

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 19 September 2018

1:00pm – 4:00pm Heathrow Academy – meeting notes

Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Cllr Peter Szanto	Elmbridge
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow
John Coates	Richmond
Cllr Peter Taylor	Runnymede
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
John Stewart	HACAN
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Armelle Thomas	HASRA
Tim Walker	London resident
Dr Maureen Korda	Plane Hell Action
Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Kathleen Croft	Spelthorne resident
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Sarah Bishop	DfT
Gary Marshall	DfT
Connor Daly	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Mike Glenn	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Peter Rafano	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Sam Fountain	Heathrow
Jakub Hajko	Heathrow
Apologies	
Cllr Conrad Sturt	Surrey Heath
Rosalie James	AN3V
Dr Darren Rhodes	CAA
Nic Stevenson	CAA
Ian Jopson	NATS
Stuart Price	NATS
Robin Clarke	NATS
Geoff Clark	Virgin Atlantic

1 Welcome and apologies for absence

- 1.1 Matt Gorman (MG) welcomed members and observers in the public gallery and noted apologies for absence. He explained that today's meeting would be slightly different to usual, with the agenda split 50/50 between Heathrow and the community.

2 Previous minutes and actions

- 2.1 MG went through the actions from the previous meeting. These are summarised below.
- 2.2 **Schedule a learning session on PBN implementation in the US:** MG confirmed that a session would be arranged to share some learning from implementation of PBN in the US once a technical advisor is in place at the HCNF. He suggested that the session could take place later this year or early in 2019 depending on availability. **ACTION RN**
- 2.3 **Provide a short formal response to Stephen Clark's presentation:** MG advised that Richard Norman (RN) is currently working in this. **ACTION RN**
- 2.4 **Working groups to discuss how Heathrow Community Engagement Board (HCEB) and HCNF should work together:** MG confirmed that this was discussed at last month's working group and it has been proposed that HCEB chair Rachel Cerfontyne should attend a future working group to set out her objectives around how the two groups might work together. **ACTION RN**
- 2.5 **CAA departure noise report - comparison of departure profiles NADP1 & NADP2 for A380s on the Detling route and further discussion at the working group:** MG confirmed that the CAA report had been covered further at last month's working group including a comparison of departure procedures for A380s on the Detling route. MG added that it was also discussed further internally and he was keen to develop a program of activity to take forward. RN advised that the common goal was to work towards optimising departure procedures from a noise perspective. He showed a slide identifying next steps including exploring the feasibility of a conceptual procedure put forward by Teddington Action Group (TAG), reviewing existing data, plugging gaps in understanding and looking at what tools or mechanisms could be used to support the objective of optimising departure procedures. He said he would develop a programme of activity and take it to the working group. **ACTION RN**
- 2.6 Dave Gilbert (DG) asked if Heathrow supported the analysis of TAG's conceptual procedure and whether TAG should be involved in the Terms of Reference for such a study. RN advised that he would pick this up with Darren Rhodes. **ACTION RN**
- 2.7 **2017 noise contours:** MG advised that the 2017 noise contour report was now available on Heathrow's website. He noted that the document was too large to send by email but could be downloaded from Heathrow's Noise website.
- 2.8 **Community Noise Group (CNG) to agree governance protocol for independent technical advisor:** Paul Conway (PC) advised this was almost complete. Cllr David Hilton (DH) felt the process was taking too long and that none of the issues were insurmountable. One issue related to the involvement of councils and another concerned external communications and the release of information.

