

## Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 18 July 2018

### 1:30pm – 4:30pm Heathrow Academy – meeting notes

#### Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough / Organisation</b>
Cllr Chris Turrell	Bracknell Forest
Cllr Peter Szanto	Elmbridge
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow
Colin Stanbury	Richmond
Cllr Peter Taylor	Runnymede
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
Rob Beere	AN3V
Rosalie James	AN3V
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Bob McLellan	Englefield Green Action Group
John Stewart	HACAN
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Armelle Thomas	HASRA
Malcolm Beer	LAANC
Dr Maureen Korda	Plane Hell
Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Dr Roger Mason	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Kathleen Croft	Spelthorne resident
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Andy Kershaw	British Airways
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Dr Darren Rhodes	CAA
Nic Stevenson	CAA
Sarah Bishop	DfT
Ian Greene	DfT
Rachel Cerfontyne	HCEB
Guido Liguori	HCEB
Ian Jopson	NATS
Robin Clark	NATS
Brendan Creavin	Heathrow
Connor Daly	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Lisa Forshev	Heathrow
Michael Glen	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
<b>Apologies</b>	
Stuart Price	NATS
Sam Wright	NATS
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
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:** This has now been moved to the working groups.
- 2.3 **Invite additional local authorities to HCNF:** Invitations have been sent out to nine local authorities, covering areas likely to see the effect of airspace change and balancing geographical representation at the HCNF towards London as well as to the west of the airport. These areas are Woking, Hammersmith & Fulham, Kensington & Chelsea, City of Westminster, Kingston Upon Thames, Epsom & Ewell District, Merton, Lambeth and Southwark. Later in the year Heathrow also plans to hold an airspace and noise briefing for all local authorities within the expansion consultation zone.
- 2.4 **Circulate the wider document behind PBN literature review:** This was sent out with the previous meeting notes.
- 2.5 **DfT to present departure noise mitigation study:** Dr Darren Rhodes (DR) will present on this later in the meeting.
- 2.6 **Community groups to set out their process for working with an independent advisor:** Cllr David Hilton (DH) will cover this later in the meeting.
- 2.7 **Rick Norman (RN) to meet DH & Paul Conway to discuss the Terms of Reference for the independent advisor:** The meeting took place earlier this month.
- 2.8 **Invite the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) to the HCNF once it's been established:** Sarah Bishop (SB) advised that there had been a delay in the recruitment process. An appointment is therefore unlikely before the summer recess and is now expected to take place in the autumn.
- 2.9 **Heathrow to respond to Stephen Clark's presentation at the last HCNF:** RN said the presentation had raised the sort of questions that Heathrow was looking to answer. He advised that the issues would be covered at the HCNF working groups and expected that the independent advisor would also look at some of them. He added that he had been in touch with a colleague in the US who had been involved in PBN implementation and was hoping to invite him to a learning session on the positive and negative aspects of PBN implementation. **ACTION RN**
- 2.10 Stephen Clark (SC) asked if Heathrow could also provide a short formal response to his presentation. MG confirmed this would be done. **ACTION RN**
- 2.11 **Heathrow to send written response to Dave Gilbert regarding wind direction:** This was sent following the last meeting.

