who did the same. There are almost the same numbers of night flights at Cologne as in Frankfurt. Cologne is normally a small airport during the day, but at night there is a lot of activity there. The 40 000 night flights that we have there disturb more than 400 000 people all around this area.

And half the fret is not needed to take place there. We could organize it differently.

Back to the same picture : TNT, FEDEX, DHL, at Brussels would still want to move to Leipzig, but I'm sure they would have the problems later in Leipzig as well. I'm sure about this, in some years we will talk about this.

## **The same site dedicated to freight for the expressists, a political decision to take - The airport of freight in the countryside**

FEDEX and others, they'd better use one express "hub", if there were one, if there were a planning. But there is no planning. That's a problem and it's a political question. If there were a planning we could put this together, we could have a very nice airport out of very crowded areas – where there is a highway, where is a train., the old military airport in France, which is 110 km east of Paris. If you look at a map it's not so far away from the places today and where could be organized another place like this not disturbing hundred thousands of people who live under the flight paths or beside the airports.

### **Proposals of UECNA**

So, our demand is to stop the night flights at European airports for 8 hours, whether it's from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. or from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m.

Another demand : we demand that outside cities airports for fret. And if you look at the research that has been done by the European commission, just look at one example: Luxemburg. Luxemburg is a small country in Europe, has a small airport, and has 3 night flights per night. One or two fret companies working there. I ask you: why do these companies go there for their fret? It's not an international "hub" like Frankfurt or Paris. It's well placed in Europe but why do they do it there? The answer is easy: they got a cheap lease to do their night activity. But it's not very useful to have 1 to 3 flights there. That's not planning. They do here and here activities and make a lot of noise. You could put it together and make a good planning. But you have to start to do it one day; and we demand that you start with the tourist flights, the charter flights.

The high speed train system should also be seen in this airport planning in the future. And I also see that we will have more and more special airports for fret. Luxemburg is not really the airport of the world to make a fret business but it has worked for years and years. So it shows that you don't always need a combination between a big international hob and the fret activity at one place like Roissy, Amsterdam, and Frankfurt.

Even Frankfurt is today the most used cargo airport in the world. But you can organize fret transport differently.

# Michaël DOOMS



*Master in Management Engineering – University of Brussels*

Michaël DOOMS is affiliated as a senior researcher with the Solvay Business School of the University of Brussels (VUB). His PhD thesis will treat the spatial and dynamic aspects of stakeholder management, with an application to large-scale capital investment projects in the transport sector. His other research interests are in the fields of complex project evaluation in the transport sector, internationalisation strategies and corporate strategy.

## **Commercial interests, involved actors**

Thank you M. Chairman, thank you also to the organizers for inviting me here to speak about this problem.

I will try to give from a more helicopter view of the more trade-offs which society faces in this problem, because as we have heard this morning through the interventions of different speakers, it's a very complex problem.

So I would like to address some issues:

First of all, economic necessity, spatial development on the European level, something let's say, alternatives to our good questions because there is a lot of debate still going on and I think there a lot of study work to do but I'm glad to hear that the commission has started to work very seriously on these issues.

Then, there is the stakes : as you know there are different parties who have different objectives involved. It's very important to look at who are the parties, what are their objectives.

Then, something which is the role of public authorities: should there be public intervention or not? And how? From a broader point of view.

And then, the conclusion.

If you look at the economic necessity, we should look first at some facts about how our economy and how the global economy is organized. And if you look at the front as a



consumer ends, you see that we, as end consumers, we are becoming more and more difficult. We ask for more variety, we want them faster. Look at what we have in retailing, in the number of products.

This increases the complexity, first of research and development for all these new products but this also needs a very flexible logistical chain because products in their specificity need to be assembled very closely in accordance with the consumer.

I think that not every component of a product is the same: you will have low value component, like for example, if you take a digital camera, in order to make the finished product, you will need packaging, you will need plastic, you will need the guidelines to use it, you will need the camera itself. But all those products are produced somewhere across the globe, are stuffed into containers, especially the low value products, have two weeks of transport between Asia and Europe. But you can imagine that the stock cost of putting high value cameras in containers is much higher than the carton or the plastic. So, this may be a very concrete example of how the chains work at the moment.

For example, clothing. If you take Nike in Malines, in Flanders, they have their yearly collection, but then, they introduce about twice a year, a new collection for summer and for winter. Then, they would need for the first arrival, the deadline is very short so they use 10% air transport. And 90% will come after in containers to the port of Anthrop, then by barge to Malines.

So the complexity of logistical chains is very high and all modes have a role to play in this. That is what we see.

Those are facts. But is it an economic necessity to have those cargo flights, for example from Asia, from other regions inside of Europe? As an academic, you like to be the devil's advocate and you say no. But then, you have to look at the consequences, and we have to look at the

consequences. Your products costs will rise because inventory will go up and the efficiency of your chain will go down. You will pay higher prices. And the same goes for the example that was given about passenger traffic: the charter flights.

Basically, the answer can be no, but there are consequences. You can put anything during the day, but then you will need more infrastructures or you will need to implement more congestion pricing and prices will go up. So we will have to pay more. Are we prepared to do this? I'm asking you the question. I'm not sure.

### **The economical logic of integrators and the choice of the best area**

If you look at the spatial development of Europe, you see that throughout the ages there has always been a historical concentration of certain economic activities. We can take the example of the Blue Banana, it's on the next slide but you can see it here. If you look at the map of Europe, you will see this concentration of logistical activity in this centrally located area, where a lot of welfare and people are concentrated.

So for companies like the integrators, who need to fulfill a role also to the end consumer being close to the market, their position is there. Those "hubs" are in this region.

If you want to relocate these airports to more peripheral regions, it's not easy. Given that inside the Blue Banana, even I think in Vetry, you will have problems anywhere because people will come to live there, because they want to be close to their work.

So, it's not easy. You can also question the concept. But if you put a hub in a peripheral region, on a micro scale, you will reduce the external effect on the local community and the noise but on micro European level you will

increase the thousand kilometres on air transport. And we know that air transport has the highest external costs.

### **Which alternatives to air transport?**

Other alternatives: can we use high speed rail ? Well, I would say the basis is yes, but then we would need more investment and dedicated fret lines. And more, if we need these investments in these densely populated regions and also in the periphery, we have to deal with a Nimby syndrome

I talked to a lot of people who are real infrastructure managers in different countries and they're confronted with important Nimby problems. People don't want rail in their backyards.

If you look at the economic fact here, you will have competitiveness in terms of speed, or let's say distances, we guess, but no study has done on this and I think a study has to be done on this. What is the competitiveness opposite airlines?

### **How to change our consumer pattern?**

So, to conclude on this, if we want this problem out of the ray we would need to change our consumer pattern: we can say one "hub", or we can say the government has to decide which products have to be produced or how many varieties have to be produced and then we come to the situation of some countries, about 20 years ago, which have now exit the European Union. Or we can build a big wall around Europe and contain international trade and globalization. We know international trade trace welfare in peripheral regions, in development countries.

So, you also have to look at the problem on a more global scale.

I live in a city where I'm sitting in my garden I can read which company is flying over. I won't have any problem if

I know that for the next 25 years, there will be flights at a certain moment during the day, and maybe even during one night or another. But I need to be certain of it.

And you can't change the pattern all the time because you create legal uncertainty for the operators, for the airports, for the people, for the local communities. So, I think that legal uncertainty causes a lot of costs, a lot of process costs, and if you look at other examples of noise and externalities: for example, the sea ports, where a lot has been done to integrate all the objectives of all parties.

So, it was an addressed fact that there is no levelled playing field on the European, and more importantly, there is competition between regions for indirect investment. For example, look at the case of DHL. Sometimes EU development aid for peripheral regions for accession countries, which is good but creates a certain form of competition.

And more importantly, ecological standards and regulations differ so much, or a non-existent, that they have really become a weapon between regions to compete for investment. We saw this in the sea port sector, where a lot of initiatives have now been taken to come to a more levelled playing field; also from the port sector itself. So, this is very important.

### **Two levels of intervention for public authorities**

So we can see public authorities intervention on two levels:

- you can have hard law and define all standards, night definition, number of movements, very top down for all of Europe. But I think we will create inefficiencies because the airport sector is very diversified, which was said at the beginning of the conference. So, this is very difficult to achieve.

- Soft law, I think, provides a very good solution. You can

morally impose the development of strategic environmental impact reports, which is what the Flemish reports are doing now, and where all stake holders involved (local communities, port sector, government...) look at all the different interests and do a study on nature, development on nature, economy and mobility. And all studies are then compiled in a strategic environmental report which eventually becomes law. The regional government makes a law of it, and all the following development projects are evaluated. Again this is strategic plan but you create legal certainty. And this is very important.

Also, a number of general objectives in terms of special planning around airports, the issues of concentration, or dispersion, or flights, involvement of stake holders, a lot of studies have been done on those. You can also regulate the process of consultation and how plans have to be built up.

### **Privilege the dialogue between regions and airports**

Another point is that I also think that the discussion process must start from a bottom-up approach. So, in the regions, in the airports, there can be coordination from, I guess A.R.C., from A.C.I. and so on, with government agencies involved. But the main issue is here: you need coordination. We have this multi-level government problem: Belgium is a very good example of that. But if you don't have this coordinated approach, you won't create a levelled playing field. Because if you have a directive from the top, national governments have to formulate it for their nation, then the regional government intervenes and in fact, you end up at the fourth level, which is local where you create new uncertainty. Because what was maybe the directive at the top, isn't necessarily the same.

tant trade-offs, maximizing economic benefits and minimizing especially the noise related health costs. I think a total ban of night flights, and we are looking at veto if you discuss here today: there is a veto if you look only at economic objectives you cannot say let's have a fair policy, then obviously your ecology-related stake holders will just say no and go to court, and do anything to prevent it. So, you need to discuss to define your veto, what is possible and how can we develop sustainable development? Because sustainable development on a scientific level means sustainable development on an ecological level but also on an economic level. So, that's very important.

So, I think a balance can be found, but only if everybody is involved from the start of the discussion. And the local communities should take their responsibilities as well. They must show commitment to the legislative process on the different government levels. And a good balance: I think there is a need for some hard law, you need criteria, but it should not be too much.



## First session : debate

**Wolfgang HOFFMANN, Hare Noise Commission  
Cologne**

Wolfgang Wolfmann, I am coming from Cologne. I am member of the Hare Noise Commission in Cologne.

We have been struggling for more than 15 years concerning the night flights in Cologne.

We have been discussing with the local government for years, but we can't get any advance because there is always the argument: we have the competition with the other airports around and if we make local regulations, then the business will go to the next airport. Therefore, we need a European solution: it is mandatory. We must have general regulations and then the possibility that the local authority can, under certain rules, give an advance from this strong regulation. There is no other possibility, it is my opinion and many people think like me, and M. Kessel also.

We must have some high regulation all over Europe, and then from there things could be done lighter.

**Michel TRANSY, President of ACENAS  
(Lyon Saint-Exupéry Airport)**

I am the President of ACENAS (Association of residents in Lyon). We think we need a political commitment towards this problem. We need a regulation of noise created by night flights. The European Commission should be a little more concerned about this problem of night flights.

We have seen that we bring in strawberries from Spain and then we ship them off to other countries. I'm not quite sure about the logic of all that, so there are things to improve. I agree with my German colleague when he suggests that we should impose taxes.

Perhaps we could look at other forms of transport ?

There are different solutions. We know that other forms of transport, for example railways, are more environmentally friendly..



**Daniel CALLEJA, DG TREN, European Commission  
Director "Air transport"**

As regards the comments about the European commission, it's not often the case that people call for European regulation. So, it's good to hear that you want us to legislate.

Second comment: the commission proposes measures and then the Council and the Parliament make the decision.

The directive we mentioned has introduced something very important: that is to say a common framework setting up common rules and procedures which have the aim of setting certain safeguards which will lead to an improvement in the situation.

