

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 24 January 2018

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

Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Cllr Tony Popham	Elmbridge Borough Council
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
Rosalie James	AN3V
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Peter Szanto	Elmbridge
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Armelle Thomas	HASRA
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Kathleen Croft	Stanwell Moor Residents Association
Cllr Conrad Sturt	Surrey Heath
Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Surrey Heath
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Jayne Chace	Teddington Action Group
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Dr Dave Hiller	Arup
Dr Calum Sharp	Arup
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Tim May	DfT
Ian Jopson	NATS
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Lisa Forshev	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow

Apologies

Gerry Ceaser	LAANC
Hannah Cook	Spelthorne Borough Council
Steve Bax	Elmbridge
Rob Beere	AN3V
Dan Foster	NATS
Stuart Price	NATS
Andy Kershaw	British Airways
Spencer Norton	British Airways
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 observed that today was a significant meeting as it was the beginning of an important debate on airspace design principles following the launch of the Heathrow consultation on its proposed expansion the previous week.

2 Previous minutes and actions

- 2.1 MG went through the actions from the previous meeting. These are summarised below.
- 2.2 **Working group session on departure profiles NADP1 and NADP2:** This took place at working group 2 in December.
- 2.3 **Provide summary of ICAO PBN literature review:** This is currently in progress and will be circulated by the end of February.
- 2.4 **Potential independent technical advisors to attend working group:** Ruud Ummels from To70 attended working group 2 in December.
- 2.5 **Publish 2016 noise contours:** These were published in December. It has been agreed with the CAA that the annual noise contours will be published by April the following year from now on.
- 2.6 **More information on Twitter:** The Twitter account @HeathrowNoise will now provide more information during the day on the reason for changes to Heathrow's direction of operation. Going forward there are also plans to provide more information on night-time runway rotation.
- 2.7 Dave Gilbert (DG) asked about two working group actions to provide A380 Lmax contours and to take a deeper look at the CAA's Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA). Darren Rhodes (DR) hoped to have the A380 contours ready for working group 2 on 15 February. Rick Norman (RN) advised that SoNA would be on the agenda for working group 1 on 13 February.
- 2.8 Peter Willan (PW) asked if Heathrow's current consultation was a formal part of the DCO process. MG advised that it was not a formal requirement but the DCO encourages the maximum possible engagement, so this was a non-statutory consultation. PW asked if there would also be a statutory consultation and MG confirmed that there would. PW asked if Heathrow's plans could change before the next consultation to which MG responded that plans would evolve during the process. He said that the responses from this consultation would help to inform the next consultation if a third runway is given the go-ahead by Parliament. David Hilton (DH) cautioned that people could change their views as more information becomes available, so what they say now may differ from what they say at the final consultation. John Stewart (JS) agreed that it was a developing process and that everyone could adapt their responses as information develops.

3 Airspace principles consultation

- 3.1 Jane Dawes (JD) and Lisa Forsheew (LF) gave a presentation on Heathrow's airspace principles consultation.

