

**Heathrow Local Focus Forum – Monday 21 January 2019**  
**6.30pm – 8.30pm Compass Centre – DRAFT Meeting Notes**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough/Organisation</b>
<b>Attendees- Members</b>	
Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Wendy Matthews	Iver Parish Council
Elaine Mells	Pavilion Association
Nigel Mells	Pavilion Association
Eilish Stone	HASRA – Harmondsworth Resident
Phil Rumsey	Friends of the Great Barn
Veronica Rumsey	HASRA / Friends of the Great Barn
Kathleen Croft	LFF Representative at HCEB
Gurpal Virdi	Cranford Resident (Was LB of Hounslow Cllr until 06/05/2018)
David Blackett	Heston Residents Association
Peter Hood	Colnbrook Residents Association
Cllr Puja Bedi	Chair, Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council
Jane Taylor	HASRA Chair – Sipson Resident
Christine Taylor	HASRA – Harlington Resident
Armelle Thomas	HASRA – Harmondsworth Resident
Stan Woods	Longford Residents Association
Colin Dyer	Longford Residents Association
Rob Gray	Community and Stakeholder Director, Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Head of Community and Stakeholder Engagement, Heathrow
Laura Jones	Airspace Communications and Engagement Lead, Heathrow
Elizabeth Beale	Community Relations Manager, Heathrow
<b>Attendees- Guest Speakers</b>	
Sue Thomas	Environmental Assessment Manager: Noise and Health, Heathrow
Harri Howells	Airspace Change Process Lead, Heathrow
<b>Apologies</b>	
Cllr Anup Babuta	Colnbrook with Poyle Parish Council
Peter Jeffery	Chair, Stanwell Preservation Action Group
Cllr June Nelson	London Borough of Hillingdon

## 1 Welcome and apologies

- 1.1. Rob Gray (RG) welcomed members.

## 2 Matters arising from the minutes

- 2.1. RG explained that because this is an extraordinary LFF, outstanding actions from the previous meeting will be covered at the next meeting.

## 3 Consultation Introduction

- 3.1. RG covered slides two to eight of the presentation, which included the Expansion process timeline, an overview of the two consultations for 2019, and a brief explanation of what the Airspace and Future Operations Consultation will contain.

The presentation can be found at: <https://www.heathrow.com/company/community-and-environment/community/local-focus-forum>. *This is the same presentation that will be referenced throughout the meeting notes.*

- 3.2. Armelle Thomas (AT) asked whether the June consultation would still go ahead if Heathrow lost the judicial review. RG explained that the JR is against the DfT not Heathrow and that Heathrow will continue on the basis that the DfT will win the case.

## 4 Future Runway Operations

- 4.1. RG welcomed Sue Thomas (ST), Heathrow's Environmental Assessment Manager: Noise and Health, to speak.
- 4.2. ST explained to members Heathrow's draft noise objective, covered on slide nine of the presentation. She said the whilst it is for the Government to set the objective, Heathrow is consulting on options for it to consider.
  - 4.2.1. Colin Dyer (CD) asked why the draft noise objective references 'scheduled flights'. ST explained the scheduled references the time that the aircraft is due to leave or arrive at the stand, not the time it departs or lands on the runway. There is approximately a 15-minute difference in 'scheduled' and 'runway' time which allows for taxiing.
  - 4.2.2. AT referenced the 'cost effective' aspect of the draft noise objective, asking who the objective aimed to be cost effective for. In her opinion, the cost on health and quality of life for residents, is much higher than the cost to Heathrow. ST explained that you must have a balance between these. She added that as part of this, a health impact assessment will be undertaken – Heathrow is engaging with bodies including Public Health England, CCGs and local authorities, and the preliminary information will be available in June.
  - 4.2.3. Wendy Matthews (WM) asked what 'reduce' meant in the draft noise objective ('...*reduce the effects of noise on health and quality of life...*'). ST explained that this meant that fewer people would be impacted than in 2013. She added that targets will be created out of later work.

