

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 18 September 2019

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

Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
John Stewart	HACAN
John Coates	Richmond
Cllr Chris Howorth	Runnymede
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Justine Foley	Elmbridge resident
Bob McLellan	Englefield Green Action Group
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Armelle Thomas	HASRA
Bridget Bell	Plane Hell Action Group
Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Gary Marshall	DfT
Tim May	DfT
Rupert Basham	ICCAN
Howard Simmons	ICCAN
Robin Clarke	NATS
Ian Jopson	NATS
Mike Fairbanks	Taylor Airey
Alex Goman	Taylor Airey
Kjeld Vinkx	To70
Sarah Collyer	Heathrow
Connor Daly	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
John Henderson	Heathrow
Harri Howells	Heathrow
Richard Norman	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Pete Rafano	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow

Apologies

Darl Sweetland	Buckinghamshire County Council
Cllr Linda Burke	Ealing
Cllr Tony Popham	Elmbridge
Sue Janota	Surrey County Council
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Rob Buick	Englefield Green Action Group
Tim Walker	Forest Hill Society
Dr Mo Korda	Plane Hell Action Group
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Tina Richardson	Windlesham Society
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Barbara Perata-Smith	CAA
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 meeting notes and actions

- 2.1 MG went through the actions from the previous meeting as described below.
- 2.2 **Heathrow to contact DfT for response to Stephen Clark's (SC) comment that the CAA's Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA) was constrained by its budget (3.2).** The DfT's response was forwarded to SC, they considered that the aims of the SoNA research were met. Tim May (TM) added that SoNA had met its Terms of Reference so the budget had not affected the success criteria on the work. SC referred to the survey's clustered approach and SoNA not looking below 51 dB and advised that he would cover this during his presentation later.
- 2.3 **Request to invite a representative from Frankfurt Airport to the noise annoyance workshop (4.4).** MG observed that Dirk Schreckenbergh had been invited but was unable to attend.
- 2.4 **Heathrow to look into Peter Willan's (PW) suggestion that some noise contour maps were missing from the Airport Expansion Consultation (5.3).** MG advised that contour maps were not missing, explaining that Heathrow was only at the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) stage and Planning Inspectorate guidance is clear that the PEIR is not a draft Environmental Statement. PW asked if it would be possible to see a noise contour map for 2035 two-runway do-minimum (day and night). Richard Norman (RN) responded that he would look into it. **ACTION RN**
- 2.5 **Heathrow to circulate information about the Airspace and Noise Engagement Group (ANEG) (7.3).** This was circulated with the meeting notes.
- 2.6 **Heathrow to share information about noise fines with Cllr Linda Burke (8.11).** This was sent by email and is also available on Heathrow's noise website.
- 2.7 **Heathrow to connect Cllr David Hilton (DH) and Richard Greer (RG) via email to further discuss the definition of respite provided by the PEIR and Noise Expert Review Group (NERG) (8.12).** MG confirmed that this was done.
- 2.8 **Heathrow to respond to Graham Young's (GY) query on whether it would take advantage of airspace due to the temporary closure of Northolt Airport for runway maintenance (10.4).** MG advised that Heathrow had confirmed with GY directly that this was not the case.

3 Noise and annoyance workshop overview

- 3.1 RN gave an overview of the workshop which took place on 14 August.

- 3.2 RN explained that the workshop had started with presentations from four speakers covering the World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines and SONA study. This was followed by an expert panel "Question Time" which was independently chaired by the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN), covering a range of noise and annoyance related questions. He noted that the event had been very well attended and was considering whether this format could be used for other topics. He advised that ICCAN would issue notes from the event in due course and that Heathrow was preparing a written response to questions raised by Teddington Action Group (TAG).
- 3.3 DH felt it had been a worthwhile event with an interesting format. John Stewart (JS) thought it had worked well and commended the broad range of speakers and attendees. Armelle Thomas (AT) asked for the ICCAN notes to be posted to her. **ACTION CD**
- 3.4 SC followed with a presentation discussing his learnings from the workshop. He felt that the event had been helpful but had not reached any conclusions. His presentation raised questions about SoNA and noted that when panellist Stephen Turner (ST) was asked what one piece of research would help, he had responded that he would repeat SoNA but start wider. SC proposed that Heathrow should approve resources for ST and possibly other members of the NERG to work with communities to propose routes to resolve differences.
- 3.5 RN responded that he was happy to discuss with RG how Heathrow might engage NERG around that. He noted that Heathrow was keen to look for areas where there could be statements of common ground. He felt it would not be worthwhile getting into a debate about the inaccuracies in SC's presentation now, noting that ST was keen to engage on this topic, so he would explore this and discuss with RG. **ACTION RN**

4 Local perspectives on respite

- 4.1 Cllrs Wendy Matthews (WM) and DH gave a presentation discussing local perspectives on respite.
- 4.2 RN observed that there was a lot covered in the presentation and suggested it was not prudent to debate everything now. He proposed having a dedicated session on respite at the HCNF working group with Nicole Porter from Anderson Acoustics. **ACTION RW**
- 4.3 DH stated that respite was central to the noise aspects of the Development Consent Order (DCO). In the presentation he had drawn an illustrative map to try and indicate areas where 9dB of respite could be achieved and asked if Heathrow could provide a more accurate version. He noted that while the ten indicative test cases presented in the PEIR provided some indication of how areas could be affected, they should have provided more granularity. He also asked why NATS had not assessed whether it was possible to handle the amount of traffic proposed with Heathrow expansion.

