

## Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 16 May 2018

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

#### Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough / Organisation</b>
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow
John Coates	Richmond Council
Graham Young	South Bucks
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
John Stewart	HACAN
Rob Beere	AN3V
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Dr Maureen Korda	Plane Hell
Kathleen Croft	Spelthorne resident
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Armelle Thomas	HASRA
Malcolm Beer	LAANC
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Spencer Norton	British Airways
James Trow	Noise Consultants Limited
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Nic Stevenson	CAA
Sarah Bishop	DfT
Ian Greene	DfT
David Elvy	DfT
Harri Howells	NATS
Robin Clark	NATS
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Connor Daly	Heathrow
Pete Rafano	Heathrow
Sue Thomas	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow

#### Apologies

Rosalie James	AN3V
Andy Kershaw	British Airways
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Ian Jopson	NATS
Stuart Price	NATS

## 1 Welcome and apologies for absence

- 1.1 Matt Gorman (MG) welcomed members and opened with a warm tribute to Gerry Ceaser who sadly passed away earlier in the year.

## 2 Previous minutes and actions

- 2.1 MG went through the actions from the previous meeting. These are summarised below.
- 2.2 **Schedule a future agenda item on air quality:** MG proposed moving this to the working groups rather than taking up time at the Forum at the expense of noise-related issues. **ACTION RN**
- 2.3 **Consider which geographical areas to invite to HCNF:** MG advised that Heathrow has been looking at whether membership of the forum needs to be extended based on the fact that airspace change will impact areas further away from the airport. Heathrow wrote to around 90 local authorities during the recent expansion & airspace consultation. Clearly that number would be unmanageable and it is unlikely they would all attend. However, looking at the inner consultation zone, there are some additional local authorities that should be invited, mostly to the east of the airport. For the other areas Heathrow will plan to keep them regularly updated on what is happening with the airspace change process and potentially offer them briefings. **ACTION CM**
- 2.4 MG reminded the group it may become necessary to be stricter on only having one representative from each organisation attending the forum with an extended membership, but that time had not come yet.
- 2.5 **Consider what more could be shared concerning the Performance Based Navigation (PBN) literature review:** MG confirmed that the wider document behind the presentation given at the last HCNF meeting would be circulated with the meeting notes. **ACTION RW**
- 2.6 **Stephen Clark (SC) was asked to provide details of the 23 US PBN cases he had mentioned.** MG confirmed that SC had provided these and noted that SC would touch on this later during his presentation.
- 2.7 **Lmax modelling in the ANCON model:** MG advised that Darren Rhodes from CAA gave a response to this at last month's working group and this had been circulated to members.
- 2.8 **Community groups to confirm process for working with proposed independent technical advisor:** MG notes that this had been covered extensively at the working groups and the onus was now on community groups to provide this information.
- 2.9 **Confirm how many community representatives will be involved in identifying a short list for the technical advisor role:** MG advised that three community representatives will be involved in this one-off session, with the full committee involved in final selection process.
- 2.10 **SC to provide the numbers he quoted regarding the number of people affected by noise with expansion:** MG noted that these figures were from the Teddington Action Group (TAG) submission to the Transport Select Committee and this has been circulated to members.
- 2.11 **Respond to Rob Buick's presentation:** MG advised that this would be covered later in the meeting.

- 2.12 **Investigate an engine ground run that had disturbed Christine Taylor (CT):** MG confirmed that this has been done and a response had been provided.
- 2.13 **Respond to questions raised by Surinderpal Suri (SS) under AOB:** MG confirmed that a written response had been provided.
- 2.14 MG asked members to help him safeguard the final hour of the meeting for the community presentation and AOB by keeping comments during the meeting focussed.

### 3 Noise Action Plan consultation update

- 3.1 Xavier Oh (XO) advised that the consultation on Heathrow's draft Noise Action Plan for 2019-2023 was now underway and would close on 26 June. Details of the consultation and how to respond are available on the consultation website and copies of the consultation document were available at the forum. MG thanked members for their input which had helped to shape the document.