- 3.2 JD explained that irrespective of whether Heathrow is given the go-ahead for expansion, it was necessary to modernise airspace. In the first consultation Heathrow is looking for feedback on a set of principles or rules that will be used to help shape and develop the design of Heathrow's future airspace. These rules would be used in both a two-runway and three-runway environment. She advised that the changes would need to be able to fit into the wider airspace network in the south east of England. Airspace modernisation would not be delivered until 2024 so Heathrow has aligned its program accordingly. Flight path options would not be consulted on until after the DCO decision.
- 3.3 LF advised that the consultation contained six key principles which were designed to address a number of key issues. These covered: where to put flight paths in relation to where they are today; routing over urban or rural areas; routing over parks and open spaces within rural areas; using longer routes to avoid local communities; using the latest navigation technology; and whether to apply the principles differently at night. LF advised that the consultation would collect postcode data to help understand the views from each community rather than just a set of aggregate results.
- 3.4 MG observed that this was a big debate that would not be solved at today's meeting. He advised that everyone had several weeks to respond to the consultation but was interested to hear any initial thoughts.
- 3.5 DH stated that the 2014 flight path trials were still fresh in his memory, and thought that whatever happens, no community should be exposed to more aircraft noise than they are today. Rob Buick (RB) agreed and wanted to see everyone benefit from less noise in the future. LF advised that the design principles had not been decided yet. She noted that the final question in the consultation response document asked whether there were any other principles that should be applied to airspace design, so this suggestion could be entered there. JS didn't necessarily agree with DH's comments. He felt that flying over new areas should be avoided where possible, but that in order to provide some relief to the worst affected areas he thought it was inevitable that some new areas may be affected.
- 3.6 Margaret Majumdar (MM) asked for clarification on the fourth consultation question about noise and emissions. JD explained that there was the potential to make some routes longer to avoid communities, but this would result in aircraft burning more fuel and therefore producing more emissions (Co2). She recognised that airlines may have a different view to communities on fuel burn. MG added that a few hundred feet above the airport, pollution from aircraft disperses quickly, so there is no evidence that this would have any impact on air quality on the ground. PW commented that NOx was sitting in a plume above London and had to go somewhere. He had seen conflicting reports that NOx has no effect above 1000ft or 1km and thought there was a lot of confusion on this. MG proposed that a future meeting should include a slot on air quality. **ACTION MG**
- 3.7 PW thought the consultation should look at objectives rather than principles and felt that the objective to limit and if possible reduce noise was meaningless. He agreed with others that nobody should get more noise and that everyone should see a benefit. He added that the consultation questions were too simplistic, so he was not sure how to respond. For example, he said if he opted for flight paths over open spaces, that would still mean flights would have to go over Richmond in order to fly over Richmond Park. Wendy Matthews (WM) felt that the questions effectively pitted communities against each other and pointed out there would be fewer responses from less populated rural areas. LF reassured her that the consultation was not a referendum so the number of responses from each area would not be the basis for decisions. She hoped that this consultation would look at the broader principles rather than how it would affect people personally.

- 3.8 Stephen Clark (SC) thought that the consultation was ill-conceived and divisive between communities. He said it was unavoidable that a third runway would affect new communities. He was concerned that the amount of respite that some communities get could be reduced. He felt that nobody yet understood how to measure the impact of living under a concentrated flight path so it was totally irresponsible to go out to consultation on an option to minimise the total number of people overflown. He added that airlines did not want a ban on night flights, noting that the proposal to extend a ban on scheduled flights from 04:30 to 05:30 would result in many more flights between 05:30 to 06:00. He also felt that SoNA did not recognise the impacts of noise and that the number of noise events should be factored in. MG noted that there had already been a whole process to decide where airport expansion should be. He added that airspace modernisation is happening across the UK, regardless of a third runway and it was always going to be a challenge. He said that Heathrow was following the CAA process on airspace change and that we were very interested to get feedback on the approach we had taken. SC proposed that nobody should be subjected to more noise than they are today, that WHO targets should be used, and that there should be an equitable and fair spread of noise.
- 3.9 Christine Taylor (CT) observed that communities close to the airport were affected differently to those further out, noting that changes to aircraft speed, departure rates and take-off angles would affect them. JD acknowledged that different communities would have different questions and explained that those factors would be worked up once a specific set of rules has been established. CT felt that the consultation was not geared towards communities closest to the airport, noting that those residents would be more concerned about what might happen to their homes rather than whether they could find themselves under a new flight path. MG took her point but observed that a lot of useful information had been published last week and Heathrow had tried to package it in a way that was accessible to everyone. He encouraged communities to come to the consultation events and take the opportunity to engage with a team of Heathrow experts.
- 3.10 DH felt that airspace design was the most difficult part of the jigsaw puzzle. He was concerned that the consultation questions were naïve and might not provide feedback that could be acted on. MG reiterated that airspace had to be modernised and that Heathrow wanted to work with the HCNF to do this in the best possible way. PW thought that the question of how to modernise airspace for a two-runway airport was totally different. Aircraft were becoming quieter, so a noise credit was building up. He felt that this should be used to benefit the worst affected areas and that nobody should experience an increase in noise levels. MG responded that it was not that simple, that those from other areas may have different views.
- 3.11 JD reminded the group that Heathrow had previously involved HCNF members in the early engagement process, for example the working group that looked at how to improve the easterly Compton route. She said that following a few sessions on this, it became apparent that there was a fundamental difference in how different communities wanted airspace redesigned. Those outside the route wanted flights to be concentrated within the route, while those inside the route wanted flights to be spread out. JD also mentioned the workshops Heathrow had previously held with members in 2016, to look at the key operations principles that need to be considered. As a result, it was evident that the principles needed to be established first and that was how this consultation was born. MG thanked JD for the very timely reminder of how Heathrow had got to this point.
- 3.12 SC suggested that if flight paths are going to be concentrated then all the houses underneath should be bought up, adding there was no point presenting options that nobody had a clue about. MG acknowledged that the redesign of airspace will be a challenge and looked forward to ongoing feedback from the group.