- 4.4 Jane Dawes (JD) advised that NATS has done this assessment and it has been published. She explained that the airspace changes for Heathrow expansion are being done as part of the Government's airspace modernisation program. This is being done in three dimensions and needs to fit in with other airports and NATS. The routes also need to fit within the design envelopes presented at the Airspace and Future Operations Consultation (January to March 2019). She understood that members were keen to see how the design would look but the design cannot be guessed upfront or secured until DCO approval. She explained that Performance Based Navigation (PBN) would allow a completely different airspace design to today, but Heathrow had not yet reached the level of detail about which areas might be affected by multiple flight paths. She explained that the indicative test cases in the PEIR were built on each specific design principle, but there were no specific flight paths which could be taken forward to consultation, so it was not yet possible to say where flight paths will be or show where respite would or would not work. She noted that Harri Howell's (HH) presentation later would explain this further.
- 4.5 DH observed that metrics which took account of the number of noise events such as N65 were important because people are affected by events and not averages. He argued that the Quota Count (QC) was a poor measure of the impact of aircraft noise. SC added that average noise levels were not suitable for measuring predictable respite. RN acknowledged that there were pros and cons to every metric. He explained that QC was good for its purpose but was not a panacea. He agreed that a range of metrics was needed to fully understand noise and noted that a number of metrics were used in the PEIR. Bob McLellan (BM) felt that many of the metrics used were aircraft industry-based. RN responded that while QC was clearly aircraft-related, other metrics used were standard for measuring environmental noise. He added that Heathrow supported the idea of regular surveys of local communities and was looking to regulators and policy makers on this.
- 4.6 TM observed that there was a process underway looking at evidence around WHO and SoNA, but it was complex and would take some time. He advised that he had provided Heathrow with a DEFRA noise policy update to be circulated to members. **ACTION RW**
- 4.7 TM noted that it may be helpful to carry out another piece of research on SoNA. SC asked how that would be factored into the Environmental Statement. TM advised that he could not provide any timelines and was waiting for advice from ICCAN at the end of the year. He noted that we are living in a world where evidence changes all the time. Heathrow will carry on with their project and changes will have to be factored in as they emerge.
- 4.8 PW stressed that respite had a huge cost as it was just a form of dispersion which passes on the cost to another group of people.
- 4.9 DH mentioned that he had read a publication by Southampton University on potential future reduction in aircraft noise. It stated that past reductions came about because of work to reduce fuel burn, so airlines were not working to reduce noise, just to increase profitability. He noted that while this was perfectly laudable, reducing aircraft noise was not their primary objective.

- 4.10 Cllr Chris Howorth (CH) observed that when he sits on a planning committee people are objecting to something concrete. But in the Airport Expansion Consultation (AEC) there had been many issues that were not set in stone so people were meant to provide feedback based on good will. He hoped that substantive consultation would continue beyond the AEC closing date. JD assured him that feedback would not just be based on good will, explaining that parameters would be defined as part of the planning conditions. She advised that CAP1616 requires Heathrow to continue to engage throughout the process so that stakeholders are as informed as possible when they give feedback. CH responded that there was growing cynicism in his borough about the PR coming from Heathrow, not just on noise but also other issues such as surface access, and he hoped for more technical detail and less PR in future. MG noted his point but stressed that Heathrow had provided a huge amount of information as well as promoting its case.

5 Airport Expansion Consultation update

- 5.1 JD gave an overview of the Airport Expansion Consultation (AEC) which took place between June and September 2019. She reminded members how the Airspace Change Process (ACP) feeds into the environmental submissions to the Development Consent Order (DCO), and how the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) was created based on assumptions regarding the final airspace design for expansion.
- 5.2 DH asked for clarity on how the planning approval process works. MG explained that Heathrow will apply to the planning inspectorate, they will declare that the application has been made and they will have a period of time to say whether their requirements have been met. He advised that the examination would be topic-based and typically takes six months. He suggested that the planning approval process could be covered at a future meeting. **ACTION RW**

6 Expansion flight path options workshops

- 6.1 HH explained that Heathrow was now at the “options development” stage of designing flight paths for expansion. Workshops will take place to engage with community and Local Authority representatives to explore and test Heathrow’s approach to developing route and flight path options.
- 6.2 HH stressed that the flight path options shown in the presentation were illustrative only, noting that there were hundreds of options as would become apparent at the workshops.
- 6.3 DH enquired about the scale of the maps. **ACTION HH**
- 6.4 PW asked how the final flight paths would meet the airspace design principle of avoiding overflying communities with multiple routes, as some of the options showed the possibility of arrivals and departures over the same areas. HH advised that each design principle covers a range of individually good outcomes, but some of those outcomes would sometimes be in conflict. For example, the principle of maximising sharing through managed dispersal would have an impact on the principle of minimising total population overflown. The purpose of this comprehensive exercise was to ensure that there are options to cover all these eventualities.