### 3 Heathrow Community Engagement Board

- 3.1 MG introduced Rachel Cerfontyne (RC), chair of the newly established Heathrow Community Engagement Board (HCEB). RC advised the group that she was seeking views on how the HCEB and HCNF could work together.
- 3.2 RC explained that last year it had been decided that the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HACC) would take on the additional responsibilities of a community engagement board. The HACC had provided an opportunity for key stakeholders to engage with the airport and its membership including Local Authorities, airport user groups (trade unions, ABTA etc) and interest groups e.g. HACAN as well as some resident representatives. The requirement to establish the HCEB with an independent chair came was a recommendation from the Airports Commission and was integrated into the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS). The HCEB has a remit to ensure effective engagement with the airport's communities and is looking to be more inclusive by reaching a wider group of stakeholders.
- 3.3 RC advised that although the HCEB was established because of Heathrow expansion, its remit was not only about expansion but also about business as usual. The HCEB is funded by Heathrow but is independent of the airport and its independence meant that RC's position was impartial on the issue of expansion. RC explained that the Board is now considering the structure and activities needed to provide meaningful engagement. It is looking to develop a sub-structure of groups to cover specific issues such as air quality, noise and compensation funds. Some of these sub-groups will be short-term and some will be ongoing. The HCEB is also reviewing which other groups exist, such as the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (HSPG), to establish how to work with them.
- 3.4 RC stressed that she wanted ongoing engagement to be meaningful and to have a demonstrable impact. RJ asked what would happen if change was not forthcoming, noting that she felt this was the case with the HCNF. RC advised that she had the authority to make recommendations. She recalled her previous role at the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) where she could publish recommendations and hold the police to account, observing that during her nine years at the IPCC none of her recommendations were not acted upon. MG asked if all of her recommendations would be open. RC confirmed that she was obsessive about transparency and published everything.
- 3.5 RC also wanted to see more engagement with young people and with small to medium size businesses in the area. The HCEB also has a role to challenge and scrutinise what Heathrow is doing and hold them to account. RJ asked who the HCEB would report to. RC explained that she was accountable to her own board to ensure that the activities she undertakes are within her remit. She will be engaging with the DfT who have an interest in the HCEB's activities. She was also accountable to the community and her recommendations would be made through engagement and working together.
- 3.6 DH asked what success would look like. RC explained that in terms of engagement, success would mean that everyone has had the opportunity to engage, they would go away knowing it was worth it and that the HCEB would make good recommendations.
- 3.7 Colin Stanbury (CS) asked if the HCEB was going to keep the old statutory processes of the HACC in place. RC explained that she would look at what the HACC used to do but her understanding was that consultative committees do not operate on a statutory basis.

- 3.8 RC advised that the HCEB's Terms of Reference (ToR) would be shared with the group. SC stressed the importance of ToR and wanted to know who was writing them, who was monitoring the process and whether they could be challenged. RC advised that when she arrived she had inherited interim ToR and had since been working on them with Guido Liguori (GL), her Chief of Staff. She said that she owns the ToR and the board approves them. She allows interested parties such as Heathrow to make observations, noting that Heathrow could challenge her if she goes outside her remit. However, she expected most of the challenge to come from within the HCEB and from stakeholders.
- 3.9 Bob McLellan (BM) felt that most of the recommendations made by the Transport Select Committee had been ignored and asked how the HCEB would deal with those issues. RC acknowledged that part of the HCEB's work may be to look at this but a number of those issues belonged within the DCO process. She added that it was possible that the HCEB could commission its own research on some issues.
- 3.10 MG welcomed the introduction of the HCEB and noted that it marked a significant change. He observed that it was good to have an independent body to scrutinise Heathrow and hold it to account. He asked what the timescale was for feedback from the HCNF on how the two groups should work together. RC said it would be useful to have a clear view by the end of August, although any comments after that date would also be considered. MG suggested doing this at the HCNF working groups. **ACTION RN**
- 3.11 RJ asked if the HCEB currently had a base of operations. RC advised they had yet to decide if they needed one. MG added that there was an HCEB website.

## 4 Departure noise mitigation study

- 4.1 Darren Rhodes (DR) gave a preview of the departure noise mitigation study report commissioned by the DfT from its ANMAC group. The purpose of the study was to review existing departure noise policies and procedures and assess the possible impacts of operational changes. It also assessed the current noise limits at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted. The report is due to be published on 27 July.
- 4.2 DR noted that there are now relatively few noise infringements due largely to the gradual retirement and replacement of older aircraft types. The report concluded that there was limited scope for reductions in the noise limits at Heathrow until the retirement of the remaining Boeing 747-400 fleet, half of which was expected to be withdrawn by 2021 and the remainder by 2024. A small reduction of 1 to 2 dB in the daytime and shoulder limits might be feasible at Heathrow without causing the overall number of infringements to increase above historic levels. Rob Beere (RB) thought a greater reduction should be possible, but DR explained that this could effectively cause an operation restriction on Boeing 747s. He added that tiered limits for different aircraft types had been considered but communities are usually most disturbed by the loudest aircraft. John Stewart (JS) felt that a reduction of 1 to 2 dB did not constitute much change on the ground. DR advised that it reflected how aircraft have got quieter over time.
- 4.3 The report showed that while some airlines were departing lower than before, others were departing higher, and DR hoped that airlines such as British Airways would bring changes like these to the HCNF before they happen. He noted that adherence to the 4% climb gradient was now almost at 100% following an A380 procedural change by British Airways in 2017.