We mustn't underestimate this. So, since 2002, we've had a common framework which has enabled us to bring in certain restrictions; restrictions on night flights for example.

The directive does two things:

- firstly, it covers current restrictions
- the second thing that it covers is that it sets a framework depending on the situation in each airport and the specific situation in each state and in each region.

There is a possibility to move towards common regulations on evaluations, on planning.

The third thing that it sets out or provides for is that the commission should evaluate the situation.

There will be a report in 2007, and we'll decide whether we need to move forward, whether there is political will to regulate more at European level.

I also spoke about the current text which states very clearly that the principles of the subsidiarity and proportionality, as they stand at the moment, as they've been interpreted by the Council and the Parliament, this

juncture do not provide for a complete blanket ban at European level. But they set a framework providing for a balanced approach which could enable us to bring in more regulations, or at least lead to more restrictions in the future. We'll have to have a debate on this. Only time will tell.

There are very complex economic questions, but there are other questions to be taken into account as well. So I think we should be realistic and pragmatic. I don't think we should underestimate what has been done. We are aware of the problem but there is no doubt that there will be more procedures to come.

And, as has already been said, it will depend on the political will of the member states. It's not easy for the European commission to decide what is going to happen. We have our studies and our reports on the basis of which we put forward certain proposals. But, at the end of the day, it is the council of ministers and the Parliament which will look at this in more detail.

We can take one more question.

**Roger LERON, President of ACNUSA  
(Controlling authority of the airport sound harmful effects)**

Thank you M. Chairman. I have a question for M. Calleja. You said that you were going to make a comparative study of fret and night fret transport. I'm aware of the different operators working in this area who have said that they have to fly at night. So, I have a question ... What will be the consequence of banning night flights for fret transports?

**Daniel CALLEJA, European Commission (DG TREN)**

I'd just like to clarify the framework of our work. I mentioned the directive before, and on the basis of this we carried out a technical study in the commission and we are still carrying out this study.

First comment:

We are looking at whether we can go further in terms of limiting noise levels. We are looking at this, working with the environment D.G. Because, across Europe, airports are being built closer to cities. This is not the case in other continents but it is in Europe. So we have to see whether we can set up a harmonized legislation relating to noise reduction levels.

There are texts that already exist, which relate to the situation in airports.

The second point is the cost/benefit analysis relating to night flights. We talked about the economic interests at stake. But we want to have more statistics, more information so that we can ascertain whether we need to make further proposals in the future.

You mentioned the question of fret. This is an extremely important question and fret is affected by night flights.

So, what we need to do is to bring in guide lines for member states so that they can act accordingly.

We've also set up a working group made up of independent experts who will be drafting a report on all these different questions. The report will be finished by March 2007. This might be accompanied by proposals to amend the directive. That is why it's very important to get your input because it will help us in carrying out our work.

So, while we're carrying out this preparatory work, we are more than willing to take on board your concerns. Concerns which could be relevant to this possible amendment of the directive in question.

**Michel LAVERNHE, Air France**

I'm speaking on behalf of airlines here. We're taking this question very seriously. We believe that we have to take into account questions of sustainable development, and noise reduction. We've been working on this for a long time.

I'll just give you one statistic: since 1997, even though our activity has increased by around 35%, especially in Roissy, despite this, our noise pollution has been reduced by around 40%.

We have to do more, we have taken other measures to reduce noise pollution in Roissy. We brought that in March 2004 and I think that shows that we are taking this very seriously.

We have to do more because, obviously, requirements are becoming more stringent. We have to focus our efforts on this balanced approach.

We take into account the time zones when we're planning our flights, but it's very difficult to do. It's difficult to bring in bans on night flights on the basis of the fact that it's a local measure. We can't do that because it has an effect in other countries, in other time zones. We have to be aware of what is happening in Tokyo or in other parts of the world.

And if we don't take this into account then we will end up setting up measures which won't function.

**Louis CERCLERON, Mayor of Notre-Dame-des-Landes**

We're going to close this debate because we've run over time. I would like to thank the experts, M. Calleja, M. Kessel, and M. Dooms who gave their overviews of the situation regarding night flights. They put forward their opinions and proposals. We've seen that it's a very difficult question.





# Fons HERTOOG

*Mayor of Haarlemmermeer*  
*Member of the Committee of the Regions*  
*Member of ARC*

Fons HERTOOG is mayor of Haarlemmermeer (135 000 inhabitants) since January 2003. He is also member of the Regional Committee of the European Union (1994) since its establishment. From 1994 to 2000, Chairman of the Town and Country policy, Environment, Energy and Urban Policy Committee within the Regional Committee and from 2000 to 2004 Chairman of the Dutch Delegation.

If you're aware of the air traffic problems and the air transport situation: one hour delay is terrible. And if you need a connecting flight, it will be worse. So, if you speak about night flights and delay, it will be an extra problem. But I'm not going to add that to you.

## **Amsterdam-Schipol**

I, myself, am the mayor of Haarlemmermeer which is the city which is close to Schipol airport situated in the Amsterdam region. So, I'm also very aware of the problem. Even where I live, I am facing noise.

Speaking of this, I'm also one of the Dutch representatives who had that big thing last night, you all heard about. And as we say now in the Netherlands, 61.6 DbA trouble. Speaking of trouble, one of the things people said last night that is we shouldn't have too much conflicts with the European Union, too many rules, too many regulations. And this is interesting because today we have a seminar conference about more regulations, more rules.

I am a member of the Committee of the Regions, we have a session here next door in our own building. And I'm also a member of the A.R.C. being part of the Haarlemmermeer delegation city.

Now, we will discuss three interesting cases: Roissy Charles de Gaulle, Frankfurt, and Zaventem

## Night flights in Schipol

Before we do this, I will very briefly say something about development in the Haarlemmeer region because being the President, I take the opportunity to do this.

Night flights is a highly debated subject also in our area. This morning you heard the President of A.R.C. pointing out that we are in global business. This is what I picked out and one the last speakers of Air France pointed it out as well.

Nevertheless are we facing a dilemma to seek balance in the development of the main port and the negative effect of living in the vicinity of an airport. This dilemma is felt mostly on a regional / local level.

If I speak about my own airport, Schipol, it's one of the four main airports in Europe. And it offers very important economic benefits to the Netherlands and to my region as well. There are more than 100 000 people working there.

Since a new runway on the airport – that runway has become operational – and a new set of night time restrictions were introduced, the legal night time restrictions are still in effect between 11.00 in the evening until 6.00 in the morning. And at present, between 6.00 and 7.00 in the morning, operations are corresponding to the off-peak modes and that is one runway for departures and one for arrivals.

The exposure limits at Schipol are based on the period from 11.00 until 7.00 in the morning, including the regime period as well as the off-peak period.

In the Netherlands, legal extension of the night regime period until 7.00 is being considered in order to reduce community annoyance due to aircraft noise at night. However, an extension of restriction to this period would cause significant economic damage.

## **The Dutch State works on a new legislation applied to Schipol**

At this moment, an evaluation of new legislation on Schipol airport has started by the Dutch government. But, at this moment, they have not decided to develop additional legislation on night flights. Our Dutch government is strongly in favour of using arrival methods which causes less noise harmful effects. Improval of transparent information to the residents living nearby the airport, regarding the actual operation of the airport, changing the runway used, etc. So, more sophisticated attitudes, approaches to solve the problems.

## **The economic cost due to the suppression of night flights**

Furthermore, if the night regime period is extended until 7.00 a.m., it will cost, as estimated in the period 2005-2015, 35 to 75 million euros. The loss of flights will cost the airport authorities 10 million euros yearly. So, it's really a tremendous problem.

Totally banning night flights paused legal problems, and I'm not convinced that far reaching legislative proposals do not endanger the economic growth, which influence the liveability in the airport region as well.

In the outcome of this conference and the open debate we will have regarding the case studies, I would like to emphasize the importance of collaboration on national, regional, and local level. And in terms of territorial cohesion, I would like to join up airport regions as special European region areas, not to sanction the legislation on night flights.

Having said this, we can now continue with the first case: Roissy Charles de Gaulle. I'm especially interested in this because we have that merge between KLM and Air France, as you know.





# Michel-Claude LORRIAUX



*Manager Environment Département (Aéroports de Paris)*

M-C LORRIAUX is the chief of the Department in relation with the residents of Airports of Paris (ADP) since 1995. After having begun his career in the banking world, as attached of Management to the Agricultural credit and the Co-operative Credit, Michel-Claude LORRIAUX was a successively Principal private secretary to the Quay of Orsay (1984-1986), Principal private secretary to the Department of Environment (1989-1992), technical Adviser with the Cabinet of the Minister for the Stations and Telecommunications (1992-1993).

We've said that Europe is complex and complicated. We've seen what happened in France on Sunday for example. There are lots of examples.

Everybody knows that the best strawberries are Norwegian ones so why are they sending Spanish strawberries to Norway? I don't quite see why you can't just box Norwegian strawberries. So, it's really very complicated.

## **History of night flights in Roissy CDG**

But we want to see sustainable development of the airports, the Paris airports. There are all sorts of people within the A.R.C. that previously organized get-togethers to discuss the issues that we're again discussing here. And a large number of airports from different regions have provided input to this debate already.

But looking at the specific case of Paris: if you'd allow me, I'd like to summarize the situation by giving a historical backdrop to night flights.

July 2002 : it is not for the Paris airport, of course, to impose its wishes on what the government says. We're a limited company, and the state has been our main share holder, our main stake holder. Since July 2002, there was a major change

Looking at the run up to that period: in the previous 10-

12 years, we saw massive increases in the amount of night traffic. It was increasing much faster than daytime traffic and the limits that we put on night flights which were 500 in that span between midnight and 5.00 a.m.

But this was a historic turning point because instead of being prepared to accept untrammelled growth, we managed the airport and the total number was to be 22 500. So, that was the absolute maximum. But we have now less of a concentration in those night hours because things have been reorganized so that we've had a tailing off and you do have an absolute sealing as well.

But, as we've said, things are very complicated and that allows me to pick up with what has already been said this morning.

We've always said that we're talking about noise pollution. Where you have a sealing on the allowable numbers, it's clear that the Paris airport, being sort of a test case.

### **The new rules allowed a reduction in the sound harmful effects, including the night**

If you're going to take 15 + 9 or 24-25 whatever, you have to see a tapering of the volumes. If you consider how the companies operate and with the introduction of new rules we can show that there has been a reduction in noise.

But, what we find is that those who live in these areas still feel very unhappy. They feel very uncomfortable with the situation and it's clear therefore that the data that we have need to be much more detailed. You've got all sorts of angles on how people feel about what is going on, and their assessment of the situation; which means that we still have this problem with us and we still need to get to grips with it.

## **Fourteen rules limiting the development of Aéroports de Paris**

But what has been achieved, under the previous government more particularly, cannot be dismissed. If you consider all the rule constraints that apply to the Aéroports de Paris : we've got 14 rules which do not allow us to be entirely free in organizing exports out of the airport.

I'll run through them:

You've got the fact that the time periods and volumes of noise have to be limited.

You've got a whole string of rules which do give you the framework for you *modus operandi* in that airport.

November 2003: the most noisy aircrafts were banned.

In fact, we are quite seriously limited by all these rules and constraints. If you consider the local situation. You have to try to see things through the eyes of the locals, and you have to, at the same time, relate that to the legal constraints that legislation that has to be applied. So, we've got now a pretty strong corpus of laws and regulations to what extent we can further consolidate this which should improve on the situation further for the locals who are affected.

M. Calleja was making a suggestion with regard to what could be done at European level and what is going to happen in 2007 where we may be seeing a revision of the legislation. I think that could just provide you with some food for thought at the outset of this session.