- 6.5 Bridget Bell (BB) asked why there had been no consultation events in the wider south-east of London. JD advised that locations had been based on areas with aircraft levels up to 4,000ft. JS noted that most of the aircraft in BB's area were just over 4,000ft. However, JD explained that the 4,000ft zone was based on future airspace designs which would incorporate steeper minimum climbs. BB complained that the PEIR had stated that nothing of importance in Southwark was being overflown. MG responded that he did not recognise the statement.
- 6.6 SC stated that policy was to minimise the significant adverse effects of aviation noise, but that nobody knew the potential impact of introducing PBN because there had been no research. MG advised that this would be looked at. **ACTION RN**
- 6.7 Justine Foley (JF) asked how Heathrow could introduce PBN differently to other airports such as London City and others in the US. MG advised that Heathrow was looking at how to use respite in conjunction with PBN. JF suggested introducing a high number of routes throughout the design envelope. HH acknowledged there might be some options with more routes but noted there were technical and practical limits to this, because if routes were not separated by enough distance then there would not be much difference in noise levels on the ground.
- 6.8 AT commented that she has been engaging with Heathrow for 25 years and every time she has asked something she has been told to put it in the consultation. However, she had never received a reasonable answer to any question that she had asked. She concluded that this was not engagement, it was Heathrow asking residents what the most reasonable worst case was.

7 PBN benchmarking

- 7.1 Alex Goman gave a presentation outlining aims to deliver a substantive report on Performance Based Navigation (PBN), engaging closely with the HCNF and its independent technical advisor during the process.
- 7.2 AG advised that he would be working with Mike Fairbanks (MF) on this work. He set out the project plan to perform preliminary research, determine dates for workshops with the HCNF, draft a report including options for implementation and operation, conduct benchmarking, identify best practice and invite comments from stakeholders such as ICCAN and the CAA.
- 7.3 SC mentioned a number of reports and airports to AG and MF and advised that he would send MG a link to a US report. **ACTION SC**
- 7.4 SC suggested that the CAA did not take its environmental responsibilities seriously. IJ responded that as a member of the aviation industry he believed that it did. SC referred to comments made by the CAA to the Transport Select Committee stating they were not responsible for health, they were responsible for monitoring. He concluded that it was therefore inappropriate that SoNA had been carried out by the CAA. TM referred SC to Section 70 of the Transport Act which advised that the CAA had to take account of this. He explained that the CAA had carried out SoNA in a consultancy role and not as a statutory function.
- 7.5 PW was concerned that there was not enough airspace to take all of the flight paths.

- 7.6 JS thought the PBN benchmarking study looked interesting. He suggested it might be useful for people outside the HCNF in areas such as Hammersmith and Wandsworth to have some input. He noted that the problem experienced by some residents under London City Airport's concentrated flight paths was the lack of respite. MG asked JS to forward any suggestions to him. **ACTION JS**

8 Slightly Steeper Approaches Stage 2 Engagement on Options

- 8.1 John Henderson (JH) outlined the different options explored for introducing Slightly Steeper Approaches (SSA) at Heathrow in the short-term, ahead of airspace modernisation and expansion. He advised that the expected timeline was for the evaluation and appraisal of options to take place later this year, followed by consultation and ACP submission in 2020 prior to permanent adoption in 2021.
- 8.2 MG asked for any questions to be sent by email due to lack of time. **ACTION ALL**

9 AOB

- 9.1 RN advised that the Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG) intended to expand its community representation. He wanted everyone at the HCNF to have the opportunity to feed into the selection process so that all members felt they were represented on that group. He hoped that a decision could be reached over the next week with evidence that consensus had been reached. **ACTION ALL**
- 9.2 SC asked when the SoNA Night report would be published. TM advised that the CAA was working on this, but it would slip into next year as they have a busy workload.
- 9.3 AT complained about the number of flights after 23:30 and suggested that the airlines responsible should be fined and removed from Heathrow. MG advised that Heathrow was working hard to reduce the number of late runners, but it would also require a change to Government policy. He suggested a deep dive on night flights at a future HCNF meeting. **ACTION RN**
- 9.4 JF reiterated the issue around late flights and complained about a specific low flight over her area. JD asked her to send in the details about the low flight so that it could be investigated. **ACTION JF**

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 20th November 2019 (1:00pm - 4:00pm), Heathrow Academy.