### 4 Departure study update

- 4.1 Ian Greene (IG) gave a verbal update on the departure noise mitigation study. He advised that the work had been commissioned a couple of years ago and was nearing its end. The report is being finalised by the Environmental Research and Consultancy Department (ERCD). This will go to the technical working group and Aircraft Noise Management Advisory Committee (ANMAC) in June. It should be possible to present the report at the next HCNF on 18 July. **ACTION IG**
- 4.2 MG asked if there were Terms of Reference for the study. IG confirmed this and said he would provide a copy to circulate to members (attached).
- 4.3 SC asked who was represented on ANMAC. IG explained that it is chaired by DfT and includes representatives from the industry, CAA, NATS, the airport consultative committees and the airports themselves. The CAA lead the sub group on the departure study. He added that ANMAC was set up in the early 1990's, initially looking at noise monitoring and how it was done. The DfT has since set up the Airspace and Noise Engagement Group (ANEG) which also includes community groups. As a result of this, DfT are currently considering the future need for ANMAC.

### 5 Working group update

- 5.1 Rick Norman (RN) gave a verbal progress report on the Forum's two working groups, noting that the groups had met for a combined meeting in April.
- 5.2 RN observed that much of the conversation had been around the potential appointment of an independent technical advisor to the group. Members have agreed that there is a need for this role, and core activities have been set out along with other criteria such as the need for the advisor to be independent and credible to all stakeholders. With regard to the selection process, RN did not envisage the need for a separate subgroup to meet several times, but suggested a small group would be needed to assess applicants against a scoring criteria to identify two or three candidates who could be presented to the Forum for wider discussion. He suggested that the final appointment would be reviewed after a year to see how well it is working. He reminded the group of the outstanding action for the community groups to set out the process for how they will work with the advisor. **ACTION COMMUNITY GROUPS**

- 5.3 David Hilton (DH) felt that the community groups should be the advisor's client so that the advisor's work would be reported to the community groups. RN responded that the detail on this had not yet been worked through.
- 5.4 Paul Conway (PC) noted that DH had prepared draft Terms of Reference for the advisor role and proposed that RN and DH should meet before the next HCNF to discuss the draft before circulating it to the group for further scrutiny. **ACTION RN/DH**
- 5.5 MG observed that there would soon be an announcement about an Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) nationally, so the HCNF should consider inviting them to a future meeting once they were established. **ACTION MG**

## 6 Airspace consultation – next steps

- 6.1 Jane Dawes (JD) discussed the future timeline for airspace consultation. She advised that feedback from the first airspace consultation on design principles which took place earlier this year was currently being collated.
- 6.2 JD went on to explain that stakeholder focus groups will be set up to help analyse data gathered from this consultation and to help Heathrow develop airspace design principles. These will then be submitted to CAA who will review the process and approach used to develop these principles. CAA will then hold a gateway assessment session and publish its gateway assessment within one week of the session. Design envelopes will then be developed prior to the second consultation. This stage will seek to understand what local factors should be taken into consideration when designing where the future flight routes should go. There will be an initial Environmental Impact Assessment for each option.
- 6.3 Margaret Majumdar (MM) asked if there was any indication of what the feedback from the first consultation was showing. JD advised that it was too early to say at the moment but Laura Jones (LJ) added that this would be published in July.
- 6.4 Rob Buick (RBU) asked if design envelopes would be similar to Heathrow's departure corridors, known as Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs). JD advised this would not be the case. The design envelopes will be broad areas and that routes could be located anywhere within those areas. Peter Willan (PW) asked if the design envelopes would include indicative noise levels. JD advised they would include some indication of potential aircraft altitudes and numbers of aircraft using colour banding.
- 6.5 DH asked if the results of the first consultation would be presented to the CAA. Stuart Lindsey (SL) explained that the CAA would assess whether Heathrow had met the required gateway criteria and would look at the guidance document CAP1616 to see if Heathrow had achieved the necessary levels of engagement.