# Charles de COURSON



*French Deputy*

*President of the parliamentary group of studies "Nights flights and harmful effects"*

Charles De COURSON, Deputy of the Marne since 1993, Vice-president of the general Council of the Marne, mayor of Vanault Les Dames. He is the secretary of the Committee of supply to the French National Assembly. He is former pupil of the ESSEC (1974) and the ENA (1989). Lastly, he is a former public auditor at the Court of Auditors (1979-1993).

M. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. I'm here for several reasons. I am the rapporteur for the Air Transport Budget at the National Assembly, the Chairman of a group studies "Night flights and harmful effects". I'm also an MP in an area where there is also an airport.

## **Socio-économique impact of night flights? Night flights and health**

As a MP, I would say that the problem of night flights has undergone no socio-economic impact study. How much does it cost Roissy, or how much does it bring in for Roissy ? Well nobody knows.

My colleague here, in front of me, is one of those MPs who represent residents who suffer from noise pollution. But this is not an indicator of the socio-economic cost of these huge airport platforms.

We know that there are health effects, but we haven't been able to quantify them.

There is also cost to linked infrastructures. Roissy is running at a surplus. We also have cost of rail links, road links. A lot of questions have to be taken into consideration.

But it's difficult to make an assessment platform by platform if we don't have a minimum level of European coordination.

Moving on to Roissy Charles de Gaulle.

Some MPs in France would like to have a ban on all night flights. We've had a similar debate on hunting.

### **Which definition of night flights?**

#### **A total ban or a partial curfew?**

There's the debate of the definition of night time: midnight to 5.00 a.m. But very few people just sleep from midnight to 5.00 in the morning. Most people sleep seven hours.

But there are societies which have different notions of what is night. Not all citizens sleep at night. So, banning night flights does not protect everybody, and we have to take that into consideration. Is it possible to bring in a ban? I don't think so at Roissy or at any other airport.

Why ? Because airlines have said that it will break them. And therefore, I think that this blanket ban would be impossible.

### **Possibility of a suppression of night flights**

However, banning passenger flights is possible and steps have been taken.

Air France has very few flights between midnight and 5.00. If we had a night time definition from 11.00 p.m. to 6 a.m. then, obviously, more flights would be affected.

I think that we could ban passenger flights at night if it were sufficiently well coordinated. And I don't think it would lead to large scale relocations of services.

However, there is a problem with fret and postal services. The French government has taken measures. We're the last member state that controls its postal service. But we have reduced our postal night services by 25%. This has had an effect on the collection times for post. It has to be collected about an hour, an hour and a half earlier each day. And a lot of this post is now taken by road transport.

People have said : why don't you use the TGV lines to take post? But that would pose other problems. SNCF has said that it doesn't want its infrastructures used at night because it prevents maintenance work being carried out. That's a strange argument, because maintenance workers could be given warnings when these trains carrying post came past.

So, I think we could get round these problems.

### **Freight flights and postal flights? Solution of a network TGV-Freight**

There's a problem with cargos and this type of services. The government signed an agreement with FEDEX but the four big companies working in this area have come to agreements with member states. They have good agreements.

We could take several different cases: Brussels, Cologne... There are a number of conditions that these companies are subject too. For example, reduction in taxes up to 50%, that's an unbelievable reduction. It's around 20 % in order to encourage fret transport.

There are also different charges for day flights and night flights. And we have a ratio of 1 to 10 at the moment. But unless we find a balance between social costs and other costs, because it's the social security that pays for the anti-depressants that many Parisians take and the sleeping pills that they take. This has a social cost.

It's not the air transport sector that pays for this. It pays a small part, but only a fraction of the social cost.

### **The case of FedEx in Roissy CDG : effects of a delocalization on the site of Vatry (Marne)**

If we come back to FEDEX, now. If we change the operating conditions, then FEDEX is entitled to ask for compensation. FEDEX has a cost of around 300 million Euros,



so they basically ask for 150 million in compensation. This could lead to relocations perhaps. That poses the question of who would pay the bill for that.

Relocation of Fedex enabling companies to work under better conditions might be the solution. So, these companies could work in areas where there is a very low population density, where there are stringent urban development conditions. So where there are very few residents. This has happened in Vatry and I think that's the only example in Europe.

We have built an airport which has a very low population density: 5 to 6 people per square meter. That's across all the different categories A, B, C, D.

As you said, Chairman, huge amounts of money: 300 million Euros were spent insulating 10 000 houses, to protect houses.

So, relocation might be the way forward. So, simple relocation to a current airport in Belgium of wherever wouldn't be a solution.

### **The solution of taxation.**

#### **Design platforms dedicated to freight. Sanction the companies : a dissuasive strategy to reinforce**

I think we need to find a balance when we're imposing charges on night flights so that we can use new platforms for fret transport.

So, it would be possible to relocate a certain amount of air traffic providing there is coordination. However, recent electoral results have shown that it's not possible to continue constructing Europe as has been done in the past.

Now, the question of reducing noise pollution : obviously we can through regulation, imposing chapter to condi-

tions. We can also impose penalties : we increased penalties and we've also improved the ways of actually enforcing the payment of these penalties.

We could also set up an environmental tax. We've increased the tax in France: it brings in 55 million Euros now as opposed to 17 million three years ago.

We also have to look at urban planning, but I think if we really want to solve this problem then we have to relocate to new platforms.

Thank you very much. Then we move on to Mrs Simone Nérome, she is the president of ADVOCNAR which means: Association de Défense contre les Nuisances Aériennes.





# Simone NEROME

*President of ADVOCNAR (Roissy CDG)  
President of UFCNA*

Simone NEROME is a hospital doctor. It is committed in the defense of the environment and the control of the air harmful effects since 1999. She chairs the ADVOCNAR (Association of Defense Against the Air Harmful effects) since 2002. The ADVOCNAR is the principal association which, in the north of the Ile de France, federates the populations concerned with the air movements of the airports of Roissy Charles-de-Gaulle and Le Bourget. The ADVOCNAR counts more than 1500 members and gathers a score of associations of the Val d'Oise, Yvelines and the Hauts-de-Seine. Association has a roles of information and defense of the inhabitants concerned with the sound harmful effects, chemical pollution and the risks of accidents. It represents the residents within the authorities of dialogue. It contributes in addition to the evaluation of the medical impact of the flying activity in particular by making measurements of noise, and studies epidemiologic. Simone NEROME ensures since 2004 the presidency of the UFCNA (French Union Against the Harmful effects of the Aircraft).

## **Effects of night flights on resident's health. Series of measurement of noise by ADVOCNAR association. Epidemiologic investigation around Roissy CDG**

I'm happy to be here to give the viewpoint of the association on the health effects of noise pollution at Roissy. Of course, a lot has already been said about Roissy Charles de Gaulle but the first air platform in terms of the number of movements in 2004 : 526000 landings and take-offs. So, an excess of 4000 per 24 hours and a lot of these are between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. It's the 6th in terms of the world and the 3rd in terms of Europe.

## **Roissy CDG : the European airport more harming during the night**

Roissy is highly placed in volumes of night traffic: much higher than the other main European airports. Geographically, in particular up to the West where you've

got a lot of people living. We've 780 000 to 1.5 million virtually being over flown depending on weather conditions. So, you can see between 0 and 1000 meters, depending on the weather, as I said, between 44 000 and 314 000 people have planes going over them.

This very high traffic density means that there are a lot of noise disturbances, especially, of course, during the night. There are 4 runways: 2 plus 2 for landing and take-off. And because you've got 2 plus 2, you get serious concentration of the harmful effects factor.

**The effects of noise reduction at source are not perceived by the bordering populations because of the repetition of sound emergences and the traffic growth**

Since the end of the 1990's, express fret company has set us off up here and this has meant the take-off in volume of the number of flights.

Overall, there's been a reduction but this is a mathematical calculation which does not reflect at all the way people actually feel. You can have the same indicator by eliminating a few very noisy aircrafts: an old caravel, for example, would be equal to 120 airbus crafts.

But if you have people whether they'd prefer to have one caravel every two hours or 120 airbuses every few minutes, of course they'd prefer to have the one old heavy noisy aircraft.

So after 2002, you have seen that between midnight and 5, a number of flights have been taken out but they're flying just before or just after that time sector. So, they are very much concentrated.

**The non-observance of the WHO's recommandations  
The thershold of 45 dB(A)**

People have been trying to see precisely how all of this

can affect people's health. It seems that it wasn't just a harmful effects factor for the environment, but really a health problem that was being constituted. You've got the W.H.O. guide values and here you can see that the W.H.O. considers that once you've got 45 decibels, you start to have sleeping problems.

There are French recommendations as well: this is the French Higher Council for Public Health from May 2004. They have issued their recommendations depending on the times and where the noise pollution occurs. But these recommendations are not actually being respected.

We started out by trying to evaluate the noise within the dwelling. Previously, we used to have annual global figures and data but we wanted to know exactly what people were finding were affecting them directly. So, we also undertook tape recordings and we got the number of flights which could be up to 87 over certain family dwellings in one night.

And we've also tried to establish what the maximum peak of DBA within the dwelling was. You've got the figures for each different aircraft in the course of the year.

Acoustic experts undertook an analysis, and it was found that in 68% of cases the W.H.O. 45 DBA maximum was exceeded. Scientific experts and medical experts in their publications have pointed out that people get very stressed and there can be psychological and pathological repercussions: cardio-vascular disturbances, people can't concentrate and focus (this affects young people and children in particular), people's sleep is disturbed (they find it hard to get to sleep, their sleep is broken up, they wake up early, so they get much less really restful sleep). Obviously, this is the number one problem with these night flights.

If you look at the graph produced by someone who's been wired up for their sleep, you can see that their

sleep pattern is totally different from someone sleeping peacefully. Sleep, of course, is necessary to be able psychologically and physically to recuperate from the day.

### **Air pollution due to air transport**

As far as air pollution is concerned, this appears to be having a serious effect. But no serious studies have been carried out and with the Department of Val d'Oise, we've undertaken a more thorough epidemiological study with an expert who has analysed the sleep patterns of a number of people: 500 persons who live in the flight paths were analysed and compared with a number of persons not living in the flight paths.

So, these are the areas affected: you've got 2 that are in or close to the flight paths, 2 that are further away. We've also used import from Anglo-Saxon studies to correlate with results we got from the 1000 person study.

There were 3 types of questionnaires. They were very detailed; lots of questions were put to all of these people. And we got a response rate that was very high. So, we did gather some very interesting information from all of that.

You should note that those considered were typical of the socio demography of the country in general. And sleep problems, you can see, are significant in statistical terms.

So, real disturbance of sleep patterns in the flight paths.

So, people started to feel depressed; they had anxiety, problems linked to stress and statistically, these were really significant.

It was particularly the anxiety element which was noted. We didn't note so significantly long term depression factor. Those who were over 60 were much more sensitive. Men more than women and those who've been in the region for 10 years at least had seen an accumulative

effect and suffered more. So you can see that people don't get used to this and no longer have a problem. It's actually the opposite; and the situation worsens with time and accumulation.

I would say that this is a serious health problem affecting people's personal lives. Those who are affected by this feel tired, they're much more irritable, their personal lives are adversely affected and they have less concentration, their memories are affected. They can therefore be more likely to suffer an accident at work or others; they have to take sleeping tablets.

The consequences for normal activities and the effect on the quality of life, we know that there are serious economic consequences if you do not sleep properly.

Something like 6 days a month are lost at work by those who do not sleep properly.

### **Proposals**

If we had a total curfew for just a few consecutive hours at the major airports which are near to urbanized areas that could be a big help. And, of course, we need to have general rules and proper legislation so as to be sure that we do not see a distortion over competition because of some airports not having to introduce the same sort of measures.

Well, of course you can see that Darwin's theory of natural selection possibly will mean that in so many thousands or millions of years it might be possible for us to adjust to this. But it is a very long process, probably by then we won't have any oil anyway. So we won't have to worry about night flights or planes at all.

We need to find a much more speedy solution to help those who live near to airports.