4 Sound demonstration

- 4.1 RN invited members to participate in a sound demonstration, which he described as a genuine attempt to engage more meaningfully on aircraft noise. He welcomed feedback on its usefulness as an engagement tool and on how it might be improved.
- 4.2 Heathrow commissioned the sound demonstrations from Arup using their proprietary SoundLab technology to provide a more accessible means of illustrating the concepts set out in the consultations. This was done by presenting three key elements relating to how the sound of aircraft could change in different situations: how flight paths can be distributed using runway operations; how the perception of aircraft sound is affected by the existing sound climate; and how people's exposure to aircraft sound indoors can be reduced. Dr Dave Hiller and Dr Calum Sharp from Arup were on hand to assist members during the demonstrations.
- 4.3 Tony Popham (TP) asked if the demonstration could be set up as a mobile app. RN noted his suggestion. MG advised that the sound demonstration will also be available at upcoming consultation events at the Heathrow Academy during February and March. He added that other visits could also be arranged. PW asked if a group of representatives from Richmond could arrange a visit. Cheryl Monk (CM) said it was possible and asked him to send an email to arrange it.

5 Working group updates

- 5.1 RN presented an overview of the Forum's draft work plan for 2018. He advised that the list was not finalised yet and expected members to offer more suggestions.
- 5.2 RN noted that the Community Information Reports for Ascot and Bishopsgate had now been published online, while more work was needed on the Lightwater report. He announced that a new noise monitor had been deployed this week in East Molesey. He also noted that a second report on respite research would be published online on 16th February and would be accompanied by an animation. **ACTION RW**
- 5.3 PW thought it would be helpful to discuss webTAG. Tim May (TM) explained to the group that webTAG was an appraisal model used to assess the cost and benefits of transport schemes. DG asked about the disbenefits of Heathrow's operations, citing a study which claimed the UK aviation industry created a disbenefit of £550m per annum. MG said it could be looked at but questioned whether it would fundamentally alter the approach. TM noted that when looking at the disbenefits, the benefits would obviously have to be looked at too. RN proposed a learning session around webTAG. TM agreed to invite a DfT expert to do this. **ACTION TM**