- 2.9 DH felt that councillors could not represent the views of their council unless those views were written down, noting it was impossible for a council to have fully briefed a councillor on all their views. He therefore spoke on behalf of Ascot residents rather than the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead council. Cllr Peter Szanto (PS) stated that he had been asked by Elmbridge Borough Council to attend the HCNF. He felt that he had a good understanding of the council's position on the issues, but he may need to check with the council if he was asked to formally endorse any new policy. Cllr Peter Taylor (PT) advised that although his ward had a very active resident group at the Forum, he had been appointed to the HCNF by Runnymede Council and it was clear that he represented that council and thought that most councillors at the Forum had been appointed by some sort of council process.
- 2.10 MG advised that when Heathrow originally set up the HCNF, they had written to councils and asked them to nominate council representatives to the Forum. MG said it would be useful to confirm in what capacity each council member felt they were attending.
- 2.11 **Discuss how to structure the community slot better:** MG advised this would be covered later in the meeting.
- 2.12 MG noted an addendum to the HCNF meeting notes from July 2018 where Colin Stanbury had been listed as representing LAANC instead of Richmond council. The meeting notes have been updated accordingly.
- 2.13 MG advised that Heathrow was planning two consultations in 2019 building on consultation feedback from earlier this year. He advised that in January 2019 Heathrow will consult on future airspace change (current and future) and runway operations, followed by a statutory consultation in June 2019 as required by the Development Consent Order (DCO) process. This will cover Heathrow's proposed scheme for expansion and how it will manage and mitigate the effects of airport growth.
- 2.14 Peter Willan (PW) asked when Heathrow's preferred masterplan would be published. Cheryl Monk (CM) advised that it would be presented at the June 2019 consultation.

3 Airspace Update

- 3.1 Jane Dawes (JD) gave an update on airspace change for expansion and Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA) for a two runway operation.
- 3.2 JD advised that Heathrow submitted its airspace design principles to the CAA on 31st August and the CAA will make its recommendation on 28th September. Heathrow's submission and supporting documents are now available on the Heathrow Expansion website. At the consultation in January 2019, Heathrow will consult on the broad geographical areas known as design envelopes within which potential flight paths could be positioned for both the third runway and IPA. The consultation will seek views on local factors that should be taken into account when developing the new flight paths for an expanded Heathrow.
- 3.3 JD explained how IPA provides a more efficient way of using both runways for landing when there is a build-up of delays, improving the resilience of the airport and allowing it to recover more effectively from disruption. IPA will use Performance Based Navigation (PBN) to follow new flight paths from the holding stacks to the final approach. These aircraft would need to join the final approach closer than 8 nautical miles (nm) from touchdown to ensure that flights using the main landing runway remain unchanged. This would result in some areas being newly overflown. By increasing resilience, IPA has the potential to improve periods of respite achieved from runway alternation, reduce the number of late running flights and reduce use of the holding stacks.

- 3.4 JD advised that Heathrow plans to introduce IPA in 2022 regardless of whether the airport expands. However, whilst IPA is primarily a resilience measure, Heathrow is also considering putting forward plans for additional capacity for the first phase of expansion, before the third runway opens. This request for early release of capacity would need to form part of Heathrow's Development Consent Order application for expansion. If the early release of capacity is approved, the use of IPA could help support an increase in the number of arrivals between 06:00 and 07:00. She added that IPA was also one of a host of measures which would support Heathrow's ambition to introduce a longer ban on scheduled night flights.
- 3.5 JD informed the group that Heathrow will be engaging with various groups between now and mid-November to develop a set of design principles for IPA.
- 3.6 PW expressed his opposition to IPA and said he would challenge it to the bitter end. He cautioned that introducing flight paths over new areas would be very harmful to a lot of people. He thought IPA was the same as mixed mode, but MG disagreed and explained it was about the better use of Tactically Enhanced Arrival Measures (TEAM) for arrivals on the departures runway. John Stewart (JS) agreed that it was not mixed mode and asked for clarification on where the joining point would be. JD explained it would be closer than the current distance of 8nm but she could not give a precise figure at that moment. Margaret Majumdar (MM) asked what the inner limit would be. JD advised this would be approximately 4 to 4.5 nm but could not specify what that would look like.
- 3.7 JS asked if IPA would lead to a reduction in the number of arrivals between 04:30 and 06:00. MG responded that IPA creates more capacity so Heathrow had a choice of how to use that for resilience or additional movements. Heathrow are separately investigating the ability to move the start time of arrivals from 04:30 to 05:30, but that would not necessarily mean those before 06:00 being moved to after 06:00. MM thought that an additional 70 flights per day from 2021 sounded like a horrific idea.
- 3.8 JD advised that regardless of expansion, Heathrow would look to introduce IPA to improve resilience of its two runway operation. And reinforced that a proposal to add additional capacity before the third runway would need to be part of the DCO application. However, JD stressed that Heathrow did not want to consult on IPA without letting stakeholders know from the outset that it could potentially be used as one of a number of tools to support additional capacity before a third runway opens.
- 3.9 PW advised that Richmond Heathrow Campaign (RHC) had researched Heathrow's capacity between 06:00 and 07:00 and found it was not currently full. JD advised that any capacity assessment would have to account for the fact that Heathrow was mainly only landing aircraft during that hour so comparing to the number of movements Heathrow achieves post 07.00 is not accurate. PW claimed that pilots were flying fast to get to the front of the queue. However, JD disagreed and noted that over the years many tools had been put in place to control the speed of aircraft a significant distance from Heathrow to ensure the optimum position of aircraft. PW commented that the World Health Organisation (WHO) recommended eight hours sleep from 23:00 to 07:00, so adding more flights from 06:00 to 07:00 was unfair. RN advised that WHO guidelines did not advocate no noise exposure for eight hours, as by that measure it would require no road or rail movements either, so the context of the guidelines needed to be understood.