# Debate

## Roissy Charles-de-Gaulle

**Fons HERTOOG, Mayor of Haarlemmermeer  
Amsterdam-Schipol airport**

You've been able to give us a lot of information in very short time.

To finalize this debate about Roissy Charles de Gaulle, I would like to give the floor to two speakers. There's the first one:

**Michel TOURNAY,  
President of AREC-Plaine de France association**

Michel Tournay, President of the AREC Plaine de France, which is an association of residents around Roissy CDG airport. I have a question which I could put to M. Lorriaux and M. de Courson.

You've been saying that we could be jeopardizing a certain sector of the economy by banning night flights. Then I noted that you said it was possible to relocate to 200 kms away certain aspects of air transport.

We have visited the Vatry airport (our association), and we have seen many people saying - M. Chirac, M. de Robien - that Vatry is excellent. There is modern equipment, modern buildings.

So, I have a very simple question: we've talked a lot about it, a lot has been written about it, but we've done nothing. Why has nothing been done?

What about the relocation of flights? What's happening with that? Who can make that decision ?

**Charles de Courson, French deputy**

We're in a free market economy. That doesn't mean that there are no rules. It's not the Far West as somebody mentioned before. This year we will have 30 000 tons of cargo; in France we account for about 4% of this.

You can't force companies to come and work in your country. We have two of these new platforms: Leipzig and Vatry. Some companies plumped for Vatry because they thought it was the one airport that would enable them to develop themselves without being subject to severe restrictions whereas in Germany, they plumped for Leipzig. But there will be problems in Leipzig. This was a political choice taken by the German government which is involved with companies working in this sector.

So, in a free market economy, how can we get companies to make the right choice ?

I think we have to increase restrictions so that companies have to pay increased charges, environment taxes, if they want to fly at night.

But if we got more help from the European Union, then things would move along more quickly.

Is there really a political will to do anything among member states? I don't think there is. There's an extremely ultra liberal approach in the Commission and also in other Member States. For example, in the Netherlands, in UK and other member states.

# Thomas SCHAEFFER



*Senior executive manager masterplaning  
Frankfurt airport (FRAPORT)*

Engineer and economist, since 1996, Thomas SCHAEFFER is trainee at Fraport AG (various duties) and since 1999, he is also leadership responsibility for the airport expansion program. His main responsibilities: Airport masterplaning, determination of the capacity needs and development for the airport facility and long-term forecasting, development of usage concepts for the airport infrastructure, etc.

## **Analyze situation of night flights in Frankfurt Operational restrictions on the landings and surtaxes Planning of Frankfurt's development and insulation of the dwellings**

The case of Frankfurt is a case which is threefold: firstly, we have our situation as it is at present: we have night curfew, we have some restrictions for landing aircrafts in Frankfurt, and we have a total of 150 movements at night (night time in Germany is, by law, from 22.00 to 6.00).

So, firstly, in Frankfurt, we are putting surcharges on noise, on daytime noise for aircrafts related to the noise they are making. And we are putting even more surcharges in the night time. Loud aircrafts is up to 12 times as costly to land in Frankfurt as noiseless aircraft.

That's one point which we are making.

The second point is that we received, several years ago, a decision by our planning authorities that we had to create a zone around the airport where we have to make insulation in the houses which will last until 2006. We have some 17 000 houses insulated around our airport.

The cost is put onto charges so that the airlines have to pay, and mostly the airlines which are flying at night as it is especially related to night time noise.

## **A dialogue carried out since 1998 : total curfew counters the opening of an additional runway**

The second part is that we had a discussion which started in 1998 about the expansion of Frankfurt airport. We had a mediation process where all the stake holders (the airport, the government, and also the local communities) discussed the following:

Can this region afford to expand this airport? If yes, under which conditions? And this mediation ended with five points:

- firstly, the airport should be expanded
- secondly, we should make optimize the use of our existing airport
- the third point was that we should have night flight ban between 11.00 p.m. and 5.00 a.m.
- the fourth point is that we should reduce the noise in the surroundings of the airport
- the fifth point is that this mediation process should go on with the so-called region and dialogue forum which is in place and which is working and I think Miss Barth will be able to say much more about it as she is working for this forum.

The owner of the airport has committed himself to this mediation package. This means that with our planning approval procedure which we started and which we are doing at the moment, we put a proposal to enforce a night flight ban as proposed by the mediation.

And we also put into action a ten point program where we try to reduce noise with different measures; like the one I just explained: to increase the charges on noisy aircrafts. Moreover, we made something which is quite unique in Europe. We are giving people who are flown over at a very low altitude, up to 300 meters, the possibility to get money from us as a form of compensation for this annoyance we are giving to them. And for one part where the new runway should be placed, we even say to people

who build their houses there, not knowing that the runway will be there, we even talk about buying these houses.

We are trying to find a compromise between the interests of the air traffic industry on the one hand, which needs to fly at night too, and the surrounding areas. It's quite a hard way to find, and I can tell you that everybody is against us. The communities are against us; they want to have much longer night curfews, they say the whole night must be a curfew, and that you also need curfew during the day. For example, at midday, because you want to sleep until midday, so you need curfews at that time too. And also during the weekends.

On the other hand, we have the airlines which are also opposing because they have economic interests.

We made a study, for example, in the mediation to look at the cause of night flight bans. And only on the fret part, which is only part of the flights concerned, we calculated that the cost will be between 100 and 200 million euros per year for the airlines. This is quite a big amount of money for them and you know airline industry is not that profitable at the moment.

So you have to consider how you could deal with this.

It's a very complicated process and I think the way we are doing it in Frankfurt is quite a good compromise in considering all the interests of all parties.



# Regine BARTH



*Coordinator Environmental Law Division – Oko-Institute*

Ass. Jur. Regine BARTH, studied law in Passau and Köln and finished her education with the bar exam in Düsseldorf. She is the head of the Environmental Law Division of the Oko-Institut, one of the major independent research and consulting institutions on sustainability issues in Germany with offices in Freiburg, Darmstadt and Berlin. Ms Barth is specialised in EL European law, aviation law, planning law, EIA and SEA and the development and assessment of environmental policy instruments in general. She is the head of the Institute's scientific consulting team for the Regional Dialogforum for the Frankfurt Airport.

## **The mediation process in Frankfurt**

Provide dialogue among the different stakeholders on the Frankfurt airport is kind of a past or post mediation process.

I'm working for the OKÖ Institute which is an environmental and research institution in Germany and we have been providing scientific advice from the beginning of the mediation process, and also now for region dialogue forum, kind of the study scientific consulter.

I'm basically attending all meetings and coordinating also the scientific consultancy.

I will not only talk about night flight ban in Frankfurt but I'd like to give you an overview of how the mediation and the regional dialogue in Frankfurt work. And we have heard before that the involvement of stakeholders is one of the major assets that should be included in the process because it is complex and I can tell you from the past years that it has been very complex; even though we are only looking at the isolated night flight ban.

The mediation process started in 1998 and it basically was founded in the deep commitment of the government of that time which was a social democratic green government but which was then taken over by the preceding



government which was conservative.

So it's not really partisan question in Frankfurt to have this kind of process.

And having had some really bad experiences with the previous enlargement of the Frankfurt airport. Starting one way in the west which severe fights among policemen and environmentalists, it was clear that there should be another approach this time.

Therefore, policy makers and also Fraport called for a different approach and a mediation process to be initiated. The main objective of the mediation was to find out how important the airport really is and what are the possible scenarios and whether there is a need for an expansion which had been called for by the Lufthansa at that time; but also to bear in mind the environmental consequences and the consequences on the health of the people who are already affected by noise to a very large extent.

### **Missions of the mediation group**

Very briefly, the mediation group which was installed, which was given the power to decide these things consisted of mayor of the neighbouring communities, of representatives of the aviation community, the Lufthansa, the German air control agency. We also had three main mediators. All of them are much respected persons in the region. Then we had the head of the Frankfurt department of commerce and we also had a clergyman from the region who is very much involved in the fight against aircraft noise and he has been involved in that for many decades.

So we tried to establish a group and then these three neutral mediators to find out whether there should be an expansion and if there is an expansion what could be the mediation measures.

The mediation package which the result of this work

consisted of five different parts. It's basically a compromise which was found which helps Fraport to enlarge the airport but which also consists of clear statements and commitments to a reduction of noise, especially at night. And then the region dialogue forum which is this post-mediation process which we are having now.

It's basically very similar to what we had at the mediation. We have different stakeholders sitting at one table and we have also neutral participants such as churches and trade unions.

We also had environmental NGOs but they left the process or they don't take their seats at the moment because they felt it was a better strategy for them; which is unfortunate I personally think...

### **The installation of a regional dialogue forum**

As you can see the regional dialogue forum does not only consists of this group of people talking together and trying to find solutions. But also, there is an information office which is open to all citizens. There are many events: people go to schools and go to classes and play games with them. There are a lot of public events trying to inform the region of the pros and cons and giving neutral information. That's at least our goal. And we also provide service like noise mapping which is available on the internet and which has already been approved this year.

Here you can see the structure ; I will skip that. It's just to show that we have different working groups and one plenary session which take the main decisions.

### **Presentation of the working method**

I'd like to talk very briefly about the working method. Because I really do think that the approach in Frankfurt is really unique in Europe. We do not have any approach

like this for large infrastructure project with such a immense and long term commitment.

At the moment, we have a budget of about 250 million Euros per year, which is a lot I know. We are very lucky with that. So we do have the means to really look deeper into things and to go deeper on this mediation package, to make it real. This is the main purpose of this regional dialogue forum. It's to take these five points and make them enter the real world which is difficult enough. What we do is we draw scenarios together with the different stakeholders and you can imagine they have different points of view. Then there is the working program which is about 40 pages or something. Many details about what the regional dialogue forum will look at and how and with what methods.

Commission experts opinions is one of the major works. There will always be quality controlled by external independent experts. So that there is a double check with that also. Then we have expertise and join papers where we try to come to a conclusion together which sometimes doesn't work, I have to admit.

### **Which agreements following the mediation process?**

Just now, very briefly about the package deal and especially the night flight, but it has already been said. It's from eleven to five, and this is also for German airports. We have mixed pictures. Some of them have night flight ban, some of them don't. But for Frankfurt it's a new thing and it's difficult to realize because today there are about 150 flights operating each night and we have to somehow squeeze them out of these six hours.

The criticism about this night flight ban, and there is criticism from both sides. Of course airlines and fret carriers especially say that it's bad for their business, which is obvious and they do threat to sue if the night flight ban becomes reality.

Then also some municipalities and environmental groups claim that it should be from 22.00 to 6.00 which is the legal definition of the night in Germany. And then also they said that the aviation potential of Frankfurt could be endangered as an international airport.

One of the most important findings was that the best way to do it is if Fraport apply for it by themselves, which they did. And this was a tremendous step forward towards the night flight ban.

And also it must be proportionate and it is non-discriminatory; this is also due to EU law and also German law.

### **Consequences of a total curfew in Frankfurt for the Lufthansa company**

What does it cost for those like the Lufthansa cargo, which is one of the leading fret carriers in Frankfurt? How would it affect them? And this is also important for the legality of the decision. If it affects them to an extent that extinguishes their existence or that really threatens it, it could be – this is also the finding of the legal opinion – it could be that there has to be some solution for that because since they are operating today, it means that they have certain rights and we have to take care of these rights. It doesn't help if you just ignore them. It is better to look at the effects now and see how to deal with them. And this is actually a step which we have not taken yet in the regional dialogue but we are discussing it at the moment. How can these effects be compensated for ? Especially because for systematic reasons, home-based carriers are more affected than any others, because they have to fly their aircrafts back to Frankfurt to get them repaired or to check them at night. That means that they have less operation time than carriers which have their home-base somewhere else and who would actually benefit from the night flight ban.

So this is something we don't want even if we know that EU commission doesn't like any home-base carrier stuff. But, from a regional point of view, it's something we look at.