## 7 LAMP2 airspace design principles

- 7.1 Harri Howells (HH) informed the group that NATS is developing its design principles for airspace change above 7,000ft. This is part of the second phase of the modernisation programme for the airspace network over London and the surrounding area.
- 7.2 HH advised that LAMP (London Airspace Management Programme) is part of a wider programme called Future Airspace Strategy (South) or FASI-S for short. He explained that LAMP2 will interface with airport Airspace Change Processes (ACP) via departure 'gateways' and arrival 'letterboxes' at 7,000ft or above.

- 7.3 DH asked how many gateways there would be for Heathrow. HH advised there was scope for hundreds of gateways, but these would need to be shared out between airports and that work has not been done yet.
- 7.4 John Stewart (JS) asked how the schedule tied in with Heathrow's work. HH advised that NATS, Heathrow, DfT and CAA were stakeholders in each other's process so they were all talking to one another.
- 7.5 JS observed that while HACAN does not receive complaints about aircraft above 7,000ft, some rural areas were affected by them. HH advised that 7,000ft was defined in guidance and Sarah Bishop (SB) advised there was also flexibility between 7,000ft and 9,000ft. MM asked whereabouts aircraft were at 7,000ft. JS observed that the holding stacks were at 7,000ft and thought that was a distance of around 25-30 miles. HH advised this would be a long track distance so it could be closer but there was not a simple answer.
- 7.6 RBU asked if LAMP2 was related to PBN. HH advised that it was, noting that it was not possible to have segregation without PBN. Dave Gilbert (DG) asked if all aircraft would require NAV1 capability. HH advised that it had not yet been established whether there might be contingency for aircraft without this capability. DG asked when the fleet was expected to have this capability. HH explained that this was currently under discussion but they were looking to introduce this in 2024.
- 7.7 Dr Maureen Korda (MK) observed that London City Airport had already fixed their routes below 7,000ft and asked if they would have to change them. HH advised that they would have to review them. London City was a late addition to the airport network and the work had gone ahead because it has its own segregated airspace. He advised that it may not be necessary for London City to change much to fit in with the network but he expected that something would have to be done.

## 8 Noise modelling, predictions and comparisons

- 8.1 Following a presentation by Rob Buick of Englefield Green Action Group (EGAG) at the last HCNF on 14 March highlighting differences in the forecasts of the number of people affected by expansion at Heathrow, James Trow (JT) gave a presentation explaining how noise exposure figures are prepared and what factors and assumptions affect noise exposure forecasts. He advised that even when scenarios appear the same, different assumptions can lead to different results and these assumptions will be based on what is foreseeable at the time. These include the number of aircraft movements, fleet mix and mitigation assumptions.
- 8.2 SC observed the variation in estimates in the table showing a comparison of the numbers affected by Heathrow expansion in 2030. JT advised that much of this was due to population forecasting as well as flight schedule and fleet mix forecasts.
- 8.3 SC felt that a key issue was the number of intrusive overflights. JT responded that it was not all about the average noise level (Leq), the number of flights above 65dB (N65) also had to be considered, as well as trade-offs between concentrated routes or sharing. PW noted that average noise levels were important for those living in Richmond, not just the number of events.
- 8.4 DG observed there would be a range of possible outcomes, noting that two of the aircraft types used in the modelling (Boeing 747-800 and Airbus A380neo) were not expected to operate at Heathrow in the future. RN agreed that assumptions about the future could never be 100% correct but Heathrow was as interested as everyone else to be as accurate as possible.