- 3.10 Stephen Clark (SC) stated that IPA was about increasing capacity as well as resilience and asked how the process would be implemented. JD explained that Heathrow was talking about the concept of IPA as part of airspace change. There was a range of scenarios where IPA could be applied. Within the existing cap of 480,000 annual movements it would be used for resilience purposes. It could also be used for additional movements before the third runway is open to increase capacity from 06:00 to 07:00 and in that scenario could enable a later start to the day. Beyond 07:00, IPA would provide additional resilience for the remainder of the schedule. She reiterated that Heathrow wanted to be honest and transparent about how IPA could be applied, adding that any increase capacity would need to be part of the DCO and would be subject to consultation.
- 3.11 Rob Buick (RB) asked how IPA fitted with ICAO PBN procedures. JD advised that it was a recognised technique. PS felt that the benefits of IPA would disappear if it was used for additional capacity and suggested that people would not know how to respond to the consultation unless they knew how it would be used. JD advised that the IPA consultation would need to articulate both scenarios. She advised that a range of measures such as eTBS, RECAT and EU598 would work together with IPA to support Heathrow's proposal for a longer scheduled night time ban. Armelle Thomas (AT) asked if Heathrow would seek the additional 25,000 movements if the third runway did not go ahead. MG advised that Heathrow did not have a position on that. JS noted that the additional flights would equate to an additional two arrivals and two departures per hour.

4 Managing Noise for an Expanded Heathrow

- 4.1 RN advised that Heathrow would be consulting on and seeking views on its runway operations as part of the January 2019 consultation. He advised that the consultation would seek views on how Heathrow should manage its future operations such as aspects of night flight management and runway alternation. He added that prior to this Heathrow will carry out focussed stakeholder engagement workshops with a number of key stakeholders with the HCNF being one of them. RN asked the Forum to appoint two HCNF members as the Forum representatives at the community workshop.
- 4.2 SC asked if this meant Heathrow would only engage with those two HCNF members. RN explained that the HCNF was an important stakeholder and the idea is that the two representatives would provide a useful way to get multiple views from the group.
- 4.3 DH asked how this differed from the work presented by JD on airspace design. RN explained that they were different processes, and this was about moving towards a package of noise measures for an expanded airport. For example, how to rotate patterns of runway use to provide respite and develop different outcomes for how redesigned airspace could be used.
- 4.4 DG asked if the Community Noise Group (CNG) could present its thoughts on night noise at the next HCNF. RN confirmed that Heathrow would welcome their thoughts.
ACTION MG
- 4.5 MM proposed Peter Willan (PW) and Christine Taylor (CT) as HCNF representatives at the community workshop. PC was happy to support these nominations if they were happy to take on the task but noted others may feel differently. CT thanked MM for the nomination but wanted to discuss with the group to select the right two people. PC confirmed the CNG would discuss this and let Heathrow know. **ACTION PC**