What are the general recommendations looking 5 to 6 years back about this kind of expertise that we have and this experience with this mediation package and also this approach of trying not to do it in the wood but to do it by discussion rather.

Lufthansa and everybody in there working together but on the outside, the next day, when they are sitting with Fraport in the official procedure they say something else.



# John STEWART

*President of HACAN ClearSkies*

John Stewart is the President of HACAN ClearSkies, which is the organisation that represents residents under the Heathrow flight path. He is also President of AirportWatch, which is the national umbrella organisation which brings together all the groups opposing airport expansion in the UK. He is also Vice President of UECNA.

Because this morning is over running a little bit, the session with the Belgium group is not going to happen but there will be an opportunity for people from Belgium and from Brussels to say a few words.

My name is John Stewart. I chair an organisation called HACAN CLEARSKIES which represents the residents on the heathrow flight path. I'm gonna saying a little bit in a moment or two but before that, Rob Gibson is going to speak. Rob is a local authority officer for a place called Hounslow which is very closed to Heathrow. Lot of planes overflying it. So to start with, Rob is gonna speaking from a local authority perspectives about the situation around Heathrow and after that the residents perspectives.

## **Rob GIBSON, Council of Hounslow Heathrow airport**

I'm Rob Gibson and I have a very short presentation which I'm going to go through with you. I'm one of a substitute for one of our Councillor Mrs Ruth Canterbury. She couldn't be with us today. I thought I'll just go through what is the Hounslow position regarding night flights, to trying form the debate. The slides actually illustrates how close the residents of Hounslow are to Heathrow airport. When we are talking about night flights in this zone, it concerns probably 2 millions people.

**John STEWART, President of HacaClearskies**

Thank you Rob. This conference must be a way forward, and it seems to me that if we are going to look at ways forward on night flights, it needs to be based on hard and firm evidences. With a lot of opinions today, and a lot of opinions are great, we heard some evidences, we heard great evidences from Paris Charles de Gaulle and the health study there and what night flights are doing health wise.

Those solutions need to be based on hard independent factual evidence. Today's find from opinion, we need to move beyond that. And looking at that, I think one of the opportunities is when the Commission was talking earlier about the reviewed on the update they are doing on the European noise Directive. And hoping of that will be done in 2007. That's seems to me there is a piece of legislation that is already an existence that is applied to all the Members States and the Commission is going to updated. I believe that our opportunity is to insert more definite proposals about night flights. What I believe, is missing at the moment from the European noise directive is any real targets, any real definite levels.

When those of you are involved before with the air quality Directive would know the targets and levels were uncertain. And should the targets and levels uncertain, then they became legal limits which all members states had to work to rules.

**Need for a precise legislative framework on noise on a European scale**

I believe the way forward for noise generally and for night flights in particular is to develop that model. That model which the European Union had already done on air pollution.

So then, what sorts of limits are we talking about ? We all have our ideas or opinions but it seems to me that a com-

mon position of our organisations is necessary. As you know, experts have recommended noise levels for daytime noise and for night time noise.

The night time noise is very challenging. As we said, it's 45 dB(A) max. It's averaging out at 30 dB(A). Why are we ignoring the "WHO", the World Health Organisation levels? particularly, when all Members States of the European Union have, in theory, signed up to eventually implement those levels.

Such recommendations should be inserted in 2007 in the European noise Directive.

Now they are challenging, they are challenging at night and they are challenging at day ; they are challenging for aviation and they are challenging for traffic.

The questions have never well been established. If that's the right target for health or population affected by noise. In certain case, it is advisable to choose for restrictions of traffic of night

The European Commission is now suggesting eight hours. I suspect it's the sort of time the people like to sleep.

### **Economic impact of night flights**

On economics, the Commission talked about early among the study that they were doing on economics of night flights and some of you looked seen an early draft or the draft is nearly finished. What are they looking at ? it's the affect of restrictions or a ban on the economics of the aviation industry and fullled stop.

What they are not looking at, it's the affects of a ban of night flights on the wider European and national economics which actually it's something quite separates. If you ban or restrict night flights, that will have negative consequences on employment in the aviation indsutrie. What they haven't done and what needs to be done if we're going to be based our results on evidences, is looking at the night flight restrictions or bans on the wider economy.



Let me very quickly give you one example : if we've got say a business person travelling from Singapour overnight to Heathrow in order to catch an early morning flight for a meeting in Stockholm. That person is probably paying a premier theoric night is bringing some money and to the aviation industry is bringing some jobs and for night workers.

But say that night flight was banned to Heathrow, that business person would need to spend an extra night either in London or in Stockholm. It would be although a loss for the aviation industry.

### **Ban on night flights : operationally possible?**

Finally, the question if we have a night ban or restrictions as it is dated by WHO standards, is that operationally possible ? This is very interesting and this is where the European Commission Report I think it's excellent.

Let me just read you one quote. It's says, it's the conclusion : "If the same restrictions apply to all the competing airlines flying the European long haul routes, they do seem to be able to adapt their schedules and get over the problems of slot availability congestion and connexion and fly by day".

The question often asked : aren't we in the which world we're calling for night flight bans, we're calling for restrictions ? What to say to the populations which suffer from these harmful effects ? These populations which don't have the capacity in the development of the rules ?

### **WHO, the right authority of regulation**

So my conclusion is, let's us up evidences based solutions : on noise levels, the one independent piece of evidence we've got is the "WHO", World Health Organisation. If that was implied it would suggest restrictions and bans.

# Sabine VAN DE POELE



*Regulatory Officer DHL*

Sabine VAN DE POELE is graduated in economy and european management (master). She is also Regulatory officer in DHL since 2001.

## **DHL : the express industry**

I'm quiet please to have speaker opportunity also here and that you here also the voice of one of the operator of Brussels airport.

So my name is Sabine VAN DE POELE and I'm the regulatory affairs officer at DHL. I have to be also very brief and therefore I'll skipped some of the slides. I think that the role of the express industry is quiet clear for all of you. We offer a service next day delivery but also more than that we're also responsible for custom clearance, duties, export formalities and so on. We're speaking about night flights but that's not our main business.

We spoke a lot of economics contributions and so is the express sector delivering a lot of economic contributions. So we have exact figures of what we contribute in employment. So this studies are available and also the European Commission study which was carried out last year. You can find all this studies and figures and the conclusions on the website of the European Express Association. So just a few words. What is important is that we also support regional development (connexions with all European cities and the rest of the world).

## **Why is it necessary for DHL to fly during the night? The "Hub"**

One of the most important elements : we have to flight during night. Why?

Certain customers like to employ the day for all to prepare, so that we remove all the evening, We bring it to a station, it goes in Hub. It arrives again at a station, to be finally delivered at the final customer, early in the morning. Thus, the oil can necessary to restart its business is delivered with the documents.

So for a company, it is very important do not lose time and that's one of the main elements of our economic today. Everything has to be fast, everything has to be cheap and our customers are more demanding.

DHL combine a lot of activities because logistics is becoming more and more important. We are a company which is servicing worldwide and therefore we have 450 dedicated aircraft operating in our network. We hope we have two airlines, one in the UK, DHL-Air, and the other one here in Brussels, European Air Transport.

We have from Brussels each night about 25 apt authority flights. Two, what we called the "sub-hubs", and from the "sub-hubs", there are flights to other European cities. We do support the Belge approach because then finally we had an European framework for noise management. What is Belge approach is was explain this morning by M. Calleja, so I'll not explain this once again but I'll just focus on how is it implemented here in Brussels.

### **Noise reduction - Planes of DHL - Flight procedures**

What we see is that speaking about reduction at source that we faced out the Boeing 727 and replaced by 757, an aircraft which is less noisy and it was an investment over 4 or 5 years of about 1,2 billion euros.

Also, we're constantly looking of how we can optimise the flight procedures so there was an interdiction of continues descent approach, better technics to use climb power and so on. All of this has an impact on noise reduction.

On the other hand, what we have is noise reduction at source and the competences of the local governments, and then we see that it's not full failed.

### **Restrictions existing in Brussels-National**

Restrictions existing in Brussels : quotas counts, the number of movements which is limited, noise emissions norms imposed by the Brussels government.

We reduce the number of people affected by the aircraft noise with more than 40%. So less people are impacted by aircraft noise over the years, nevertheless the number of complains increased.

What we see is an improvement of the situation and therefore we thought it was possible to build an intercontinental "Hub" here in Brussels. So today we employed about 6500 people here in Brussels and we have the ambition to double the capacity so also to increase employments.

In 2008, a new "Hub" will be established in Leipzig. So there is no creation of new jobs here.



# Peggy CORTOIS

*Administrator of UBCNA*

Peggy CORTOIS is Administrator-Manager of a production events company, resident of the national airport of Brussels national and administrator of Belgian union against harmful effects of planes (UBCNA).

## **A voluntarist policy on noise to carry out for the Belgian government**

The planes should not be a Community conflict as it is unfortunately the case in Belgium. They are not expressed in any language but fly over the 3 areas of Belgium by in the same way disturbing the sleep of million of residents.

The Governments must work together to obtain results which are concretized directly on the planes, only means of limiting the noise to the profit of all and not by an ineffective play of modification of the air routes or rotation of the tracks, by a discriminatory dispersion which does not hold at all account of the density of population of the zones flown over.

## **Night flights are not an economic need**

No law, no criterion economic forces on the airline companies freight express train to steal during the night. It is only for strict reasons of internal competition to the sector of the companies of transport express train says as "integrators", as the night flights were born...!

The principle is simple to understand, for commercial reasons, the companies suggested to their customers a collecting of the increasingly late parcel and the need for a delivery bound for more in earlier ; this fact the period of night, during which reign a certain partial economic inactivity in the business world, is made profitable to convey the parcels and to bring them to destination, by ensuring the transport of the parcels during the night.

### **Modern means of communication substitutes night flights**

The modern means of communication (fax, mail, Internet) bring concrete solutions to the urgency of transmission of documents, the night flights thus do not represent absolutely an economic need due urgently.

### **A European regulation on night flights for single solution**

Only a European regulation of prohibition of all the night flights in Europe for the only airports described "as urban" between 11 p.m and 6 a.m would bring a solution to these problems, while allowing the maintenance of the employment making land all the planes before 11 p.m. and by authorizing them to take off only as from 6 a.m, and of this fact by modifying the hours of catch and handing-over of the parcel of maximum 2 hours.

### **Which European definition of the night**

Europe must also define the time of the night, in Belgium for the types of planes usable of night, the night finishes at 6 a.m.; on the other hand for the levels of noise endured by the residents, the night finishes at 7 a.m.

### **DHL in Brussels-National**

DHL, become subsidiary to 100 % of Deutsche Post, is a profitable activity. The Belgian State made the soft eyes at DHL to settle in Brussels in 1984, DHL pays few rents for the occupied hangars like for its sorting office. DHL uses old planes, shown a profit and deadened for more than fifteen years, DHL has had all the facilities to work in Brussels. Let us not forget only DHL and thus the German Post office, directly competes with the Belgian post office while being launched in the crenel of the fast distribution of parcel, packages and other spare parts.

### **DHL, principal user of night flights**

Without DHL, there would be practically no flights during the night with the Airport of Brussels-National. DHL exploits +/- 50 movements of planes per night, is 25 landings and 25 takeoffs. During the summer, many flights charters come to be added to the noisy movements of airfreighters, often these charters leave around 4 a.m. The night flights do not bring anything to Belgium, nor with the Airport. It is a question of an artificial means of creating traffic with the Airport of Brussels-National. The only solution with the legitimate problems of all the residents would be a pure and simple suppression of all the night flights, without exception, for the local period of night between 11 p.m and 6 a.m in Brussels.

All the residents, in some area which they are, would be thus definitively saved sound harmful effects of the planes during the night.

The last planes, certainly more modern but noisy according to their important total mass on takeoff like MD-11 or Airbus 300 which have a figure of individual noise (Count Quota) of 11 would have also soon prohibited of flight during the night.

