

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 20 November 2019

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

Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Cllr Ralph Bagge	Buckinghamshire County Council
Cllr Linda Burke	London Borough of Ealing
John Coates	Richmond
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks District Council
Tracey Willmott-French	Spelthorne Borough Council
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Justine Foley	Elmbridge resident
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Rob Buick	Englefield Green Action Group
John Stewart	HACAN
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Armelle Thomas	HASRA
Bridget Bell	Plane Hell Action Group
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Tina Richardson	Windlesham Society
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Richard Greer	Arup
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Gary Marshall	DfT
Ian Greene	DfT
Maggie Gault	Farnborough Airport
Ian Jopson	NATS
Gary Dixon	NATS
Alex Goman	Taylor Airey
Kjeld Vinkx	To70
Geoff Clark	Virgin Atlantic
Lisa Forshew	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Kathryn Leahy	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Rachel Thomas	Heathrow
Andrew Bird	Heathrow
Michael Glen	Heathrow
Apologies	
Darl Sweetland	Buckinghamshire County Council
Cllr Luisa Sullivan	Buckinghamshire County Council
Paul Baker	Hammersmith & Fulham
Sue Janota	Surrey County Council
Nigel Davies	Englefield Green Action Group
Dr Mo Korda	Plane Hell Action Group
Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Barbara Perata-Smith	CAA
Stuart Price	NATS
Richard Norman	Heathrow

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. He noted that Teddington Action Group had suggested some amendments to the previous meeting notes which were currently being looked at.
- 2.2 **Request for a 2035 two-runway do-minimum noise contour map (2.4).** MG advised that Peter Willan (PW) had received a written response on this. Heathrow does not intend to publish additional maps retrospectively in isolation, but the request has been noted and will be considered for the Environmental Statement. Richard Greer (RG) added that the requested map had not been produced.
- 2.3 **ICCAN noise and annoyance workshop notes to be posted to AT (3.3).** These have not been published yet.
- 2.4 **Consider how to engage with the Noise Expert Review Group (NERG) (3.5).** Andrew Bird (AB) advised that he would be presenting on Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) later and would be setting out plans for engagement as Heathrow heads towards Development Consent Order (DCO) submission, including how HCNF will interface with NERG.
- 2.5 **Future working group meeting on respite (4.2).** To be arranged for a future meeting.
ACTION RW
- 2.6 **Circulate DEFRA noise policy update (4.6).** This has been circulated to members.
- 2.7 **Future agenda item on the planning approval process (5.2).** This will be covered in January. **ACTION RW**
- 2.8 **Scale of maps showing illustrative flight path options (6.3).** This will be added to the slides at the workshops.
- 2.9 **Potential impact of introducing Performance Based Navigation (PBN) (6.6).** MG recapped that Alex Goman (AG) from Taylor Airey had given a presentation at the last forum about a PBN study he is undertaking with Mike Fairbanks. AG will mention more about this at the end of the meeting.
- 2.10 **Stephen Clark (SC) to provide link to a US report on PBN (7.3).** MG confirmed this had been received.
- 2.11 **John Stewart (JS) to suggest non-HCNF members who might want to take part in PBN study (7.6).** JS noted that he had not forwarded any suggestions.
- 2.12 **Members to submit questions about Slightly Steeper Approaches as there was no time at the last meeting (8.2).** No questions were submitted.
- 2.13 **HCNF input to the noise envelope design process (9.1).** MG advised that the first session will take place on 28 November, independently chaired by Lisa Lavia from the Noise Abatement Society. MG thanked all those who had expressed an interest in attending.
- 2.14 **Future agenda item on night flights (9.3).** This is on today's agenda.

- 2.15 **Justine Foley (JF) to provide details of low flights over her area (9.4).** This was covered after the previous forum.
- 2.16 SC noted that RN had mentioned inaccuracies in SC's presentation at the last forum and asked for more details. **ACTION RN**

PART 1 – COMMUNITY

3 Co-ordinator's opening remarks

- 3.1 Paul Conway (PC) introduced the community agenda. He expressed disappointment that the nomination for David Gilbert (DG) to join the Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG) had been rejected in favour of forming a sub-group, although he thought a separate group was a good idea. MG explained that other members had also contacted Heathrow to express their desire to participate. He added that it was not a sub-group or a two-tier process, the group would be independently chaired and would go through the same conversations as the NEDG. He noted that it is a consultative process, so these are not decision-making bodies. PC asked MG to reconsider adding DG to the NEDG. **ACTION MG**
- 3.2 PC thanked the forum's independent technical advisor Kjeld Vinkx (KV) for attending the meeting. He noted that there had been good dialogue between KV and the community groups so far and KV would provide an update later in the meeting.