5 Planned Taxiway Works

- 5.1 Peter Rafano (PR) advised of some upcoming taxiway works. He explained that between 2nd October and 23rd December major construction work was required to rebuild one of the taxiways adjacent to the northern runway. This will affect the number of aircraft that are able to land on the northern runway during easterly operations. To mitigate disruption to the schedule, Heathrow will need to land an additional two aircraft per hour on the departures runway from 07:00.
- 5.2 Surinderpal Suri (SS) asked if there would be any change in the overall number of arrivals during this period. PR advised there would be no change to total numbers, just a change to how many land on each runway. MM asked if it would actually be possible to fit them in. PR confirmed that modelling analysis showed it would be possible.
- 5.3 CT observed that substantial noise had been noticed recently from Harlington and asked if Heathrow had been carrying out any work at 02:30 two or three nights ago. Wendy Matthews (WM) confirmed that she had also heard the noise. PR committed to make enquiries. **ACTION PR**

6 Community Slot

- 6.1 MG recounted that when the HCNF first started, 15 minutes had been allocated for AOB so that community groups could raise issues. More recently a community slot was built in to allow communities more time to share their perspective, and today the agenda had been split 50/50 between Heathrow and the community to see how that works. He advised that he had discussed this with PC to ensure the objectives of the community slot were met, allowing members who were looking for a response from Heathrow to share their views. PC added that he felt the community slot was a valuable process and suggested that community presentations should be limited to 20 minutes to allow enough time for questions.
- 6.2 AT advised that she had been counting flights and complained there were too many late flights on 27th July. She also thought Heathrow's 2018 Q2 night flights report to the HCEB was wrong because four flights after 03:00 were not listed. MG responded that Heathrow would follow up with her regarding late runners. **ACTION RW**
- 6.3 AT had read that respiratory diseases were the third highest cause of death in Hillingdon and that those closest to highways and airports were most susceptible to respiratory diseases. She added that poor sleep was killing people and could lead to cognitive decline and dementia. She asked Heathrow to consider looking at these issues at the next forum. **ACTION MG**

7 Airspace Principles

- 7.1 PW shared his perspective on Heathrow noise objectives and airspace design principles on behalf of the Community Noise Group (CNG).

- 7.2 PW advised that the Government has three national noise objectives and he proposed an additional local noise objective, that *“where there is a reduction in the overall noise the benefit be distributed proportionately to those already most affected and where there is an increase in overall noise the disbenefit be distributed proportionately to those already least affected”*. SC then discussed current gaps in the knowledge base. He felt that SoNA was unreliable and should be independently reviewed, that WebTAG could not be relied upon and that The Department of Health or Public Health England should lead on health issues. He warned that the introduction of PBN over London could cause protests and suggested that airspace design principles should not be decided until more was known about respite. PW concluded the presentation by asking for the CAA gateway process to be deferred until the noise objectives have been discussed further and their concerns about the design principles have been resolved.
- 7.3 JD reminded PW that consultation on these issues started in January 2018 and had been followed by further engagement. She observed that 1,834 responses were received and PW’s response was considered alongside everyone else’s to prepare the design principles that were submitted to the CAA. She added that the documentation was published on the Heathrow Expansion website this morning and this included supporting documents as well as all the feedback that had been received. She advised that Heathrow was now waiting for the CAA’s response.
- 7.4 JD explained that within CAP1616 Heathrow’s objective was to seek to design airspace for a third runway at Heathrow. MG added that Heathrow’s airspace principles referred back to the three Government objectives mentioned in PW’s presentation. He added that Heathrow had engaged with a broad set of stakeholders who had different views, so it was not possible for the final design principles to reflect every view submitted. JD advised that she would be happy to look at PW’s presentation with regard to IPA, noting that Heathrow would start to look at more details once it gets to options development. PW felt this was the upside down, that the objectives should be at the top and the principles should be the constraints.
- 7.5 Sarah Bishop (SB) noted that in 2017 Government policy had switched to minimise adverse health impacts and this was now being reviewed as part of the Government’s overall noise policy. It was possible that this would be published in November. She agreed that PW’s fourth objective would probably fit within the local category rather than national. Her sense of Heathrow’s consultation was that stakeholder engagement had been quite extensive and was above the minimum requirement to pass through the CAA gateway process. She felt that some of the issues raised today would be debated later at the design envelope stage. John Stewart (JS) agreed that these issues were for stage two of the consultation rather than stage one.
- 7.6 SB responded to SC’s comments from the presentation, noting that WebTAG was probably the most advanced appraisal tool in the world and the DfT was working with the CAA to improve it further. She advised that Public Health England sits on the Airspace Noise Engagement Group which meets every six months and includes three rotating community seats. She explained that concentration and PBN were not the same thing but acknowledged there was not much research on this. She advised that the DfT had recently commissioned some research from the CAA and the headline finding was that a PBN route designed to provide respite does provide a benefit. She was happy to share this work with the group. **ACTION SB**