### **Quota count and big transport aircrafts**

So the maximum limit of quota count by movement of plane the night, fixed at 12 since January 1st, 2003, must further be decreased towards a limit of 8 even 4 as the Areas require it, while waiting for the final suppression of all the night flights since the Airport of Brussels-National. In the same way, it is inadmissible that carrying large planes old with the quota counts very high (from 40 to 85 quota count) take off as of 6 a.m while crossing any Brussels.

A definition of the individual levels of noise of the planes for the delicate time sections from 6 a.m to 8 a.m, as 9



p.m to 11 p.m would be another concrete realization to take in order to protect these "significant" periods, that is to say to fix a limit at the quota count 24 for the significant periods of the morning and the evening, and with the quota count 48 for the day from 8 a.m to 9 p.m.

### **The action of the State and Communities is necessary**

The Federal State and the Areas must quickly define the levels of noise admitted by the overflights of planes in height of each sonometer and found a system of fines or financial sanctions to any airline company whose planes would exceed the limits of noise authorized by sonometer.

### **The mediation service of Brussels-National should become an independant controlling authority like Acnusa in France**

As airport owner BIAC holds at the same time the role of the controller and of controlled, it would be convenient and judicious to transform effective Service of Mediation for the Airport of Brussels-National into an Authority Independent of Control and Mediation of the Air Sound Harmful effects on the model of the French ACNUSA. The ACNUSA became an Authority with whole share, respected, listened, appreciated and which became qualified for :

- Regulations applicable to the measuring sites of noise
- Diffusion of information on the noise near the residents
- To give an opinion within noise exposure or sound embarrassment
- Modifications of approach and waiting, the starting procedures the control of the respect of the charters of sound environmental quality

The European Commission should intervene so that all the European airports without any competition of night, by prohibiting the whole of the traffic of night in Europe ; or at least for the airports too located close to the urban centres.

### **Revision of the “urban airport” definition**

Thus first the definition of the airport of the "urban" type must firstly be corrected in Directive 2002/30 relating to the establishment of rules and procedures concerning the introduction of restrictions of exploitation related to the noise into the airports of the Community. The Airport of Brussels-National is according to UBCNA of the "urban" type, but as it has tracks a length higher than 2.000 meters, than it offers intercontinental connections although it is located at the center of a very great agglomeration and that a great number of people suffer from the noise from the planes, it is not regarded as "urban" within the meaning of the description of the airports made by this Directive.

This Directive should be reinforced by sanctions for the States which do not respect the principle of an approach balanced in the decision-making of applicable measurements in order to solve the problem of the noise in an airport located on their territory. What is undoubtedly the case of Belgium, where the Federal Government preaches the dispersion of the sound harmful effects of the planes, without any action with the source of the noise, by scattering on all sides the harmful effects without trying to limit their emission of it.

Another interesting Directive is far from being applied in Brussels, that is to say Directive 90/313/CE of the Council concerning the freedom of access to information as regards environment. In the case of Brussels, only the Federal Service of Mediation directed by Mr Touwaide,

here present, provides data on the trajectories followed by the planes and the caused harmful effects. But I must acknowledge well that other responsible authorities, like the Belgian federal administration of Aeronautics, or the private owner of the Biac airport or the autonomous company of air control Belgocontrol refuses any informative data communication under pretext which any information falls under cover of the rules of confidentiality of use in the air transport sector.

In fact, in absence of any authority independent of control, one can do all and anything with Brussels-National, and it belongs unfortunately to associations of residents and the municipal authorities, to make respect the Law and their rights by legal actions, which were a certain success these last months with a Stop of the Court of Appeal which prohibits the abusive use of the landing strip 02 and another Stop of the Council of State which prohibits Saturdays to take off since track 20.

### **An information not always clear**

The Authorities refuse to communicate any information, pretexting that very given informations transmitted will be turned over against them or will be used in the framework of lawsuit and other actions at law; what is inadmissible : planes known as Chapter 2 land from time to time with the contempt of Directives 92/14 and sometimes 98/20, of the "hushkittés" planes continue to operate by night, of the large transport aircrafts with prohibited quota take off of night, the air procedures are not observed and the standards of wind determined for the use of certain tracks are not applied to make pleasure with such or such Minister in order not to fly over his property.

The States take into account only the positive economic impact of the night flights, the costs of health or disease of the residents disturbed by the night flights, or of the

expenses of expropriation of the zones too flown over are never taken charges some in all the decisions. My own house will be 100 years old this year, this house family thus existed well BEFORE the airport. At all times, I was flown over only occasionally and only by wind of north, until the day when a Minister very "NIMBY" had the idea to impose the obligatory use of the track 02 which flies over my house 3 nights per week and Saturdays.

### **Insulation, insufficient compensation for the resident**

I live in one of the old districts populated around the Airport of Brussels, the insulation is a lure which cloister the resident at his place and condemns it to sleep all closed windows. I agree to be expropriée but with the actual value of my house on the market of the real estate, but that the State Fédéral refuses to imagine it. One has promised to us for more than 5 years Funds of Compensation, it was still not created, not a centime was not still versed. To regulate a problem like that of the night flights, it is necessary to be able to control it on the basis of scientifically objective data, in Brussels it is all the opposite: one spreads the plague without never wanting to look after it. It is necessary to have the means of its ambitions, which is not the case in Belgium: the residents are excluded from all, they do not count, one neglects them.

The night flights are not an economic need, and we defend their general prohibition at the European level in priority for the "urban" airports.



# Debate

## Bruxelles-National

### **John STEWART, President of HacanClearskies**

So, questions or comments of what has been said here. Any thoughts or comments from anybody ?

#### **A speaker**

I'm living around Brussels. I'm an epidemiologist. I'm well in front about the medical consequences of night flights and aircraft noise in general. I think that the situation in Belgium is indeed a little bit special. But I'm glad to hear from UBCNA that the noise in Brussels is not entirely dispersed but is a little bit dispersed. There are no deserts, there are no lakes. The only one conclusion possible for the government that if one plane over a certain area is not tolerable. Nobody wants them. And there is only one conclusion that night flights should disappear from Brussels.

### **Charles de COURSON, French deputy**

The lady who represented DHL perhaps she could answer a simple question. How can DHL, which is one of the major cases, how does it see the possibility of reconsider the development with, and a respect for people sleep and what are European citizens can enjoyed in terms of peace and quiet at night ?

### **Sabine Van de POELE, DHL**

So of course it's possible. So what is important, it is to respect the noise management Directive. And we did a

lot of efforts to reduce noise reduction. One of the examples is that we see new technologies. We see aircraft with greatest capacities. So that is one aspect, and other aspect is what I said. It's very important to have a launch a planned management accompanied by a balanced transport policy. If you put all these elements together, then you can have an acceptable situation which makes possible to grow.

**Emmanuelle HOCQUARD de KERLEAU, FedEx**

I'm from FedEx. I would also like to had a few words to what from DHL in response to Charles de Courson. Clearly, Environment is something which is extremely important for us, something that we recon everyday. And I just want to add to what has been said today, there are intermodals projects with the rail transport which is something we now getting going. We do have TGV fret project which go to all destinations now less under 600 kilometres. I think from Roissy Charles de Gaulle but there are now replacing airplanes with trains. And the SNCF (the French railways) are very much involved, the Ministry for Transport in France is also very involved. And so we're a making a regular progress and I think we've got to look intermodals politics of this type and try to replace planes with trains. Obviously, a very useful thing to do. But also look of road transport too, because that they allow over these distances to replace fret going by planes and put it on the road.

**A speaker**

A question for the attention to Mrs Van de Poele :  
is it a problem if planes which take off two hours later ?

**Sabine Van de POELE, DHL**

Unfortunately, it's not that so simple because everything is based on a network. So, as I showed there are flights from Brussels to Spain, and they will then be packaged going to Barcelona. That means that the network is all based on the fact that we have to respect the connections and have the possibility of obviously, not missing those connections.

It is a complex network.

**Jean-Pierre BLAZY,**  
**President of Ville et Aéroport association**  
**French deputy-Mayor of Gonesse (Roissy CDG airport)**

It's not really a question, it's a reaction to the presentation that we had. I don't think that we can keep saying if we want to have a constructive dialogue for the future. The companies are going to make efforts to reduce noise or going to replace noisy aircraft with less noisy aircraft. I think that today there are management majors that can be taken, urban measures and it is indeed a responsibility of this state, it's not just the local authorities. We do have a specific situation in Belgium. I do know that but I don't think we can have this permanent blackmail with jobs, this threat of delocalization, and a total refusal to find proper good compromises. I think it's just a question of organisation, it's a choice that the companies can make and it has to be made. On this we can make progress together but let please stop using the same all arguments all the time and accusing the governments and the public authorities, the local authorities in particular.

**A speaker**

I have a question regarding DHL. DHL leave Brussels and move to Leipzig. This delocalization start some mixt emotions in Leipzig. Some of them congratulating the



major and others of course fearing the noise that they would have to suffer. What was the reactions in Brussels among the citizens ? I mean there are losers and winners... How is it perceived there ?

**Maurice SEEWALD, Air Libre association**

My name is Maurice Seewald, I'm speaking in the name of Air Libre Association which is the organisation that tries to keep Brussels livable.

What has been said here on the urge and what we called "society choice" concerning all the transport of goods. It seems to be an accordance not to give so much priority to it contrary to the loss of the quality of life. I'm very surprised and I say that in the name of Air Libre. I regret that the director of DG TREN, M. Daniel Calleja, is not here anymore. But we're very surprised that the European Commission doesn't take the example of Brussels, to show the voice to be followed. For the very simple reason that Brussels is the place where, since the European Commission is here, has instaured night flights to the center of the city which is not a very nice example of doing things.

**Sabine Van de POELE, DHL**

It's not correct that we are using always the same arguments. What I like to say it's that we try to set up a dialogue and has I'm already said, so we try to do everything which is feasible and we like to work together with the decision makers to come a situation which is, let say a win situation. Per definition, we don't like to fly at night. We are not inventing a service, we are offering a service which needed the customers asked for it, so we offer it. It is more expensive to fly at night so for instance we pay landing fees twice in Brussels as during the day. So why we should, from a business point of view, pay twice as high if we can fly during the day? Some people were in

favour of night flights bans so they are quiet happy to see that DHL is leaving. Others regret that there is no creation of job opportunities. So we have also the fact that we were confronted with mixt feelings.



# Roger LERON



*President of Controlling authority of the Airport Sound Harmful effects (ACNUSA))*

Graduate of the Institute of Political Studies of Grenoble, bachelor of law of Higher Studies of Political Sciences, Roger LERON is a president of the Controlling authority of the Airport Sound Harmful effects (ACNUSA). First assistant of the mayor of Valence between 1977 and 1995, regional adviser the Rhone-Alps between 1977 and 2000, it is appointed of 1988 to 1993 and rapporteur of the law of December 31, 1992 relating to noise abatement and the budget of the civil aviation for opinion. He takes the presidency of the National Council of the Noise of 1993 to 1996.

## **Creation and missions of ACNUSA in France**

Acnusa was really born at a problem in region of Paris, about adding a runway in Roissy Charles de Gaulle. We're trying to get conference between the various partners: government, companies, administration, the residents, the various associations. And the government suggested we should create an independent authority, which is in fact the only one of this type in Europe at the moment. And the reporter of the law which is created Acnusa was Jean-Pierre Blazy, and he is the president of "Ville et Aéroport". And I know that he'll able to better explain the various details than I can because I wasn't really in the loupe at this time.

It was a good idea to have an independent organisation which could say a number of things to the various partners involved. Now, there are 8 members, 6 are pointed by the government and 2 who are pointed by the President of the National assembly and the President of the Senat. The independence is guaranteed by the fact that in principle we can't have our mandate reviewed.

What do we do ? Basically, what we try to have it's the possibility of putting forward a number of recommendations, and then come up with some definitions, and then penalties as far recommendations are concerned everything to do with noise, and airports can be the subject of recommendations of the authority as far as the definition is concerned.