- 5.4 MG asked RN for an update on the steeper departure trial. RN advised that the noise monitors were out, data was being collected and updates would be brought to the group as the work progresses. SC referred to TAG's dossier on departure procedures and asked for it to be responded to. MG reminded SC that this had been covered and Mike Glen had given a presentation on this. He recalled that it was unclear whether published departure procedures were adhered to by the other airports in the study. He added that DR was carrying out a full study of the issues surrounding climb profiles and urged DR to set a deadline for the work. DR advised that he was collecting actual height data from other international hub airports, but that it was taking time to collect the data and correct it for local pressure variations. He noted that procedures are monitored differently at other airports, so a published 5.5% climb gradient at Paris CDG can actually be lower than a 4% gradient at Heathrow. MG commented that the group was keen to know about any comparable airports that may use procedures which could have a noise benefit at Heathrow. However, he reminded the group about the law of unintended consequences, noting that the implications would need to be fully understood before any changes to procedures could be made.
- 5.5 RN gave an update on the ongoing work to appoint an independent technical advisor to the HCNF and that Heathrow was keen to progress this. He noted that there had already been long discussions on this as well as a presentation and Q&A session with Ruud Ummels of To70 who currently acts in a similar role at Gatwick. So far, no consensus has been reached within the groups, so a separate one-off session would be arranged to decide the way forward. **ACTION RN**
- 5.6 MG asked Ian Jopson (IJ) how this role worked at Gatwick. IJ explained that the independent advisor has carried out technical analysis that has backed up what the airport has done but has also identified where things could have been done differently. It has also provided communities with the ability to phrase their questions and request analysis in a way that was more likely to lead towards solutions. RB felt that the Heathrow should fund the advisor without being involved in management decisions, so the community could be confident of receiving independent advice. PC wanted Heathrow to fund research on the best way to implement PBN, acknowledging that there would need to be some scrutiny from Heathrow on how funds should be spent. MG recalled that PC had written previously to Heathrow about this, which in turn had led to the process of appointing an independent technical advisor. He felt that if the To70 model was working at Gatwick then it should also work at Heathrow. SC mentioned that Gatwick's Terms of Reference stated that the advisor worked for the communities so it was not a joint study, noting that communities did not want joint studies that could be used against them. MG asked if SC could circulate Gatwick's Terms of Reference but SC suggested asking Gatwick. **ACTION RN**

6 Noise Action Plan update

- 6.1 Xavier Oh (XO) gave an update on the development of a new Noise Action Plan (NAP) to cover the period 2019-2023. He observed that this was required by DEFRA before 31 August 2018 and would be a five-year plan for existing activities, i.e. two runways with an annual movement limit of 480,000. He noted that stakeholder and public consultation was required, and it had been agreed this would be a separate consultation later this year. He noted that two final workshops would be carried out at the next working group meetings on 13th and 15th February. A Word document of the 55 draft actions will be sent out and RN asked members to send back comments before the working group meetings to allow Heathrow time to respond. **ACTION RW**

- 6.2 DG asked how much noise reduction Heathrow was planning over the five-year period. RN advised that this wasn't known yet but there would be a contour in the final NAP document. DG mentioned the disbenefits of Heathrow's operations again, noting that the disbenefit numbers were very large. RN responded that the benefit numbers were also very large, so benefits should also be looked at, otherwise costs could preclude moving good actions forward.

7 AOB

- 7.1 MG raised the subject of HCNF membership. He expected more areas to be involved in the Forum in future which would lead to less room around the table. He reminded members that the original agreement was for each borough to have one council and one community representative at meetings and that going forward the group would have to be more disciplined about only sending one lead representative to each meeting. He asked groups to think about who their lead representative would be, advising they could not have more than one. However, a deputy could take their place if they were unable to attend. PC thought that if there was historical attendance of more than one representative from a group then this should be allowed to continue, as each member brought different expertise. CT echoed his comments and MM suggested waiting to see the uptake from other areas before deciding. MG highlighted that some members had expressed concern to him that groups with more than one representative risked dominating the proceedings. He reminded the group that this had been the original joint agreement around the table, so it was a topic the group should revisit. Heathrow will also consider which other areas should be invited to join the Forum. **ACTION CM**
- 7.2 PW asked if the Community Engagement Board (CEB) would replace the HCNF. Cheryl Monk (CM) confirmed that last week the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HACC) had formally agreed to become the CEB and acknowledged that it would now look to consider how groups like the HCNF would feed into the CEB.
- 7.3 RB asked to give a presentation about the number of people affected by aircraft noise with expansion, as he felt that recent figures were at odds with Heathrow's claim that fewer local people would be affected by aircraft noise with expansion than today. MG explained that he would prefer advance notice of any AOB, especially when presentations were included, so that Heathrow had time to respond in the most helpful way. He proposed adding this item to the agenda of working group 1. **ACTION RN**

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 14th March 2018, 1pm-4pm, Heathrow Academy.