

## Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 14 March 2018

### 1:00pm – 4:00pm Compass Centre – meeting notes

#### Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough / Organisation</b>
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow
John Coates	Richmond Council
Cllr Linda Gillham	Runnymede Borough Council
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Graham Young	South Bucks
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
John Stewart	HACAN
Rob Beere	AN3V
Rosalie James	AN3V
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Armelle Thomas	HASRA
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Andy Kershaw	British Airways
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Shamanthy Ganeshan	DfT
Sarah Bishop	DfT
Ian Greene	DfT
Dan Foster	NATS
Robin Clark	NATS
Glen Smith	Trax
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Connor Daly	Heathrow
Pete Rafano	Heathrow
Rachel Thomas	Heathrow

#### Apologies

Ian Jopson	NATS
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Nic Stevenson	CAA
Stuart Price	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.

## 2 Previous minutes and actions

- 2.1 MG went through the actions from the previous meeting. These are summarised below.
- 2.2 **Future agenda item on air quality:** Heathrow will look to schedule this. **ACTION MG**
- 2.3 **Publish respite report and animation on website:** This has been done.
- 2.4 **Arrange learning session on WebTAG:** This is on today's agenda.
- 2.5 **Arrange separate meeting to discuss independent technical advisor:** This took place last month and Xavier Oh (XO) will provide an update later in the meeting.
- 2.6 **Ask Gatwick Airport for Terms of Reference for its technical advisor:** Gatwick have advised Heathrow that they do not have them. They agreed a budget and have effectively given management of that over to the community group.
- 2.7 **Distribute Noise Action Plan draft actions for comment:** This was done and XO will provide an update later in the meeting.
- 2.8 **Consider which geographical areas to invite to HCNF:** MG advised that this was in progress and Heathrow was keen to get input from any areas that might be affected by airspace change.
- 2.9 **Discuss a question from Rob Buick (RBU) about the number of people affected by expansion:** This was originally going to be looked at in Working Group 1 but RBU will present on this later during the community slot.

## 3 Airspace update

- 3.1 Rachel Thomas (RT) advised that Heathrow's current public consultation on expansion and airspace principles is still open. Heathrow organised over 40 events throughout the consultation which were attended by numbers ranging from 26 to 330 people. The last of these events took place on Monday 12th March. RT advised that the consultation will be open until 28th March and encouraged members to respond. Feedback from the consultation will be reported in due course.
- 3.2 Margaret Majumdar (MM) asked which event had 330 people attending. RT stated this had been in Ewell.
- 3.3 Peter Willan (PW) asked what would happen to the results of the feedback. RT explained that it would be produced as a report and would feed into how the design principals are decided. This was why the consultation had been extended to as many people as possible. In about a year's time Heathrow will consult on design envelopes followed by a statutory consultation which will include flight paths. PW asked if communities had an opportunity to challenge the design principles. RT hoped that everyone was submitting their views on this in their responses to the current consultation. MG added that there will be three consultations overall. When Heathrow consults on design envelopes, the principals adopted will be set out, so the opportunity to feed into those principals is now.

- 3.4 MM asked for clarification on design envelopes and noise envelopes. RT explained that a design envelope is a geographical space containing information about how it is used, whereas the noise envelope will be a set of metrics which will give Heathrow limitations on what can be done.
- 3.5 David Hilton (DH) noted that the airspace principles documents did not comment on increases in flights or noise levels, adding that if some communities were going to have less noise then others would have more noise or would be newly overflowed. MG explained that the consultation on airspace design principles was about principles that would apply to both the existing airport and the expanded airport. Airspace needed to be modernised regardless of expansion, so the principles were designed to be overarching. MG believed it was possible to expand Heathrow without increasing the number of people affected by noise. He acknowledged DH's point but he didn't feel that people were being lulled into a false sense of security by the consultation.
- 3.6 John Stewart (JS) was pleased about the number of consultation events that had taken place, but expressed that some HACAN members in South London and those affected by both Heathrow and London City Airport had been disappointed that there were no opportunities to go to an event in their area. He proposed extending the geographical coverage of future events to areas such as Leytonstone. Cheryl Monk (CM) noted there had been events in Lambeth and Camden. She advised that Heathrow had tried to provide a wide geographical spread but appreciated that not all areas had been covered.
- 3.7 Stephen Clark (SC) commented that the consultation talked about net numbers, while CAA analysis estimated that the gross number of people that would be subjected to 3dB more noise would be 427,000 and WebTAG analysis indicated that over two million people would get a noise increase. RT responded that this was at a very early stage and the moment. More information would be available as things progress, but the current purpose was to establish design principles. MG did not recognise the figure of two million. He advised that Heathrow had produced a huge amount of data for the Airports Commission report and would continue to produce data in the future. However, Heathrow does not have detailed noise modelling for future flight path options at the moment. SC noted that the consultation had been carried out before the parliamentary vote on the National Policy Statement (NPS). MG reiterated that this was not a statutory consultation and further consultation would take place on this later. Armelle Thomas (AT) suggested that the airport had not mentioned the figure of two million because it wanted the vote to go in its favour. She added that if Heathrow wanted to be honest it would not have held this sham consultation.
- 3.8 Peter Willan suggested that noise energy would increase with expansion so it would be good to have some information about where that noise energy would go. MG responded that Heathrow's view was that energy would reduce over time so the question was how that should be shared. PW also felt that the consultation missed out objectives around reducing or minimising noise, sharing noise and economic balance. He felt these should be discussed before looking at principals. RT explained that the principles must be established as part of the process required by CAP1616. For this reason, Heathrow needs feedback and all comments received would be fed in.
- 3.9 RBU thought there was no mention of respite in the consultation documents and asked how this would work for areas close to the runway ends. RT stated that respite was covered and MG added that the consultation looked at how to use new technology to provide respite.