### **Acnusa make some recommendations**

We're looking at prescriptions which can apply to noise related measures and to flight path because we try to insure that in the ten main airports in France can be connections between flight paths and the noise measures to have our proper bearing on that.

We're also look public information campaigns as well. We've defined an indicator for noise related measures. An indicator for planning in terms of noise exposure or noise pollution and before it was a concertation with the authorities concerned : the Lden is the indicator which is added to an index which is a bit complicated.

We felt it was better to suggest a different index which hopefully would allow for better compares in the European level rather than having an index which is particularly French.

I think that has allow for a better dialogue. It exist an interesting dialogue between the different airports.

At the end, obviously we have the same problems and it's a good idea to have the same indicator to measure those problems. We choose this index and the government decided to keep it and used it. And so, the noise pollution plan allows to measure what pollution residents are suffering.

### **People can get help and substitutes for noise isolation material**

The exposure plans have also been implemented excep-

ted in Paris region in fact which is where are the most difficulties. But the administration has really put this out outside the law because the noise exposure plans have not yet being finished and didn't finished within the dead line said which was December 2005.

Acnusa have to give our opinion on all texts which are legislative texts relating to maximum noise levels for example, and it also important particularly for Brussels I think is that we have to give our opinions on any changes in departure procedures, arrivals procedures, so anything in relates with the flight path really. We meet together to discuss these issues.

### **Acnusa and his power of sanction**

We can impose fines which today can go to 20 000 euros per flight. At the moment, in 2005, I signed the last mandate recently and I've already a million euros for 2005. So I think by the end of the year, we've 2 and a half million euros for the ten French airports in terms of fines.

So that's what the organisation does, that's its role, that's its fonction. We were created in 2000, 5 years later, we asked for an evaluation of our role and our task should be carried out. So at the next congress you have the possibility of looking the evaluation and seeing of this authority is actually useful at all or if it's a waste of time.

### **Acnusa position on night flights**

On today's subject in particular, we said in 2001 from our very first activity report that the problem of night flights is something which is clearly a very important problem. But we couldn't make a recommendation for an absolute ban on night flights in France. First of all, it's because in all our recommendations, we've try to ensure that the recommendation could be followed up.

The second reason was that we couldn't do this really in a uniform way in France and make unique to France. So that would mean there'll be no corresponding measures in other countries in Europe. We felt that was just impossible.

So that mean that could be restrictions on night flights has something we're pushing for obviously because it is one of the most important problem that we have to do with today for the residents are concerned.

We've got to look at things on a case by case bases, airport by airport and try to gain one hour, two hours, three hours, keep pushing for that. And that is something we encouraging airports to do. But there is no more discussion about night, as the European directive which says that the night is 8 consecutive hours. There is only discussion that we have now is how they should be apply ? But 8 consecutive hours, that's defined now.

Number of associations are fighting on the 8 hours but this is the text which exist now.

### **Need for airports dedicated to freight traffic**

To come back to the question of noise and what happened in France, it would mean that there will be airports which function at night if there's no noise, if there's no much residents around like VATRY. But if there's a limit among airports it doesn't mean it has to be limits in all airports. And then the question is been unique in Europe. Today we've got 4 to 5 airports which are congested.

Are we going to continue bringing traffic into these airports? Are we going to try to look for solutions ? In Roissy CDG, at the moment, there are one thousand four hundred flights a day.

There are people who have got three hundred and fifty flights coming over the heads every single day. If that something that we can expect people to deal with, is that

feasible and reasonable ? I think we've got to look at a real factual bases which larges to move our heads, which is larges to make progress.

### **Economy of express freight**

An other element that I'd like to talk about is the all question of the activities of express fret. There is a paradox in all this. Studies on the question of fret transport at night, his economic impacts, it's something which exist in all airports because the people who deal with fret at night have shown that there is a social economic usefulness and that's true you can't say the contrary.

But the problem is that if there is no night fret then how will the all thing work economically ? If there is no activity at night for fret, how will the companies fonctionned ? Will things fonctionned better, worse ? I really don't know but that's a study that hasn't being done and that's what I think we need to be doing. That's really the study that we have to start commissioning and trying get people to look at this in various places.

The situation in Europe is totally different from one airport to an other, and from one country to an other. There's something we do need to bear in mind. If aircraft do make noise, they have to try to limited as much as possible particularly where there are many people living and that's the all paradox : where there are the most people there are most flights, and that's indeed difficult to deal with.







## Bernard GARANDEAU

*Secretary-general of association "Ville et Aéroport"  
1st assistant of the Deputy and mayor of Mérignac  
Vice-president of the general Council of the Gironde*

1st Assistant of the Deputy-mayor of Mérignac, Bernard GARANDEAU is delegated to finances and the economic development. He is a vice-president of the general Council of the Gironde in load of solidarity and the social housing, secretary-general of association "Ville et Aéroport". Qualified engineer of the National School of Civil aviation, it made a part of his professional career in the services of air control. He is also engaged in the defense of the durable development of air transport and that of the framework of life.

We're going to continue with this debate, and talk about proposals that we can make at the end of this conference. I'm the secretary general of Ville et Aéroport. Our association is made up of elected officials affected by airports. We study economic and social impacts of airports. And we defend the interests of our residents. We look at economic concerns of course but we also look at environmental concerning people, so a sort of humanist approach as well.

### **Define what night is, a requirement**

First thing we have to do is define what night is. The European commission says it's 8 hour night but we've seen for example that a children go to bed earlier in some countries. So, I think we have to have a precise definition of what night is and how this could be into a regulation. We have to define the exact duration of the period, is it seven or eight hours ? Can we have a complete ban during that period ? Can we have a certain motif of toleration for certain flights ? Many people think that they should be a more precise a European law than the 2002 Directive. But regulations which should take into account the situations in airports across the EU. In

France, we tend to compare airports which have different characteristics in terms of passenger volume, noise pollution.

### **Apply the principle of precaution and sustainable development**

We need a very precise specific European law. In Bordeaux, we are in favour of expression and decentralisation. So obviously we don't want more European involvement in general but that is not forget that a flight goes across Europe. So therefore, Europe is involve with regulating flights. The EU have competence for health matters and we've seen night flights have an affect on health. So we have to comply with the precautionary principle, and the principle of sustainable development.

### **Night flights : legislate on a European scale as on a national scale**

As regards night flights, if there was a ban, then companies would go to other member states.

And therefore, this would disturb competition. The local authorities also have to work with national authorities.

With the example of Frankfurt, it's one of the biggest European airports, there has been a lot of dialogue which is let to progress.

So, we are in favour of this European directive but we need national involvement as well. We are also need debate at local level. We need to undertake negotiations involving local authorities and residents. So that airport policies take into account economic interests but also environmental interests as well.

### **Found new more virtuous behaviors for the integrators and freight's companies**

As regards a curfews, this could resolves certain health

matters, but have an economic impact as well. But this two things are not incompatible. Why can we change the way postal services work for example ? Why wake up a part of the population in one town when this could have an impact on them ?

Is fret using aircraft the best solution ? So, we have to debate this. We have to have a wide ranging debate on this, is what we're being doing today. We have got representatives of airlines defending their interests, residents defending their interests as well.

We can also regards how airports are managed. We can involved local officials, residents, airport officials in this process. We have to make the right economic choices. That is our position.

Lobbying is one of our activities, this is why we are here today. We are trying to get the European Union to find a solution to this problem.



## Bengt CHRISTENSSON



*ARC Secretary general*

Bengt Christensson is the Industrial and Commercial Manager for Harryda kommun in West Sweden. He was a long serving Chairman of the ARC Business and Employment Interest Group before being elected as ARC Secretary General at the Annual General Meeting on 24th November 2004 in Brussels. The Secretary General is the administrator of the ARC and is responsible for its day to day management and its finance. He also has a representative role on behalf of ARC and is responsible for the management, work and running of the ARC's Brussels Representation.

As secretary general of the Airport Region Conference (ARC), this is the first time that our two organisations have been together here on a subject which is so important for citizens of Europe. And this is something which has a bearing on people's health particularly for residents of airports in Europe.

After a lot of speakers, I would like maybe to give a bitter different angles. Airport Regions Conference represents thirty regions from all of the Europe, not only the major airports in the central part of Europe.

Night flights is a nightmare. I suppose we are all might be living in a flight path now.

How it feels like to have a runway through your bedroom?

Still people are buying houses and renting apartments in the area surround the airports because it's a very nice place to live sometimes. It's very attractive areas. But it can't be worse. I'm thinking of those living in relatively quiet areas closed to airports. When airlines and flight paths are changed, and their particular area comes under the noise. I believe their situation is even worse.

Now we have other areas closed to the airports directly affected by noise as Martin Kessel pointed out earlier. I'm thinking of those living closed to the highways, that is often affected 24 hours a day by a high level of noise.

### **The noise : a major reason for ARC's creation**

Noise is the most important issue for local original authorities hosting in airport. The bigger the airport, the bigger the problem. Noise was one of the reasons for ARC first to come together and still is one of the top priorities in the work of a organisation.

At the same time, our communities having benefits from rapid economic growth and new development surround the airports. With the global ascension of markets, airports are key features in the 21th century economic and the prosperity of Europe.

Aviation creates noise, it creates congestion in major regions, and it brings prosperity.

At the same time, we mustn't forget that economic growth generated by airports creates better conditions for our well being, health situation and quality of life in general. For the citizens of our local regions authorities, sometimes it might be right to put a cap on night flights, but sometimes not. The more you think of night flights and what we have heard here today and possible affects of a common legislation on night flights, the more complicated I think it gets.

### **Different ways of life to take into account on an European scale over the 24 hours period**

Sometimes, in some countries, you go to bed when others go to dinner. We have different ways to look at the 24 hours that we are talking about. There are cultural differences and we have of course to accept that, and that will of course also affect how we look upon night flights. We are also rapidly moving into a global economy. I think we should bear in mind that when we are talked about air fret, 25% or 30% is dedicated frets and the rest of air fret goes with passenger fret, and also need to be in the center of Europe where major flights arrived since air fret is

a continental business.

Whose night are we talking about ? Is it the European night only or is it the night in south America, or China ? Is it more important to consider the night in Europe than an other parts of the world ?

But let say we consider a total ban of night flights in Europe. Let's say we close our airports between eleven o'clock in the night and six o'clock in the morning.

What would the international reaction be? Would a ban on night flights be considered as a technical restriction? If such a ban is to be followed by others around the globe it would certainly being impossible to have international flights during the night.

What is the threshold for night disturbance ?

Do we have one single noise level that is accepted as a European standard ?

Are we ready to accept the consequences of lets say a lower general level of 5 dB?

### **The Swedish example**

In my country, Sweden, an impact study was made. Sweden is not at all urbanised in the same way that in other parts of Europe. Even in Sweden the effects were so big that most of urban developments would have been stopped. A lot of our urban environments wouldn't have been possible to continue to develop.

But let's imagine your own environment if you lowered the decibel contour in your cities or around your airports with 5 db. I can assure you it would in most cases not possible to alter the level of noise disturbance with about 5 db without changing the whole urban structure.

But let us keep it simple. Let's say that 55 db is a standard that all Europeans can live with.

I'm not arguing that this is the right level but I am just trying to give an example.



Wouldn't it then be easy to say:

- Let's have a pan European legislation that gives us a cap on night flights in areas where the threshold is above 55db between 11pm and 6 am?

Again it may not be so easy.

**Ban night flights would harm the economic growth potential of freight, charter, express and the postal one**

I mean there is a major economic growth potential that is in jeopardy.

This means that almost 1/3 of the airport capacity in Europe is not used in. Can we afford it? And what would be the effect of our prosperity in terms of job opportunities etc.?

What if we have a European regulation and there are but a few people living in the noise zone?

This may very well be the case in parts of Europe with low population density.