4 IPA consultation - unanswered questions and issues arising

- 4.1 Tina Richardson (TR) gave a presentation covering questions and concerns about Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA) from community members. She stressed that no business case had been put forward to justify IPA and that it should be considered separately from Heathrow expansion because any delay or cancellation to the third runway could mean that IPA flight paths remain in place indefinitely. She stated her belief that IPA would have a massive impact on the health and well-being of residents who would pay the price for Heathrow's increased profits, noting that HCNF members almost universally opposed Heathrow's plans for IPA and early growth. MG acknowledged that Heathrow had received clear feedback from HCNF members and from the Airport Expansion Consultation (AEC) over the summer and was considering this feedback.
- 4.2 Cllr Wendy Matthews (WM) advised that she had a number of questions about respite. PC suggested compiling the questions so that they could be considered, noting he appreciated that not all questions would have definitive answers, but they could possibly be covered at the next forum. **ACTION RW**

5 Compton route - issues arising and design priorities

- 5.1 Rob Buick (RB) gave a presentation highlighting concerns about proposed changes to the Compton easterly departure route. He expressed a preference for flights to remain where they are rather than becoming concentrated PBN routes. PC added that communities were opposed to concentrated flight paths and would prefer fair and equitable dispersal. MG acknowledged that Heathrow has observed the challenges of introducing pure forms of PBN and this was why so much work was being done to understand respite and introduce forms of noise sharing to avoid single route concentration.

- 5.2 MG reminded members that Heathrow was required by the CAA to update the Compton route. Rachel Thomas (RT) explained that a trial has been in use on the Compton route since 2009 for NATS air traffic controllers to manually direct aircraft. This trial needs to be formalised, so a new route needs to be created through the CAP1616 airspace change process. She added that DfT had also contacted Heathrow regarding the poor track keeping on this route as pilots are following verbal instructions from NATS rather than following the established Standard Instrument Departure route (SID).
- 5.3 Cllr David Hilton (DH) felt that the solution was worse than the problem and asked if doing nothing was an option. Stuart Lindsey (SL) advised that because the SID is not flyable, aircraft plan for that SID only for their plan to be cancelled by NATS. This undermines the rationale and safety of a SID and is not an acceptable situation. He added that it also undermines the Noise Preferential Route (NPR) altitude restriction, so air traffic controllers are free to vector aircraft because they are not following the SID. The CAA has therefore requested for the trial to be replaced.
- 5.4 RB questioned the order of the design principles for the new route, suggesting that mitigating the effects of aircraft noise should be a higher priority than air quality. MG explained that Heathrow consulted with many groups and had to take a range of views into account but reassured members that aircraft noise would of course be a high priority.
- 5.5 JS advised that when he started with the Heathrow Association for the Control of Aircraft Noise (HACAN) in 2000 they received more complaints about the Compton route than anything else, as aircraft were flying outside the NPR over areas such as Ashford and Staines. He noted that many members had recently attended a series of helpful workshops on the development of the route and suggested there would almost certainly be multiple flight paths that can be rotated rather than a single flight path. He suggested that John Henderson (JH) could give a presentation at the next HCNF. **ACTION JH**

6 Night flights and shoulder periods

- 6.1 Peter Willan (PW) gave a presentation on night flights. Topics covered included night noise estimates, recommendations for immediate action to reduce night flight noise and a request for an 8-hour night time ban between 23:00 – 07:00. He believes there is no economic or other reason for night flights.
- 6.2 MG responded that there was a lot of content in PW's presentation. He noted that Heathrow's Operations Director Kathryn Leahy (KL) would be presenting on night flights later and this should cover some of PW's points. He suggested scheduling a future agenda item to look at the economics of night flights. **ACTION RW**

7 Independent advisor work plan update

- 7.1 Kjeld Vinkx (KV) gave an update on his work as independent technical advisor to the HCNF. He advised that his assignment was to support the community groups with independent expert advice on highly technical subject matters such as the noise envelope and the impact of new aircraft on total noise. Activities so far had included community group sessions, HCNF meetings and the commencement of a study on departure optimisation. He felt that the meetings had been very constructive, and the study would be useful to provide better insight. He noted that he would like to work on improving the community preparations for the HCNF such as their presentations.

PART 2 – INDUSTRY

8 Midhurst departure route airspace change

- 8.1 Maggie Gault (MGa) gave a presentation about a change Farnborough Airport is making to a departure route. She advised that to avoid causing a conflict with Heathrow's existing Midhurst departure route (SID), two truncated SIDs will replace the existing Midhurst SID, called MAXIT (westerly) and MOGMI (easterly). The flight profile of the new truncated SIDs will sit entirely within the swathes (vertically and laterally) of where aircraft fly today. The change will go live on 27 February 2020. Gary Dixon (GD) added that truncating the SID would allow some environmental improvements but would not change the number, type or fundamental profile of aircraft.
- 8.2 DG asked what truncating a SID meant. Ian Jopson (IJ) explained that NATS had truncated several SIDs around the UK in recent years. He gave an example of the Dover SID which directed aircraft to a physical beacon on the ground and instructed them to be at 6,000ft at Dover. He explained aircraft are actually much higher than 6,000ft by the time they reach Dover, but the procedure means aircraft upload a certain amount of fuel to allow for only reaching 6,000ft. Therefore, bringing the end of the SID inwards provides more certainty on the amount of fuel needed. GD added that from a flight planning perspective the SID end is closer to Heathrow, but the actual profile flown by aircraft is the same as before.

