

## Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 24 July 2019

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

#### Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough / Organisation</b>
Cllr Peter Szanto	Surrey County Council
Cllr Charlotte Morley	Surrey County Council
Cllr Victoria Wheeler	Surrey Heath
Cllr Tony Popham	Elmbridge
Justine Foley	Elmbridge resident
Cllr Linda Burke	Ealing
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow
Colin Stanbury	Richmond
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
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
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Kathleen Croft	Spelthorne resident
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Tina Richardson	The Windlesham Society
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Geoff Clark	Virgin Atlantic
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Ian Greene	DfT
Gary Marshall	DfT
Aaron Deary	ICCAN
Robin Clarke	NATS
Ian Jopson	NATS
Dale Reeson	NATS
Kjeld Vinkx	To70
Connor Daly	Heathrow
Lisa Forshew	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Michael Glen	Heathrow
Richard Greer	Heathrow

#### Apologies

John Coates	Richmond
Sarah Bishop	DfT

## 1 Welcome and apologies for absence

- 1.1 Connor Daly (CD) welcomed members and observers in the public gallery and noted apologies for absence. CD apologised that Matt Gorman (MG) was running slightly late.

## 2 Previous meeting notes and actions

- 2.1 CD stated that Stephen Clark (SC) had requested changes to the previous meeting notes – these will be amended accordingly and published on the HCNF website. There were no further comments. CD confirmed that for future meetings, notes will be circulated amongst members for comment and only once they are agreed by members at the next meeting will they be uploaded to the HCNF website. He went through the actions from the previous meeting.
- 2.2 **Issues Tracker.** This has now been developed and was circulated for comment during the previous month.
- 2.3 **Peter Willan (PW) to provide data around ATM cap.** Heathrow had not received data from PW, but Heathrow was aware that the Department for Transport (DfT) has recently written to PW on this. This action was therefore closed.
- 2.4 **Paul Conway to circulate independent advisor briefing note.** PC said that whilst no notes had been provided in writing, previous discussion between community representatives and Kjeld Vinkx (KV) had been very constructive. He added that some members of the HCNF have put forward questions on various topics and these will be answered in due course.
- 2.5 **Provide Paul Conway's (PC) email address to members.** This was circulated to members after the previous meeting.
- 2.6 **Heathrow to arrange workshop on measuring noise annoyance.** CD confirmed that a workshop will be held on 14<sup>th</sup> August – HCNF members will have received a notification of this already. Further details will be provided during the meeting.
- 2.7 **Members to email John Stewart (JS) their views on his Noise Relief presentation.** CD encouraged any members that had not already shared their views with JS to do so.
- 2.8 **Heathrow to confirm whether Surrey Heath Council is represented on Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (HSPG).** Heathrow confirmed that HSPG membership includes Surrey County Council but does not include Surrey Heath Council.
- 2.9 **Circulate Noise Envelope Design Group Phase 1 Final Report.** This has been circulated.
- 2.10 **Send focus group report to Armelle Thomas (AT).** This was sent to AT by post and is also available on the Heathrow website.
- 2.11 **(Further action added after meeting): Respond to AT's request to confirm the 2013 baseline for Heathrow employee car trips.** This was sent to AT by post. To confirm, the 2013 baseline for colleague car trips is 47,700. More information on this is available in our Surface Access Proposals document on Heathrow's expansion website.

### 3 Community presentation: Unanswered questions on measuring noise annoyance

- 3.1 Dave Gilbert (DG) outlined challenges raised by community groups around measuring noise annoyance which he said were not being answered. He highlighted the Survey on Noise Attitudes (SoNA) conducted by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), describing it as an “outlier” when compared to the evidence base published as part of World Health Organization Environmental Noise Guidelines 2018. DG also suggested that SoNA considered community annoyance to varying levels of ‘steady state’ noise whereas an airspace change would lead to a change in noise exposure. DG suggested that based on the noise complaints resulting from the 2014 airspace trials, airspace changes would lead to higher noise annoyance than forecast by SONA. He commented that given the potential impacts airspace changes can bring, the DfT should re-evaluate its guidance around airspace changes.
- 3.2 Stephen Clark (SC) added to DG’s criticisms of the CAA’s SoNA research, arguing that it was constrained by its limited budget. He said that he would like to query the appropriateness of establishing airspace policy given this fundamental issue. MG responded that this was a government rather than Heathrow survey, but asked SC whether he wanted Heathrow to contact the relevant government department to request a response on this. SC said that this would be helpful. **ACTION CD**
- 3.3 SC asked Stuart Lindsey (SL) of the CAA for his response to the presentation. SL responded that the CAA follows the rules set by the government and requires Heathrow to follow their processes. With regard to the SoNA report, SL said that any airspace change will inevitably have an impact, and the SoNA study intended to reflect this. However, SL stressed that he was not a subject matter expert on noise and hence was not in a position to respond to the community presentation.
- 3.4 PC claimed that Heathrow’s response to this argument had been deflective and Heathrow had not organised the workshop on aircraft noise annoyance that it had previously offered. MG disagreed and reiterated that these topics will be covered in the specific separate HCNF workshop on 14<sup>th</sup> August which will involve internationally recognised experts. He asked Richard Greer (RG) to provide an overview of what will be covered at this workshop.