- 3.10 DH asked if any consultation events had been held in areas not currently overflowed to ask about design principles there. RT noted that some events had been in outlying areas such as Hendon in order to extend the question to those further out. CM added that everyone in the inner zone had been leafleted, including areas that are not overflowed. Linda Gillham (LG) observed that Runnymede Borough Council had responded to the consultation on the basis that half of the borough was overflowed but the other half was not. MG thought this was useful to know.
- 3.11 AT asked when the report would be published. RT advised that the timescales would depend on the size of the response. MG added that updates would be given through this forum.

## 4 Airspace Change Process

- 4.1 Stuart Lindsey (SL) gave a presentation on the Airspace Change Process. He advised that the CAA does not own proposals for changes to airspace. The CAA has a process and its role is to see that people go through that process. He asked for this to be borne in mind as he went through the presentation.
- 4.2 SL explained that in January the CAA launched its Airspace Change Portal project. DH observed that there were a lot of glossy presentations and minutes on the portal and asked if they were the actual minutes of meetings that attendees had taken away. SL advised that they were but they had been redacted for names.
- 4.3 Dave Gilbert (DG) asked if the CAA provided a service to model noise and if they were still responsible for modelling the implications of any airspace change. SL could not talk with complete authority but he understood this would not change. He added that it was not part of an assessment of airspace change, the CAA had their own team that was independent of the ERCD. DG asked if the CAA would assess the assumptions that have been put in the noise model. SL confirmed this and observed that the CAA does push back.
- 4.4 AT asked if the CAA was happy that the consultations on expansion and airspace were happening at the same time. SL said the CAA understood that the Development Consent Order (DCO) and airspace change were taking place at the same time and had made it clear to Heathrow that they would have to satisfy the process. He accepted that to run the two consultations in sequence would end up being a ten-year process that wouldn't benefit anyone.
- 4.5 SC observed that a process is only as good as the framework and rules. He asked for the DfT's thoughts on the principles. Sarah Bishop (SB) commented that the DfT's own consultation had received over 800 responses and was published last November, so people's views on that had been considered. SC thought it was significant that the NPS was going on before the principles were decided. SB advised that the DfT had communicated on this and observed there was still a long way to go in the airspace change process.
- 4.6 PW asked if there would be a chance to revisit the principles after they have been decided. MG reiterated that airspace had to be modernised so Heathrow had approached this with good intent starting from first principles and that there would be two further stages of consultation. RT explained that the principles had to be locked down at some point so that something could be designed. PW argued that the objectives were missing, noting that he would like to start with the objective of not wanting an increase in noise. MG explained that the objectives were set out in the consultation documentation.

- 4.7 DH suggested that there will be principles but then there will be NATS. He felt that at the end of this process NATS would say there was a practical world in which they can move, so the principles may be side-lined by what NATS consider to be possible. RT conceded that it may not be possible to apply all the principles all the time, noting that safety overarched these principles. She added that when a principle could not be followed then evidence would have to be provided. MG added that Heathrow had been working on modernisation with NATS for several years now, so it was not a sequential process. Rob Beere (RBe) observed that three options were given in the consultation and asked if NATS had confirmed they could work according to those principles. Dan Foster (DF) advised that the short answer was yes.