As a matter of facts a lot of regions would like to expand their air traffic because there are more to win than to lose in expanding air traffic in their particular regions. Dedicated airfreight is a growing business and is spreading through Europe. Night flights, as we have heard, seems to be a necessary requirement for that industry and for just in time deliverances.

And the rest of our industry, manufacturing industries, depending on just in time deliverances, not only in the airport regions but beyond the regions.

Should there be a ban on night flight if you only have a few flights each night? What noise level would be the right level to set up for or isn't it night flights, in general, the problem? Or is it the problem on certain flight paths that should be restricted?

Maybe there are various technics to apply to mitigate the noise problem. It could be quotas, restrictions for certain hours or periods or certain aircrafts, procedures for take of and landing etc...

I'm not a technician but I'm sure the last technic isn't invented yet. The point is that there are of course different settings in different regions.

I have now only talked about the effects of night flights on urban life.

I truly believe night flights is one of the most important issue airport regions have to address and have to face. It is of course a major problem in residential areas around our major airports but I'm not convinced that there is just one solution to be found on the European level.

After all noise, as I said at the beginning, is a local problem.

### **Night flights : a solution to find on a regional and local scale - The application of subsidiarity principle**

The solution to night flights should therefore also stay on a local and regional level.

Regional and local authorities usually believe in the principle of subsidiarity as an important principle. I personally believe night flight is one issue that should stay close to the people and close to the political level, that has to find the balance between the benefits of having an airport in its region and to find technical, political and administrative ways to address problems not only noise, but also emissions and congestion.

After I said this, that noise is a local problem and should be dealt with by a local and regional authorities, I would like to argue for a wider perspective.

The development around the major airports in Europe is of great concern to the more peripheral regions in Europe. They will all have their eyes on the development in the major regions. Why is this so important to ARC members and airport regions in Europe ?

### **ARC's program of work**

When analysing the European agenda today ARC and its members find themselves standing in the crossroads of three vital political task :

- One is to enhance the growth in European economy according to the Lisbon strategy. The members of ARC have a major role to fill since our members are the major regions with major airports in each country and hence the motors of the economy in Europe. In ARC regions we find political, economic and research centres in Europe. The rest of Europe is depending on having access to the major regions in order to develop the economy in their region and in Europe as well.

- A second task is to enhance and grow new and strong relations with regions in the new member states. That happens only when people meet people, and thus aviation will grow to meet that demand.

- The third task is to fulfil the Gothenburg strategy, maybe the most important.

The growth must be sustainable. In a way that ensures us all conditions that meet our need for economic development, environmental care and quality of life. This means that we need to optimise the transport sector from an environmental point of view, including aviation with other modes of transport in the Trans European Networks perspective. It is important to also include other means of transport and to have a more balanced mix of transport especially on short distances where other means of trans-

port is compatible and more environmental friendly.

Air transport may by many be considered not sustainable, but we all know it is indispensable in a growing Europe.

ARC thinks noise and environmental problems for citizens in our major regions is also a problem for our peripheral regions.

Air transport causes problems at the regional and local level. It would be treated, in the same time, at the European level.

ARC has recognised the complexity of the night flights question and the difficulty to define a common European legislation today.

### **ARC's means of pressure**

ARC members use this platform to enhance and share best practices examples and that is what we've discussed today and we must be better to plan and to develop our environmental strategy. We are working groups and other european projects. We also have with 30 members the capacity to influence European policies and to enhance the awareness at the local and regional level for the effect of regional policies on the development in Europe.

Finally I would like to mention that ARC is about to launch a new project about Managing Aircraft Noise In Communities, called MANIC. Over the next two years this project will focus on how to address this issue from a technical point of view and also from a regional and local perspective. I hope we will be able to present the results in our next biannual ARC conference in the end of 2006.



# Jean-Pierre BLAZY



I think we have heard a good exchange even if, as always, there were many speakers and perhaps not enough space for debate. Nevertheless we've heard an exchange here today and this something louders to agree of several points.

## **European report : 10 millions residents undergo air harmful effects**

First of all, I think we can state that today on all continent : 10 million of residents every day suffer from new noise pollution due to flights, and that night flights are 550000 movements on the only bases in the major airports and this is for most pollution that population find particularly difficult to deal with, and we've seen that the effects on people health are indeed something which gives us causes for concerned.

We can also state, I think that because of the principle of subsidiarity is really local, regional and national level, rather than any responses being found out high level but this responses are insuficient and it is not enough even if progresses have been clearly done.

But also there is the question of mobilisation of residents and the representatives, there is now a great way environmental issues but there is also being a development in transport and trafic level, particularly during night.

## **Stakes of the 2002/30 directive's revision**

M. Calleja did said that Commission would prepar a report on the implementation of the 2002/30 of 26 March 2002 Directive.

We heard this morning that people judged it to be inadequate. The Commission could then purpose on these

bases a possible amendment and change the regulation high european level.

**Ville et Aéroport association will formulate its proposals near the European Commission (DG TREN)  
Need for reaching at a “daring compromise”  
on night flights**

It is clear that “Ville et Aéroport” is not going to just wait. We have to take action, I mean to put forth proposals aiming to better regulating the night flights in Europe. The compromise that I suggested this morning, which I know is a subject of political debate.

I insist that we’ve got to find what is the definition of night. It’s true that the night, of the noise Directive 2002/49 of 25 June 2002, gives a definition of night but the Directive of Airports does not talk about the question of the night and do not give us a definition on what night should be ?

**A clear definition of the night : the precondition to any future legislation**

It is something to discuss and to modulate according the rythm of life of each Member-States

To guarantee the perennality of this compromise, it is necessary that the European Union is made hear within the assembly of the OACI

Europe does not have to give anymore under the pressure of the United States which turn the back on the principle of sustainable development. We saw it on the old question of Hushkitts, on the ratification of the Kyoto protocol. Europe yielded on the Hushkitts.

So do we have to have a regulation on night flights in european level ? I think we need to reform the 2002/30 Directive.

## **Need for an internalisation of the air transport environmental cost**

Progress to try to reduce noise at source. That is going to be some progresses I am sure in the future but this is a long term job. I think we do need to think about setting up an environmental tax, it is something which should be at the european level and apply it to all companies. It would have a deterrent role and it would encourage companies to fly less at night and into large airports which are in the middle of major agglomerations, it is advisable, as the "White Paper" suggests it, to set up a true policy of internalisation of the environmental costs at the European level.

And I think it is a difficult subject because we are talking about tax than is not really something particularly well seen at the moment, and companies say that they are already taxed enough (there is a tax on the airport, for safety etc...). But the levels of tax when existing national level relating to noise is a very low level.

It does not give night sufficient ressources so I don't really think that in France, we are going to get 55 millions of euros was promised.

### **Regulation of night flights : which action of the Member States?**

The second level, is the state level, what members states can do here ? I think it's clear that the principle of subsidiarity has to be maintained as a factor principal.

### **The Frankfurt case, an example of "daring compromise"**

Another case was Frankfurt, and I think we've heard today. This would be an example. Mr. Schaefer and Mrs Barth explained us very well how in Frankfurt a total cur-



few between 11PM and 5AM could be negotiated against the opening of a 4th track.

It is the example that we can find solutions to arrive to a compromise via a negociation of 4 years with the elected officials and associations of residents. The freight activities will be transferred from the Frankfurt airport to the Hahn airport located at 120 kms.

### **Create platforms dedicated to night flights (freight and charter) - Roissy CDG and Vatry airport**

Regarding to Roissy CDG, it is necessary for us to study the possibility of creating platforms dedicated to the night flights, freight and charters. Vatry, located in a low populated zone, is under-utilized and would be immediately operational to accomodate the night flights of CDG.

### **Continuation of ARC-Ville et Aéroport partnership on this question**

This day is the first stage of this construction. For the future, we need to determinate how we will be able, between our two associations "Ville et Aéroport" and the ARC, to continue to work together ? It seems important to me to open the discussion with the European members of Parliament concerned and to seize, then at the same time, the European Parliament and the European Commission by subjecting a platform of common proposals.

I think we need also to continue working with the Committee of the Regions who contribute to this meeting today.



# Sergi ALEGRE-CALERO

*Vice-Mayor of El Prat de Llobregat - Member of ARC*

Sergi ALEGRE-CALERO is, at the local government of El Prat de Llobregat, Councillor of environmental affairs (1991-1999), Councillor of education affairs (1993-1995), Councillor of solidarity affairs (1993-1995). He is also Vice-mayor of education and environmental affairs (1995-1999), Vice-mayor of urban development, housing, public works and environmental affairs (1999-nowdays).

M. ALEGRE-CALERO is also Councillor of the Metropolitan Government of Barcelona (1995-nowdays), Vice-president of the public company Aigües del Prat (1995-nowdays), Councillor of the Natural Park of Collserola (1995-1999), and Councillor of the Catalan Federation of Municipalities (1991-nowdays).

## **Localization of night flights and localization of harmful effects**

El Prat is a city near of the airport of Barcelona (22 millions of passengers)

After today and after other meetings. I live 2 kms far from the Barcelona airport, we have no problem of night flights.

May be a few people will disagree with the problem, because it's a problem for million people, few hundred places in Europe and all over the world. With a need more scientist, all of us and especially politicians and heads, will know it is a problem for the health, we know it is an economic business, we know how million of passengers how much it is important for the economy. We have to look for it. It is the aim. Which aim ? For me, it's to put the thing on the political arena with politicians, public and economists.

So I pointed in a way, my friend John Stewart. We need a european regulation, we need limits, like economic acti-

vities. We need targets, and we need deadlines. No more than and noneless than that.

And we need a local level. How every airport, every region gets this targets, this deadlines and these limits ?

### **For a planned regulation**

Especially with plannings, we are not dealing with this problem today and we have to regulate it in 10, 15 or 20 years because they are not going away. The companies need plannings and because they have to plan their activities with deadlines, with limits and targets.

I think it is important and for sure when you say a local level. Manchester does not have any problem, the communities are happy and very proud to have it. So it is completely different in the way of thinking in Brussels.

One important aspect in this local thing it is to put high traffic flights in the matrix of the economy. They have to put a noise penalty, they have to put insulation, they have to put social insurance, taxes, they are fighting with “low-cost” companies, they can do it with time and they have to do it, they don't like it works all over.

### **A ban on night flights is a lure**

I think we have to find a better way, in my opinion, than to try to ban it. I am afraid to say it is not going to be like that.

Noone is going to ban the traffic on the motorways, noone is going to ban the trains nights and there are a lot of people affected.

# Ales KUTAK

*Transportation Adviser of Ministry  
of Environment Czech Republic*

## **The case of Prague-Ruzyně**

I would like to make a short statement on the situation met in Prague-Ruzyně, which is our only big airport.

Some measures implemented for reduction of night flights noise.

- Limits for movements per hour : it is limited to 3 landings and 3 takings off.
- Limits for night time, only category of planes lowest noise according ICARE Classification can take these movements.

## **Open conflict after the decision of a third runway**

What is today ? They discussed and started the conflict on that new third runway. Airport decides this runway in able to get landing corridor from more populated to less populated areas.

On the other hand, because of constant increase of air traffic, they need to have at the end, three fully used runways instead of two originally.

It is more Heathrow than Stansted if I use this comparai-son to London conditions.

## **Good solution : a new runway more distant from Prague Transfer of freight transport**

Surprising, it is Ministry of Regions Development who asks quite resolutely for, either, making new runway more

distance from Prague or shift all freight air transport to another airport.

It blocks building of new family houses, this restant sector of Prague is extremely attractive for building a new family houses but you can't do it because you are more and more close to the airport and nobody want to have a Boeing on this head when making barbecue.

**The inequality in region development between different regions : the transfer of activities as solution**

Only big difference which is in Czech Republic is difference between capitale and any other regions. So I think they want to shift some activities to an airport which is not so closely connected to Prague and don't increasase the inequality.