- 4.4 The report also looked at the effects of the two noise abatement departure procedures NADP1 vs NADP2. The analysis showed that there is no single NADP that will reduce departure noise in all locations; a change of NADP simply moves noise from one location to another. He advised that using NADP1 delays the point at which the aircraft accelerates in order to gain height. This results in a reduction in maximum noise level (Lmax) at some points along the flight path but an increase in noise duration and sound exposure level (SEL).
- 4.5 MG asked if it would be possible to do a departure route analysis to show the total winners and losers. DR advised that looking at every aircraft type going to every destination would be a huge task, observing that the comparison in the presentation was just for an A380 going to the Middle East, so a full study would have to look at hundreds of combinations. MG thought it would be interesting to look at A380s on the Detling departure route to see how many people would see an increase or decrease in noise using NADP1 vs NADP2. **ACTION RN**
- 4.6 SC felt that Lmax was a more significant indicator than SEL because people were most upset when aircraft were loud. He thought this should be looked into by an independent expert and the HCEB. DR advised that the World Health Organisation (WHO) uses SEL. RN added that various pieces of independent research showed that the duration of a noise event was an important factor. DH agreed with SC and felt that reducing loud noise levels directly under a route was desirable even if it meant a noise increase to the side of the route. BM acknowledged there was no simple answer but it should be about fairness going forward.
- 4.7 MG expected that the final report would be on the agenda for the next working groups. **ACTION RN.**

## 5 Airspace update

- 5.1 Jane Dawes (JD) gave an update on the development of Heathrow's proposed airspace design principles.
- 5.2 JD explained that developing the principles had been a lengthy iterative process starting long before 2018. Community workshops had been held in 2016 and these had been written up independently by Arup. Consultation was carried out between January and March 2018 on key design principles for Heathrow's future airspace design, and feedback from the consultation was used to develop emerging themes on this. Further community engagement has also taken place including a working group session and stakeholder focus groups within areas that had not responded to the consultation to further develop the design principles. Further analysis will be carried out before Heathrow submits its design principles to the CAA in August. This will be published on the CAA portal. If this is successful in passing through the CAA's airspace change process gateway then Heathrow will move on to the next piece of work on design envelopes, which would go to consultation in the first half of 2019.
- 5.3 John Stewart (JS) stated that while HACAN members have been historically reluctant to praise Heathrow, feedback on this process had been broadly positive because Heathrow was asking people to help shape the design principles and this had not happened before. He added that residents had also welcomed the clarity of the leaflet and the questions asked.

- 5.4 Peter Szanto (PS) also complimented the consultation documents. However, he did not agree with the principle of 'minimising new people' being above 'sharing' in the prioritisation list and did not believe this was supported by the consultation data. Peter Willan (PW) felt the consultation had been difficult to use but the most recent circulation was a significant improvement. He asked if the design principles would be fixed once they pass through the gateway. JD responded that they would still be open to challenge throughout the process, so Heathrow would have to demonstrate how any feedback had been considered.
- 5.5 SC asked how many leaflets had been distributed and how many responses there had been to the consultation. Cheryl Monk (CM) responded that over two million leaflets had been sent out and JD added that 1,834 had responded to the consultation. SC said that most responses had come from people under flight paths who did not want more flights, so prioritising the principle to minimise the number of people newly overflowed was based on input from the minority. He added that flight paths should not be designed until the health impacts are known. JD advised that Heathrow could not respond to all feedback individually now but would respond at the end of the process by email or in a report.
- 5.6 BM observed that those who were not currently overflowed did not want to be overflowed in future, whereas those who were currently overflowed did not want more flights over them. He felt that the community's view should be given a higher weighting than the industry's view and felt that NATS and the CAA were only concerned with safety and efficiency. Ian Jopson (IJ) responded that this was not the official NATS view.