- 4.2.4. AT asked which CCGs Heathrow is engaging with as part of the Health Impact Assessment. ST explained that these are the ones which surround the airport, and we could provide a list of these. **ACTION** – share list of CCGs.<sup>1</sup>
- 4.2.5. Gurpal Viridi (GV) asked what measurement was being currently undertaken to make comparisons to the impact of the 3<sup>rd</sup> runway. ST explained that lots of monitoring is currently taking place and that DEFRA has a series of noise maps for road, rail and airline. She added that Heathrow will prepare a forecast for future years, so that the impact of 2 runways and 3 runways can be compared.
- 4.3. ST explained 'Respite through alternation' to members (slides 10 to 12).
  - 4.3.1. Veronica Rumsey (VR) asked if the proposals meant the respite was being shortened. ST explained that this is part of the consultation, and Heathrow needs to know whether you would prefer some respite every day, or a longer period but not every day. She added that the Airports Commission has acknowledged that the amount of respite will be less. RG explained that Heathrow is looking to ensure that every community overflown gets some respite.
  - 4.3.2. ST explained that to help guarantee respite, the plan will be to alternate when the runways are operating in an easterly direction, which is currently not done. Peter Hood (PH) said that he felt this was important to those living in Colnbrook.
  - 4.3.3. AT asked what controls Heathrow has to enforce airlines to abide by the respite plans. Cheryl Monk (CM) explained that the airlines have to adhere to the alternation pattern today and that this will continue. She added that NATS ensure the airline uses the prescribed runway (unless delays prevent this), and Heathrow monitors adherence to runway alternation.
  - 4.3.4. Eilish Stone (ES) asked what will happen to the airspace if Heathrow does not expand. CM confirmed that the routes have to be changed regardless of expansion as a result of the Government's Airspace Modernisation Strategy.
  - 4.3.5. GV asked how the holding stacks operate. Harri Howells (HH) explained that there are currently four stacks, and as part of airspace modernisation, the advancement in technology will allow aircraft to be spaced more efficiently before they arrive, therefore reducing the need for holding stacks. HH added that the stacks will move, to be positioned further out and higher.
- 4.4. ST explained directional preference to members (slide 13).
  - 4.4.1. AT asked whether having a preference makes a difference. ST explained that for 20% of the time, the wind is light enough for aircraft to safely land in either direction.

---

<sup>1</sup> NHS Buckinghamshire Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS Ealing Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS East Berkshire Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS Hillingdon Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS Hounslow Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS North West Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group, NHS Richmond Clinical Commissioning Group

- 4.4.2. PH said that he felt the predictability of respite was very important. Kathleen Croft said that she felt respite used to be considerably more predictable than it is now. CM explained that wind changes currently reduce predictability of respite because alternation on easterly operation is not possible.
- 4.5. ST explained Night Flights to members (slides 14 and 15).
- 4.5.1. AT said she felt that Heathrow was already using an extra 30 minutes each day, with operations finishing at 23:30, and not 23:00. ST explained that on page 31 of the consultation document, current times of operations are detailed. She added that there is a recovery time each day to catch up with delays.
- 4.5.2. ST explained that there is a restricted night period between 23:30-06:00 where Heathrow are restricted on types and numbers of aircraft that can use the airport. Unscheduled aircraft wishing to land in that period would need to have reasons for their delays. She added that noisier aircraft are charged more to land in this period.
- 4.5.3. VR asked whether an aircraft taking off late from Singapore would be allowed to take-off if it meant arriving at Heathrow late. ST explained that this does occasionally happen, but it counts against the late-night quota. VR asked what circumstances would mean that this was allowed to happen. CM explained that Heathrow is working closely with airlines to reduce occurrences including helping airlines to understand the impact they are having on the local community. **ACTION** – EB to include night flights as a future agenda item.
- 4.5.4. WM asked how Heathrow monetarises the cost of the health impacts of night flights. ST suggested that this was covered at the future session on night flights.
- 4.5.5. Graham Young (GY) asked how Heathrow's quota of night flights is set. ST explained that the government sets this, and they consult on it every five years. GY asked if he could bring this up with his MP. CM said that he could, but they are public consultations, so he should be able to give his input first hand too.
- 4.5.6. VR shared that she felt that Expansion will not stop flights being pushed into the night period because exceptional circumstances will still occur. CM explained that part of the cause is that the runways are currently operating at full capacity, and a 3<sup>rd</sup> runway will change this. VR refuted this.
- 4.5.7. GY and AT asked about the landing charges outside of scheduled hours. **ACTION** – share these charges with members (if available).
- 4.5.8. ST explained that the 6 ½ hour scheduled night flights ban is only deliverable with expansion; the CAA has confirmed this.