## 5 Performance Based Navigation (PBN) literature review

- 5.1 Glen Smith (GS) provided a summary of a literature review that has been conducted on a global body of PBN documentation. The review highlighted the impacts that PBN implementation may have on local communities of major hub airports and complex airspace. It also identified the documented issues, risks and opportunities associated with PBN implementation.
- 5.2 JS thought this was a useful summary and asked if it would be published in detail. MG responded that all the slides and references would be provided. GS added that there was a wider document behind this and MG proposed an action to see if there was anything useful to share including the wider document. **ACTION MG**
- 5.3 RBe asked if any legal documents from the US were included in the review. GC advised that specific mitigation issues were not included. MG added that it was just a summary of the ICAO literature review. He thought it was critical to look at the challenges of PBN and hoped to get a more robust set of case studies on the topic.
- 5.4 SC emphasised the problems caused by PBN at Gatwick and in 23 cases in the US. He wanted to know if it was possible to provide respite with PBN. He noted that there was no reference to those more intensively overflowed and hoped that international experience would be drawn upon to see whether PBN could be used over residential areas. MG stated that it would be useful to see details of the 23 US cases. SC confirmed he had all the details. **ACTION SC**
- 5.5 MG observed that Heathrow had concluded in its submission to the Airports Commission that it was possible to design a series of routes that could be alternated. He added that Heathrow was committed to investigate that and felt the options put forward in the consultation were possible including route rotation. SC was concerned whether it would be technically possible to code enough routes into aircraft. RT responded that Heathrow was focussing on those issues. MG added that Heathrow believed the overall noise contours would shrink and that respite was possible.
- 5.6 SC was unaware of anywhere that PBN has been introduced that has been considered acceptable, observing that those under flight paths will want more sharing and those not under them will not. MG explained that the consultation was not a referendum, the aim was to understand what constitutes fair sharing of noise. SB added that the DfT was also talking to other airports where PBN had worked to avoid populated areas. She explained they were looking for solutions tailored to the population around the airport. PW commented that there was a huge difference between sharing to get a reduction in noise and sharing to get an increase in noise.

## 6 WebTAG learning session

- 6.1 MG was conscious that everyone in room had different levels of knowledge about WebTAG, so DfT would present a high-level overview to get everyone up to speed. Shamanthy Ganeshan (SG) explained that WebTAG was the DfT's suite of guidance on how to assess the expected impacts of transport policy proposals and projects.
- 6.2 DG asked what the negative impact of Heathrow was, observing that the Aviation Environment Federation (AEF) had done this calculation. SB responded that anyone in the room could do that but it would only give a very partial analysis, so DfT would not be doing this. She added that this was not how appraisal works. DG said that AEF had arrived at a figure of £350 to £450 million and asked about the monetised costs of strokes and sound levels. SG explained that health impacts were provided in a table. SC asked where the data came from. SB explained that it was DfT policy but very much informed by DEFRA, noting that if DEFRA disagreed with the interpretation they had an opportunity to question it. She added that DfT had considered the disbenefits as much as possible, so the analysis was there.
- 6.3 DH asked if the impact was assessed using average noise levels rather than N numbers (N65, N70 etc). SG explained that wherever possible they had looked to use the most robust evidence. The DfT was not driving that, but as more evidence becomes available DfT would look to use that as well.
- 6.4 AT advised that she had been to every Transport Select Committee and they always talked about the benefit of a third runway. She thought that the cost to health should be considered and thought that if it was then there would be no third runway.
- 6.5 RJ found it alarming that a monetary value could be put on someone's life. She was also concerned that the DfT was not driving this forward. She noted that the DfT been in room since this started and were aware of the issues around using average noise levels, so to allow a calculation based on that was alarming. MG observed that the model had to be guided by the latest best scientific guidance and that currently this was based on averages. He explained that as more evidence becomes available it would be considered, but this could not be put at the DfT's door. SB added that the DfT worked at an international level with other countries and organisations but the data on other metrics was not there right now. MG noted that Heathrow had acknowledged the limitations of using average noise levels many times and was looking at a whole range of metrics.
- 6.6 DH understood from CAA that the ANCON model had underestimated maximum noise levels (Lmax) by 1db. He asked if the DfT had taken this into account in the WebTAG model. Ian Greene (IG) said he was not aware of this but advised that WebTAG only used average noise levels (Leq) so it would not be affected. DH asked if the DfT would change its advice to the Government because of this. SB noted that if there was an error that could potentially inform the decision then she would expect the Government to look at that. DG thought it would affect the N65 contour. SB said she would check how this had been looked at in the analysis and MG committed to look at the issue.
- ACTION SB, MG**
- 6.7 JS observed that Darren Rhodes had previously mentioned that the CAA was doing some work on this but the work was not published yet, so he suspected that was why most members were not aware of it yet. He was sure that when the work was published it would be brought to the HCNF so the group could look at it then.