## 6 Community slot: Airspace principles

- 6.1 PW gave a presentation highlighting various issues that Richmond Heathrow Campaign (RHC) felt should be addressed before the airspace design principles are finalised.
- 6.2 PW felt that the design principles had been constructed without properly establishing the objectives. He suggested that a key objective should be to share noise between communities. He expressed concern over the wide range of estimates for Heathrow's future fleet, and felt that ICAO's balanced approach was unfit for purpose in terms of land use. He wanted to know where the Government's target of 649,000 new houses should be built when it was not known where the new flights paths would be. He also felt that national parks such as the Royal Botanic Gardens in Kew were being undervalued.
- 6.3 PW stressed that there needed to be a clear evaluation when balancing noise and other environmental impacts with industry and passenger benefits and costs. He suggested that there was a disbenefit to the aviation market and a substantial environmental cost. He thought that Heathrow was not at full capacity and did not need to expand, and added that RHC was seeking an 8-hour ban on night flights and believed this would have no negative impact on the airport.

## 7 Community slot: Prioritisation of airspace design principles

- 7.1 SC claimed that the health impacts of the proposed airspace design principles had not been assessed. He added that there had been no consultation with Government departments and that DEFRA had not agreed on SOAEL values (Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level). Sarah Bishop (SB) responded that there had been a health impact study and that DEFRA had signed off on SOAEL and were on the same page.

- 7.2 SC mentioned that Anderson Acoustics had produced two good reports on respite but there were no conclusions such as the minimum amount of respite that was acceptable. He wanted to know how it would be possible to start designing flight paths if the respite work was not complete. Nicole Porter (NP) explained that further respite work had been carried out to look at alternation on westerly arrivals and the role of non-acoustic factors. An initial report has been drafted but further work was required to develop more conclusions before it is published. SC wanted to know when the report would be ready and how it would inform the airspace design principles. Lisa Forshew (LF) advised that Heathrow was proposing to include predictable respite as one of the design principles, adding that everything around respite and how it should be delivered was still open. These decisions will be considered at the next stage of the process.
- 7.3 SC asked about Lmax noise contours and wanted to know when new maps would be available. DR explained that as well as providing a revised noise map for 2016 he was working on a comparison between the old and new maps which would be included in an appendix. He expected that this would be sent to Heathrow within a week for signing off. MG added that he would discuss this with RN and respond to SC. **ACTION MG**
- 7.4 Dr Maureen Korda (MK) advised that some residents to the east of Vauxhall were sometimes simultaneously overflown by Heathrow on westerly operations and London City Airport on easterly operations. She asked how this would be accounted for in the airspace design principles. Stuart Lindsey (SL) responded that somebody would have to propose a change to London City Airport. SB assured her that all 15 London airports were working together to look at the overall area and the DfT was encouraging that approach.

## 8 Community slot: Independent Technical Advisor - governance

- 8.1 DH gave an update on behalf of the forum's Community Noise Groups (CNGs) on the appointment of an independent technical advisor to the forum. He advised that there was agreement in principle that Heathrow would fund the advisor. A governance protocol still needed to be agreed by the CNGs\* and a draft had been circulated by Paul Conway (PC) based on arrangements in operation at Gatwick. He added that there were still discussions to be had but he was confident that if everyone could work together it would put the CNGs in a powerful position when presenting evidence to the industry. **\* ACTION CNGs**

## 9 AOB

- 9.1 Armelle Thomas (AT) complained that there had not been a proper health assessment for Heathrow expansion. She advised she had attended the vote in parliament and could not recall health being mentioned at all. She added that if Heathrow can fund yoga and meditation classes they should also provide a fund for the trauma caused to residents every day. She was also unhappy at the lack of time to bring AOB and asked if presentations could be printed out before the meetings. MG advised that Heathrow would be carrying out health impact assessments as part of their DCO application and this will be consulted on.
- 9.2 He conceded that 60 minutes had not been enough time to cover the community slots and AOB. He advised that PC was responsible for allocating time within this hour and he would talk to him about how to structure the time better. **ACTION MG**

9.3 LF reminded members that the deadline for responding to Heathrow's proposed airspace design principles was Friday 27 July to allow Heathrow sufficient time to analyse all responses and prepare its submission to the CAA for the end of August. She thanked members for the feedback received to date.

### **Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> September 2018 at 1:00pm-4:00pm, Heathrow Academy.