## 5 **Airspace**

- 5.1. RG welcomed Harri Howells (HH), Heathrow's Airspace Change Process Lead, to speak.
- 5.2. HH explained Airspace Change to members (slides 17 and 18).

- 5.2.1. HH explained that as part of the consultation we need the public to suggest where there might be local factors that we need to take into account. VR asked for an example. HH gave the example of a hospital with noise sensitive equipment. He added that Heathrow needs to know why these areas suggested would be particularly sensitive to noise.
- 5.2.2. HH explained that the design envelopes are areas that flights paths will be within, but that the specific route has not yet been defined. He explained that this meant that some areas within the envelope may not be flown over. WM asked what it meant for people who were not directly overflown but still impacted by the aircraft. HH said that the CAA provide an overflight definition, which for the reason WM mentions is shaped like a cone. He added that this is partly why Heathrow has chosen to consult at this stage with broad design envelopes and a postcode search.
- 5.2.3. AT shared her thoughts that the consultation is not going to be beneficial, because she feels Heathrow is not working closely with other airports. HH said that working closely with other airports is important and that they will feedback into this consultation. He added that Heathrow has bilateral meetings with other airports and that airports sit in regional groups. HH explained that airspace is being looked at in the context of a much broader airspace modernisation across airports in the region.
- 5.2.4. AT asked if Heathrow is the first airport to consult on airspace under the current airspace modernisation plans. HH said that Heathrow is ahead of many other airports, and committed to more extensive consultation than many too.
- 5.2.5. HH explained how the postcode checker on the Heathrow Consultation website works (slide 19). PH asked if the number of flights above 65 decibels, as shown on the postcode checker, is based on the noisiest aircraft. HH said that it is based on the fleet of aircraft in use currently. GY asked if the postcode checker will be available at each consultation event. HH confirmed that there will be staff available to assist you to use the postcode checker.
- 5.2.6. PH asked if you could use the postcode checker to compare how you are overflown today, to the new proposals. CM said that the postcode checker on the consultation website does not have the capacity to be able to do this, but you can enter your address into X-Plane, which will show you how you are overflown today.
- 5.2.7. AT asked if Heathrow expected all of the 2.6 million households which had been sent leaflets about the consultation, to visit the website. CM said that Heathrow has already received over 3,000 responses, and they have the option to visit the website, a document inspection location, a consultation event, or to ring the community relations hotline.
- 5.3. HH explained Independent Parallel Approach (IPA) to members (slide 21 to 23).
- 5.3.1. HH explained that the changes proposed under IPA are for the period between the DCO being granted and the third runway being in operation. GY asked if Heathrow would look to submit a planning application for the additional 25,000 flights proposed under IPA, in advance of the DCO. HH confirmed that this would not be the case - the 25,000 additional flights under IPA will be applied for in Heathrow's DCO application.

- 5.3.2. AT asked what would happen if the DCO was unsuccessful, regarding the 25,000 additional flights proposed with IPA. HH said that Heathrow does not currently have plans to apply separately for these if the DCO is unsuccessful.
- 5.3.3. Eilish Stone (ES) asked if Heathrow's plan is to implement the additional 25,000 flights before the third runway opened. RG confirmed that this is correct.
- 5.3.4. Kathleen Croft asked if IPA meant that there would be more easterly arrivals on the southern runway. Laura Jones (LJ) said that it is not expected to increase these numbers. HH said that IPA should make arrivals more efficient, which would mean fewer out of alternation arrivals.
- 5.3.5. VR asked if any other airports use IPA. HH said that Atlanta is a good example.
- 5.3.6. PH asked if IPA was coming about because of new technology. HH said that the technology was not actually that new, and most aircraft will already have the capability to use it.

## **6 Format of the consultation**

- 6.1. RG explained how Heathrow is consulting and that the deadline for responses is Monday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2019. He encouraged members to respond to the consultation.

RG thanked all those in attendance and closed the meeting

### **Date of next meeting**

Tuesday 5 March 2019, 18:00-20:30, Johannesburg, The Compass Centre