9 Night flights

- 9.1 Kathryn Leahy (KL) gave a presentation about night flights at Heathrow. She explained that there have been 235 late running non-dispersed departures so far this year and provided a comparison to previous years. She also noted there have been 91 nights with no flights at all so far this year, with Heathrow interventions responsible for 64 night flights being avoided, 19 night flights cancelled or refused, and 59 night flights granted permission that subsequently operated before 23:30. She also provided a summary of the number of dispensations over the past six seasons.
- 9.2 PW thought Heathrow's figures looked different to his annual data. KL suggested this was because the data looked at different time periods.
- 9.3 JF complained about Virgin and British Airways planes flying over her area after 23:00. KL explained that Heathrow has been doing a lot of work with these airlines on flights that leave within the last 90 minutes. KL recognised that some flights had particular challenges and noted that one of them had been rescheduled by 30 minutes. KL added that the airlines have been very willing to work with Heathrow.
- 9.4 Margaret Majumdar (MM) was grateful that the number of late runners had reduced but wanted to know why British Airways were allowed so many flights after 23:30. KL explained that British Airways manage their night quota and have to ask Heathrow's permission to use it, noting that Heathrow had refused British Airways flights before.
- 9.5 PW thought it was difficult to tell when Heathrow was referring to scheduled time or runway time. MG responded that Heathrow would prepare an explanatory note on the night quota period. **ACTION PR**

- 9.6 Armelle Thomas (AT) asked why so many flights were allowed after 23:30 and proposed that no flights should be allowed after 22:30. KL advised that Heathrow was well below the night flight quota allowed by law. She recognised that AT would like the current regulations to change and explained that Heathrow was looking at the next steps to work with the DfT to tighten the night quota. AT asked why there had been so many late flights on 27 July. KL advised that these were due to thunderstorms and had therefore been dispensed under Secretary of State (SoS) rules. AT responded that a responsible airport would make sure all flights took off before 23:30, adding that she had no sympathy for people who want to fly at 23:00. She accused Heathrow of having no corporate social responsibility, stating that just because something is allowed does not mean it should be done. KL understood that AT did not like the current legislation but explained that Heathrow could not fine airlines that were operating within the current regulations. MG added that Heathrow was looking into charging more for late runners.
- 9.7 Bridget Bell (BB) asked if Heathrow could address the problem of arrivals flying over London from 04:30 and then continuing all day. MG advised that Heathrow was looking to bring the start time later and the possibility of switching off certain areas of airspace to provide respite.
- 9.8 DG asked if the next night flight regime was being discussed yet. Ian Greene (IG) advised that discussions had been due to start before Christmas, but plans had been affected by the general election. He explained that the current regime ends in October 2022 so to get a new regime in place it would need to be decided by April 2021, meaning that any consultation would need to be concluded before then.

10 Statement of Common Ground

- 10.1 Andrew Bird (AB) explained that Heathrow plans to submit Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) with its Development Consent Order (DCO) planning application in 2020. These SoCGs will be drawn up with stakeholders, including community groups, to give PINS an understanding of historic and current issues, how they have been addressed and which issues are currently outstanding.
- 10.2 MG hoped that some areas of agreement could be found, acknowledging that some may be at a fairly high level and that there were some areas where members would not agree. PW asked when Heathrow would be producing a report on its masterplan. MG thought this would be as part of the DCO application. PW felt it was important to see it sooner, especially in relation to noise. MG said this would be considered. **ACTION MG**
- 10.3 DH asked if Heathrow would seek SoCGs with other stakeholders and AB confirmed. DH asked what value this would give to PINS and whether they would assign greater significance to SoCGs from other groups. RG advised that he had been involved in many DCOs and explained that PINS found SoCGs very valuable in terms of what has been agreed or disagreed. They would then look for common themes and the differences between those, allowing them to narrow down the areas they should focus on. AT recognised that it would not matter if some issues in an SoCG were unresolved and AB agreed.
- 10.4 MM was concerned that members were expected to come to a common view on a framework that was set by Heathrow and noted that some members may be left out of the discussion if they were unable to attend every meeting. She added that the issues to be covered should include the gap between the ACP and DCO. AB acknowledged that the list of issues was not complete yet and that there would be a lot of discussion at the first session.

10.5 JS thought it might be difficult for Heathrow to get full agreement from groups such as HCNF, noting there may be areas where agreement could only be found with 75% of members. AB felt this could be dealt with in the SoCG. JS asked if SoCGs could be reviewed over the course of the public inquiry. RG confirmed this, explaining that they are living documents all the way through the examination, so that even when there are areas of disagreement there is an opportunity to resolve those issues during the process. JS thought that before starting it would be useful to have an overview of what is required in the DCO process. MG agreed. **ACTION AB**

11 AOB

11.1 Alex Goman (AG) reminded members of the PBN benchmarking study being undertaken by Taylor Airey. They are seeking to engage with the HCNF and the independent technical advisor on their study and AG asked interested members to see him after the meeting to sign up.

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 22nd January 2020 (1:00pm - 4:00pm), Heathrow Academy.