- 8.5 RN observed that the noise envelope would provide constraints. DG asked if this would be based on average noise levels but RN advised that it had not been defined yet. DG asked if the noise envelope would be expected to reduce over time. RN did not want to pre-empt work that had not been done yet but expected there would be targets and JT thought it would be routinely reviewed. RBU asked what benefit the noise envelope would offer to Heathrow. RN discussed the concept behind the noise envelope, observing that over the last 30 years of operating Heathrow, the first 15 years saw an increase in movements while the last 15 years have been relatively static. As a result, technology has been of benefit with regard to noise performance. He explained that a noise envelope would balance that boom and bust cycle to provide a certain level of improvement with a certain level of growth.
- 8.6 JT noted Heathrow's public commitments on noise exposure, i.e. fewer people exposed than in 2013. RBU asked what forecast date this was referring to. JT clarified that Heathrow's work for the Airports Commission had looked at 2030 and 2040. The Airports Commission had looked at 2030, 2040 and 2050, and for each of those years this was found to be the case.
- 8.7 Malcolm Beer (MB) referred to the proposal for displaced thresholds so that aircraft land later on the runway and therefore fly higher over communities. He noted that with a third runway, one or more runway would be operating in mixed mode so there would be less benefit. RN explained that these were two separate issues, noting that displaced thresholds would provide a fixed benefit.
- 8.8 Christine Taylor (CT) was concerned that house building close to the airport would result in more people affected by noise and thought there should be an exclusion zone for housing. RN advised that Heathrow was not a planning authority so it could not decide where properties were built, but this was the sort of issue Heathrow wants to look at under its new Noise Action Plan. Armelle Thomas (AT) suggested that Heathrow should ask the Mayor of London how many new homes were planned for the London area. Rob Beere (RBe) added that he thought the Government was issuing targets to councils. RN stated that Heathrow had also requested this information.

## 9 Community slot – Corridors of concentration

- 9.1 JS presented a joint research paper by HACAN and Plane Hell Action highlighting the impact of aircraft noise on South East London. The report was distributed to members prior to the meeting. He observed that over the last decade most emails received by HACAN were from South East London and he felt this was because the area is affected by aircraft all day long. He hoped that the research paper would help to influence the policy debate.
- 9.2 JS noted that while the number of aircraft had not changed over the last ten years, the number over certain locations such as Brockley and Greenwich had increased, with numbers in the 'southern corridor' having risen significantly and increased concentration resulting in more flights over some communities. He recommended that flight paths should be varied as much as possible, night flights should not be concentrated over particular communities and that PBN should be used to distribute arrivals fairly across multiple approach routes. He observed that Heathrow had responded positively to the report.
- 9.3 MK observed that the problem in South East London was the perpetual noise caused by aircraft, meaning that as one aircraft is passing the next one is approaching.

## 10 Community slot – PBN, flight paths and airspace capacity

- 10.1 SC gave a presentation on Teddington Action Group's (TAG) perspective on PBN, flight paths and airspace capacity. SC explained that the presentation was based largely on work done by TAG and set out a series of questions that he felt should be addressed by Heathrow and DfT before airspace modernisation and the NPS are considered by MPs.
- 10.2 MG observed that there were airports in the US affecting similar numbers of people that had introduced PBN and experienced the challenges that SC identified. He confirmed that Heathrow was looking to learn from these cases to see how this technology could be used and noted this represented some common ground. He added that Heathrow would look in detail at the presentation and respond. **ACTION MG**
- 10.3 SB advised that the DfT had attended a number of meetings with the US Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) on this, observing that the FAA does not provide the same level of community engagement as in the UK. She acknowledged the respite research carried out by Anderson Acoustics and would look into that, noting that the DfT would certainly be considering the possibility of using PBN to implement multiple routes.
- 10.4 DH recalled that the airspace trials in 2014 had changed his perception of aircraft noise and warned of the potential impact PBN could have. He was concerned that the airspace consultation was being run in a vacuum, asking people where aircraft should fly with no connection to the consequence on noise levels in different areas. He added that while respite could only offer limited options closer to the airport, aircraft noise further out should be managed and routes should be more dispersed.
- 10.5 AT said that Heathrow should not expand if the cost to health was too high, complaining that the profit would go abroad while the cost would fall to the NHS.
- 10.6 PC thanked JS and SC for their valuable presentations and confirmed that the communities wanted to work with Heathrow, CAA and DfT to achieve the best possible outcomes.

## 11 AOB

- 11.1 MG observed that DG had submitted a question for AOB regarding wind direction. As time had run out he proposed a written response for this. **ACTION RW**

## Date of next meeting

Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018 at the slightly later time of 1:30pm-4:30pm, Heathrow Academy.