

## Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 20 March 2019

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

#### Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough / Organisation</b>
Cllr Peter Szanto	Elmbridge
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow
John Coates	Richmond
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
Rob Beere	AN3V
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Tim Walker	Forest Hill Society
John Stewart	HACAN
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Armelle Thomas	HASRA
Malcolm Beer	LAANC
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Kathleen Croft	Spelthorne resident
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Tina Richardson	The Windlesham Society
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Ian Greene	DfT
Gary Marshall	DfT
Rob Light	ICCAN
Robin Clarke	NATS
Ian Jopson	NATS
Dale Reeson	NATS
Henk Veerbeek	NLR
Kjeld Vinkx	To70
Connor Daly	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Rachel Thomas	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow

#### Apologies

Geoff Clark	Virgin Atlantic
Sarah Bishop	DfT
Luisa Sullivan	Buckinghamshire County Council
Darl Sweetland	Buckinghamshire County Council
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group

## 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 welcomed new member Tina Richardson who has joined the forum representing The Windlesham Society. He also noted that Hammersmith and Fulham Council would be joining the forum and looked forward to welcoming their representative at the next meeting.

## 2 Previous meeting notes and actions

- 2.1 MG went through the actions from the previous meeting. He noted that three of the actions were for DfT and would be covered later in the meeting. The remaining actions are summarised below.
- 2.2 **Consider what issues could be covered at the working group (3.1).** MG observed that, in the spirit of making the main HCNF meetings as efficient as possible, plans were being developed to arrange learning sessions and deeper dives through the working group on a range of topics such as Performance Based Navigation (PBN) and the World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines. The possibility of conference-style meetings with guest speakers was also being considered as another way to discuss various topics.
- 2.3 **Agenda item on aircraft heights over Lightwater (3.2).** MG observed that this was on today's agenda.
- 2.4 **Community Noise Groups to have separate meeting at the DfT (4.2).** MG noted that the meeting took place in February and would be discussed later.
- 2.5 **Invite the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) to attend the HCNF (5.2).** MG confirmed that ICCAN's head commissioner Rob Light would be speaking later in the meeting.
- 2.6 **Compile an issues tracker (5.6).** MG observed that an initial draft of an issues tracker had been circulated internally and would be developed further. He noted that the forum tends to keep going back to certain topics and felt it would be helpful to keep a record of how those discussions have progressed to avoid covering the same ground. He advised that Heathrow would hold another session internally before sharing with the working group how the tracker would be structured going forward. **ACTION MG**
- 2.7 **Respond to community presentation on "Unanswered Questions" (6.1).** MG confirmed that a response had been sent in writing and circulated to members following the last meeting.
- 2.8 **Provide an overview of air quality at the working group (9.2).** MG noted this had been covered at the working group last August. He advised that he was keen to keep this forum focussed on noise but if any group was particularly interested he would be happy to arrange a briefing.
- 2.9 **Consider if future meetings should be longer (10.1).** MG noted that this action was for all members. He personally felt that three hours should be long enough, with the group focussing on how best to use the time rather than making the meeting longer. He asked anyone who had strong views in a different direction to express them. Nobody made any representations for meetings to be longer.

- 2.10 Armelle Thomas (AT) referred to paragraph 9.3 of the meeting notes from 30 January 2019 regarding the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) and presented documents to support her comments questioning ICCAN's independence, including The Airports Commission Report Follow-up: Carbon Emissions, Air Quality and Noise (HC840) which expressed concern that the Government had *"downgraded the proposed Independent Aviation Noise Authority to an Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise. The proposed structure and role of this body would prevent it from having an authoritative role and may raise questions about whether it is truly independent and credible"*. MG reiterated that ICCAN's head commissioner Rob Light would be speaking later in the meeting.
- 2.11 AT sought clarity on possible plans to add up to 25,000 Air Traffic Movements (ATMs) in advance of the opening of the proposed third runway, asking if Heathrow would still look to pursue those extra movements if the third runway did not go ahead. MG suspected this would be the case but noted that Heathrow did not have a position on the issue. AT had understood from the previous meeting that Heathrow would continue with these additional movements until a further application was made. MG advised that this was a reference to Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA), not additional movements. He explained that IPA could be introduced without additional movements, but additional movements could not be introduced without IPA. AT asked for confirmation of this in writing. **ACTION RW**

### 3 Community slot

- 3.1 MG handed the meeting over to Paul Conway (PC) to chair the community slot. PC mentioned that representatives from the Community Noise Groups (CNG) had met with the DfT last month. He noted that the DfT had been somewhat fettered in what they could say because of the ongoing judicial review of the Government's decision to designate the Airports National Policy Statement. It was his hope that similar meetings could continue regularly in the future. MG advised that Ian Greene (IG) from DfT would pick up on those points later in the meeting.
- 3.2 PC referred to an earlier comment by MG that questions would only be addressed to the main spokesperson of each group to help manage time more effectively. PC said he would be disappointed if those who had attended the forum since the beginning would have to withdraw due to the increasing size of the group. MG explained that it was not his intention for those members not to stay involved. However, he stressed the importance of keeping the balance right following feedback from a number of members that some groups had more than one representative who asked a large number of questions and limited the opportunity for others to participate.