## 7 Working group updates

- 7.1 XO gave an update on activity in the HCNF working groups.
- 7.2 **Noise Action Plan (NAP) 2019-2023 update:** XO went through the timeline and list of draft actions for the new NAP that was being developed for the period 2019-2023. He advised that the next opportunity to provide feedback would be at public consultation in May.
- 7.3 **Independent technical advisor update:** MG recounted that work was underway to appoint an independent technical advisor to the HCNF following a request from community groups. XO presented updated slides from a separate meeting about this that took place last month. The presentation described the role of the advisor, the skills required and the selection process. He reminded community groups to confirm their working practices to help Heathrow inform the drafting of the tender and how they will interact with the independent advisor. **ACTION COMMUNITY GROUPS**
- 7.4 Paul Conway (PC) advised that the community groups had talked among themselves to nominate representatives to be involved in the selection process. Given the number of meetings involved he proposed the following four nominees, so that two could attend each meeting: Peter Willan, David Hilton, Rob Buick and Stephen Clark. XO responded that nominating two people had been discussed at the meeting, but he was happy for two to attend with two fall-back options. He reminded PC that this was only for the shortlisting process, the final selection would be done by the whole Forum. PC confirmed that they would revise their list to two or possibly three nominees. MG felt the group was 99% there and suggested Rick Norman should confirm the final number. **ACTION RN**
- 7.5 MG asked about timescales. XO advised that an advisor would not be appointed before the next HCNF meeting as the position would have to be advertised for a few weeks. *(Added after meeting): It is hoped to have an independent advisor in place for the HCNF meeting on 18 July provided all necessary steps are completed in time.*
- 7.6 MM was disappointed that the four nominees were chosen at a meeting to which she was not invited, despite making it clear that she was interested in taking part and had been nominated by a Forum member. She said it reduced her confidence in the procedure. PC responded that MM had been invited to a meeting on a Monday but was not available on Mondays. JS confirmed that he had nominated her but other members had felt the four names put forward were more suitable in terms of technical input. He told MM that if it was any consolation he had not received any nominations.

## 8 Community slot

- 8.1 RBU gave a presentation which looked at whether there was a disconnect between Heathrow's consultation documentation and the revised NPS documentation around the number of people affected by noise with expansion. He advised that Heathrow claimed fewer people would be affected with expansion than today, whereas the revised NPS documentation estimated that 92,700 more people would be significantly affected in 2030.
- 8.2 MG advised that a combination of factors meant that it would be possible for fewer people to be affected by noise than today, noting that a lot of detail was provided in Heathrow's final submission to the Airports Commission.

- 8.3 SB advised that the difference arose from the update the DfT made to the NPS, where 54dB had been used rather than 57dB. She added that 57dB was still included but they had not done an assessment on how noise impacts would be mitigated.
- 8.4 SC suggested that WebTAG analysis showed approximately 420,000 people would experience an increase of 3dB and this had been totally concealed. He claimed that 920,000 households would experience more noise, with 2.2 million people getting more noise by 2050. JS observed that many members were hearing these numbers for the first time and asked SC to provide a short two-page report to be circulated to members. **ACTION SC**
- 8.5 MG thanked RBU for tabling the issue and proposed that Heathrow should provide a written response. **ACTION MG**

## 9 AOB

- 9.1 AT advised that Christine Taylor was not present at the meeting because she had been woken by engine noise from Heathrow during the night. XO advised that engine ground runs were a necessary part of running an airport but confirmed he would investigate the event. **ACTION XO**
- 9.2 PW noted that the recently published respite report was dated 2017 and asked why it had taken so long to publish. Nicole Porter (NP) responded that it had not been published immediately so as not to prejudice follow-on field work.
- 9.3 PC asked if an hour could be set aside at future meetings for the community slot followed by ten minutes of AOB. MG said he would endeavour to do that, but advised that this would require cooperation from forum members to reduce the number of questions asked in order to keep the meeting on track. SB suggested it would be helpful to agree what would be covered in advance. MG wholeheartedly agreed and said this was requested every time.
- 9.4 Surinderpal Suri (SS) felt that if the DfT used the Lden metric to assess cost versus benefit then the number of people impacted by expansion increase. He asked how PBN would provide predictable respite for areas close to the airport such as Hounslow. He added that local authorities close to Heathrow were under immense pressure to build more housing, noting that most development land in his local authority falls within the 63dB(A) noise contour. He asked how Heathrow would help to reduce this additional burden and requested a response at the next meeting. **ACTION MG**

## Date of next meeting

Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> May 2018, 1pm-4pm, Heathrow Academy.