- 7.7 Stuart Lindsey (SL) discussed the CAA's position, observing that he was independent of the airport, DfT, ICAO, IATA and the airlines and was a creature of statute. He advised that the DfT sets policy and guidance while the CAA owns the airspace change process CAP1616. He confirmed that Heathrow had submitted its design principles and that the CAA was involved in that process. The first gateway was approaching and Heathrow's design principles would either be good enough or they would not, but he could not comment further because the gateway process was still a few weeks away.
- 7.8 Surinderpal Suri (SS) asked if the early release of additional capacity was consistent with the ICAO principle of reducing noise at source. RN explained that any early release of capacity would be part of the DCO process and that any associated mitigations would be consistent with the ICAO balanced approach. SS noted that research suggested a noise reduction of 5-6 dB was required to provide effective respite but that more clarification was needed. RN acknowledged there were gaps in respite research and that more research was needed.
- 7.9 DH observed that the HCEB had been set up to help manage these consultations and thought it was a serious omission for these consultations to have started without the HCEB's involvement. CM advised that the HCEB had been briefed and would play an important role in stakeholder engagement and how that could be made more inclusive.
- 7.10 PW expressed concern that the design principles would be fixed once they have passed through the CAA gateway process. He felt the list of principles was confusing because it included both concentration and dispersion. He reiterated his request for the decision to be deferred. MG noted that he was not in a position to agree to defer the process or to agree to PW's fourth objective. He reiterated JD's comments that Heathrow had sought to reflect a wide range of different input and acknowledged there was still a lot of debate to come over how to apply those principles at the next consultation. He added that Heathrow would provide a considered response to the presentation. **ACTION MG**

8 South East London - No Respite from Aircraft Noise

- 8.1 London resident Tim Walker (TW) gave a presentation on aircraft noise in South East London. He advised that aircraft from London City and Heathrow airports combined to create community noise blackspots in South East London. He called on the industry and airports to work together to address the noise impact and asked for aircraft to be flown higher over London. He advised that London City had introduced a concentrated flight path in 2016 resulting in very low, concentrated easterly arrival routes over London, which sometimes combined with Heathrow's westerly arrivals to create double flight path noise blackspots over London.
- 8.2 MG advised that Heathrow would provide a written response or follow up at the next meeting. **ACTION MG**
- 8.3 JD added that Heathrow attended regular bilateral meetings with other airports, was aware of the issue and was discussing how to address such issues in the future. However, she advised that local wind variations meant it would not always be possible.

9 South East Londoners Living with Overflight

- 9.1 Dr Maureen Korda (MK) of Plane Hell Action added to TW's views about aircraft noise in South East London. She referred to a quote from aviation minister Baroness Sugg about DfT policy to "*limit and, where possible, reduce the number of people affected*" by noise. SB responded that the DfT was updating this policy and proposing a new objective that would be consulted on later this year.

- 9.2 MK quoted a resident who was affected by aircraft noise over 20 miles from Heathrow but outside the noise contour. MG acknowledged that while noise contours were useful they did not mean that those outside the contours were not affected.
- 9.3 MK stated that she had been advised by the DfT that there had been a “*permanent change to the number of flights using an existing flight path*” and that this constituted a Permanent and Planned Distribution (PPR). MG responded that he was not aware this was a PPR and thought some wires may have got crossed. SB advised that PPR was an evolving policy but was not in place as a policy process. She advised she would follow up on this. **ACTION SB**

10 AOB

- 10.1 DG advised that he had submitted some questions by email. Richard West (RW) responded that Heathrow would reply in writing. **ACTION RW**

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 21st November 2018 at 1:00pm-4:00pm, Heathrow Academy.