### 4 Appointment of independent technical advisor

- 4.1 Xavier Oh (XO) reminded members that the HCNF was in the process of appointing an independent technical advisor to the group. He explained that six organisations had been approached, of which three had responded and two were subsequently shortlisted by the selection committee, namely NLR and To70. XO explained that representatives from both organisations would give a presentation and answer questions to enable the forum to select their preferred candidate.
- 4.2 Presentations were then given by Henk Veerbeek from NLR and Kjeld Vinkx from To70. They both answered questions before leaving the room. A broad discussion followed but there was no clear consensus on a preferred candidate. After some debate it was agreed that the group would make their selection within the next two weeks and confirm in writing to Heathrow. **ACTION PC**

## 5 Community presentation: Missed evidence and implications

- 5.1 Stephen Clarke (SC) gave a presentation which discussed evidence from Heathrow's 2014 Performance Based Navigation (PBN) trials which he said should have been considered by the CAA as part of their Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA) and the implications for SoNA, UK aviation policy and the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS).
- 5.2 Ian Jopson (IJ) mentioned his work with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) looking at PBN practice around the world. He noted that those involved in the study included the International Coalition for Sustainable Aviation (ICSA). He advised that the work included case studies where PBN had been well received by communities and cited Toronto as an example, although it had got some negative publicity because some people had been adversely affected. He also noted that of the 99 PBN implementation plans that were reviewed, none of them had considered respite or alternation as Heathrow was currently doing. He advised that ICAO was preparing to publish the study and it should be available in the next few months. SC welcomed the work and wondered why the Government had committed to introduce PBN before the study was done.
- 5.3 In his presentation, SC stated that the use of overall average  $L_{Aeq}$  noise levels was not appropriate for assessing the impact of proposed airspace changes and thought that single mode and N65 should be the key metrics. Nicole Porter (NP) advised that these metrics would be included in the Environmental Impact Assessment along with average noise levels. However, she observed that the problem with such metrics was that the evidence base was mostly around average noise levels. SC responded that  $L_{Aeq}$  could not identify changes so this affected WebTAG, the DfT's suite of guidance on how to assess the expected impacts of transport policy proposals and projects. NP noted that there would be a workshop on the WHO guidelines at the working group, so these questions should be raised there.
- 5.4 SC commented that airspace changes were critical to public annoyance and that significant community annoyance occurs well below 51dBLAeq - both factors evidenced in Anderson's 2015 report on the PBN trials. He advised that SoNA did not address these issues and was therefore an inadequate evidence basis for assessing the impact of airspace changes or for use in webTAG cost benefit analysis. He also pointed out that the change effect was recognised by the WHO and in other studies, with the WHO making strong recommendations to avoid exposing people to levels of noise at 45 Lden, well below the DfT's 51 dBLAeq LAOEL level. His presentation included two questions put to the DfT about whether it accepted change has an impact on public sensitivity to aircraft noise, which it was unable to answer due to the ongoing judicial review.

## 6 Airspace Update

- 6.1 Jane Dawes (JD) updated the group on Heathrow's recent Airspace and Future Operations Consultation, the Airspace Change Process (ACP) 2019 programme and the proposed new Compton departure route.

- 6.2 JD advised that the consultation responses were currently being assessed and coded by independent consultation experts Wood. Feedback on the runway operations components would be published at Heathrow's upcoming consultation in June and feedback on the airspace questions would be available later. Peter Willan (PW) felt that the report from the previous consultation on airspace design principles had been published too close to the CAA decision and asked if the next report would be available in good time. JD advised that it would be available before the next round of engagement and a summary of all feedback would be available in report form. AT asked if the report would include removing options that were not wanted. JD advised that it would just be a summary of the feedback from the consultation and would not include recommendations. Rob Buick (RBU) advised that some people had found the online consultation form hard to use and suggested it should include confirmation by email that a response has been received. JD acknowledged that this feedback has been heard and has been picked up for future consultations.
- 6.3 Tim Walker (TW) noted that London City Airport would be consulting in parallel with Heathrow and asked how both could be done at the same time. JD advised that London City Airport was one of many airports along with Gatwick and Heathrow that were involved in the Future Airspace Strategy Implementation South, or FASI(S). She explained that the overall timeline has not been agreed and that Heathrow was involved in bilateral meetings with other airports which included a meeting with London City Airport last week.

## 7 Aircraft heights over Lightwater

- 7.1 Dale Reeson (DR) observed that Rob Beere (RBe) had previously raised questions about the variation in heights of arrivals over Lightwater during easterly operations (i.e. when there are easterly winds). RBe wanted to know why aircraft could not fly higher over Lightwater early in the morning. It was agreed that RBe would send examples to DR so that he could provide an explanation. **ACTION RBe/DR**

## 8 An introduction to the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN)

- 8.1 ICCAN's head commissioner Rob Light (RL) gave a presentation introducing the newly formed commission. He advised that ICCAN was currently working on the strategy for its first year and would be aiming to provide a trusted, impartial, authoritative voice along with research, guidance, clarity and consistency. He added that ICCAN would be independent and impartial, so this would involve challenging everyone in the sector.
- 8.2 Responding to questions, RL observed that some members did not appear to have much faith in the process. He was sorry that there was not enough optimism around aviation. He noted that from a community perspective it could seem like a long battle with not many victories and he was aware that community leaders need to feel they are making progress. He felt that the process didn't always help as it can sometimes take so long that people lose faith. He explained that ICCAN was currently only a small organisation but he hoped it would appoint a commissioner specifically for Heathrow and would endeavour to attend as many meetings as possible when invited. MG thought it was entirely appropriate for ICCAN to join the HCNF and would send a formal invitation in writing. **ACTION MG**

## 9 DfT actions and update

- 9.1 Ian Greene (IG) went through the actions from the previous HCNF that were directed at the DfT. These are summarised below.
- 9.2 **Consider whether CNG could observe an inter-governmental group meeting on the WHO report (4.3).** IG advised that this meeting would involve the coming together of a group of government bodies and noted that ICCAN would be joining the group as an independent body. However, while the DfT was keen to be as transparent as possible there was no possibility for external people to observe the meeting.
- 9.3 **Propose possible research on respite to DfT's airspace and noise engagement group (5.3).** IG advised that the DfT was talking separately with ICCAN about what research could be undertaken. He noted that one possibility was a refresh of SoNA as the data set was from 2014 so a repeat of that work could be in order.
- 9.4 **Find out what ATM cap was modelled by DfT (8.3).** IG advised that a soft cap of 740,000 ATMs was used, going up to 753,000 to allow for periods of congestion. PW thought that Jacobs had used a figure of 900,000 in its Airports Commission work and said his own calculations indicated at least 840,000 ATMs could be possible. He was concerned that if the middle runway was capped at 240,000 for safety reasons then this could result in a 50% increase in the number of flights over areas such as Richmond. IG felt there was some misunderstanding here and both he and MG asked to see PW's data. **ACTION PW**
- 9.5 IG advised that DfT had asked the CAA's Environmental Research and Consultancy Department (ERCD) to review its report ERCD 1006: Measurement and Modelling of Aircraft Noise at Low Levels, which looks at the problems of monitoring and modelling low noise levels and the challenge of interaction with other noise sources. He advised that the report was last updated in 2010 and anticipated that an updated version would be published in May 2019.
- 9.6 IG informed members that the DfT had extended the consultation period for its Aviation 2050 green paper to 20 June 2019 to provide further time for stakeholders to consider its proposals and submit their consultation responses. He noted that the extension would not apply to specific questions on legislative airspace change proposals, which have been consulted on alongside the green paper. The closing date for responses to the airspace change legislation questions remains 11 April 2019.
- 9.7 SC asked if the DfT accepted that airspace changes increase sensitivity. IG explained that he could not discuss this because of the ongoing judicial review. SC asked if it would be possible for the CNG to have a follow-up meeting with the DfT. IG advised that the DfT was currently considering the best way to engage with communities going forward and was looking to cover a wider cross-section than just Heathrow to talk about national policy issues.

## 10 AOB

- 10.1 Peter Szanto (PS) asked how the Development Consent Order (DCO) would be managed so that all relevant information would be available to stakeholders who want to make representations. MG advised the Heathrow was continuing to develop its DCO and would have to produce an Environmental Impact Assessment that would cover noise and the effects of the development. He explained that the consultation in June would set out Heathrow's latest evidence. He suggested it might be worth considering a member of the planning team coming to the forum to describe the process. **ACTION MG**

- 10.2 RBe asked IJ if Toronto Airport had added an extra 250,000 flights and implemented IPA when they had introduced PBN. IJ confirmed they had not.
- 10.3 Wendy Matthews (WM) suggested that the consultation experts Wood were far from independent as they had been working with Heathrow since 2002 to support Heathrow's proposal. MG confirmed that Wood had worked with Heathrow for many years and operated to professional standards in the same way as all large, professional firms. He added that the judge of their work quality would be the Planning Inspectorate who will decide whether Heathrow consultations and their responses to them have been sufficient. RBU asked if Wood had set the consultation questions. MG advised that the questions were set by Heathrow.
- 10.4 DH asked who would be developing the noise envelope and how it would be done. XO responded that it would be developed by the Noise Envelope Design Group. It was agreed that Heathrow would provide more information about the group to members.  
**ACTION MG**
- 10.5 XO informed the group that hard copies of Heathrow's Noise Action Plan for 2019-2023 were available to take away.

### **Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2019 (1:00pm - 4:00pm), Heathrow Academy.