## 4 Update on workshop on noise annoyance

- 4.1 RG responded to some points made during the meeting. In terms of studies that have been carried out around Heathrow's expansion proposals, he advised members to read the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), which he added was independently reviewed by the Noise Expert Review Group (NERG). RG highlighted Appendix 17.1 in the documentation which outlines the range of sensitivity tests that will take place – including the World Health Organisation's (WHO) Environmental Noise Guidelines. With regards to any concerns members may have around use of specific noise metrics, he said that Heathrow will continue to follow best practice in considering measurement of noise and annoyance and noted that the PEIR commits to providing and assessing a range of additional metrics in the Environmental Statement that will be published as part of the DCO application. The additional metrics include 'number above' metrics that consider the maximum noise level from each aircraft.
- 4.2 With regard to the workshop on noise annoyance to take place on 14th August, RG said the aim has been to invite speakers who have been involved with work around noise annoyance, as discussed by the HCNF in previous meetings. He confirmed that Rainer Guski of the University of Bochum (and author of the WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines) and Darren Rhodes from the CAA (author of SONA) would attend. He stressed how important this topic is to both communities and to Heathrow to ensure that the airport will submit an informed Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 4.3 RG confirmed that the workshop would be split into two sessions. The first part will invite presentations to explore the various perspectives on noise annoyance – this would include the community perspective. This would be chaired by an independent facilitator. After a short break, Robert Light, Head Commissioner at ICCAN, would chair an independent expert panel discussion. The full agenda, he added, would be circulated soon.
- 4.4 MG brought the session to a close by emphasising that this is a complex topic and encouraged members to attend. Justine Foley (JF) asked whether it would be possible to invite a representative from Frankfurt Airport to attend. **ACTION CD**

## 5 Community presentation: Noise annoyance

- 5.1 Peter Willan (PW) provided comments on Heathrow's future runway operations proposals and Airport Expansion Consultation documentation. He was critical that the documentation does not state a clear noise objective. He also said that a number of noise contour maps for the "do minimum" baseline were missing. In relation to future runway operations proposals, he questioned Heathrow's proposed four modes of runway alternation and their potential impact on respite.
- 5.2 In relation to night flights, PW said that more clarity was needed around how the runways could be used to provide dispersion of noise and how respite will actually work. He also called for more clarity around potential numbers of flights between 06:00-07:00.
- 5.3 MG said that a lot of the points which PW raised would be addressed in Dale Reeson's (DR) presentation later in the meeting. MG added he rejected PW's suggestion that Heathrow are planning to implement pure concentration. With regard to PW's point around missing contours, MG said this will be looked into. **ACTION CD**

## 6 Community presentation: What is valued respite?

- 6.1 Tina Richardson (TR) said she was relatively new to the Forum and sought to express a layperson's view on the topic of respite.
- 6.2 TR said that communities are concerned about the potential impact that the introduction of Performance Based Navigation (PBN) and concentration of flight paths will have on their areas. She asked whether communities living under these paths would receive any respite - they think dispersal and equitable sharing is important. Aircraft should be far enough away from each other to provide relief. TR concluded by saying that Heathrow asks the HCNF to consult with them, and every community has their own needs, so the airport should listen.
- 6.3 PC thanked TR for her presentation, adding that not all HCNF members are as immersed in noise metrics discussed earlier in the meeting and it's important that these discussions are had.

## 7 Community presentation: Noise regulation

- 7.1 John Stewart (JS) acknowledged that whilst there has been a lot of activity and discussion around airspace modernisation at Heathrow and other airports across the UK, communities want to know what this means with regards to noise regulation.
- 7.2 JS explained that the Airspace and Noise Engagement Group, known as ANEG, has a role on these matters, acting as a formal channel of communication between the DfT and airspace and airport noise stakeholders. The ANEG, he continued, covers all aspects of national airspace and airport noise policy development; it acts as a sounding board to identify, discuss and, where possible, resolve airspace and airport noise issues that impact on the work of the DfT. Discussions are at a strategic policy level.
- 7.3 JS provided an outline of the group's membership, which includes ICCAN and three community representatives, including from HACAN East. He also said that if HCNF members wanted to see ANEG's papers, CD could circulate these. **ACTION CD**
- 7.4 JS explained why noise regulation can be important, providing the example of what he described as a "muddle" at Luton Airport. At Luton, he explained, because the local authority owns the airport and is also responsible for its regulation, residents have not known who they should complain to about aircraft noise and other issues. With airspace changes being looked at more widely across the country, he added that communities and airports alike should look to see if there are gaps in noise regulation.
- 7.5 JS said that he sees positives with the roles of the regulator, which include: ensuring that government policy is delivered effectively; providing industry and communities with greater certainty; ensuring that aviation noise is subject to review; and creating commercial incentives for the industry to reduce noise. JS took the government's Aviation Green Paper as an example, saying it's important to ensure that such work is implemented effectively.
- 7.6 JS concluded that the opportunity for growth in the aviation industry should be in exchange for regulation. The industry can pursue growth provided its noise impacts are subject to robust regulation by an expert, independent and empowered regulator.

- 7.7 PC thanked JS for his presentation, as did MG who responded with two points. Firstly, he said that in relation to Heathrow's expansion proposals the NERG has been set up to ensure the airport's noise impact assessment is robust; Heathrow has also set out at AEC the proposal to for an Independent Scrutiny Panel (ISP) that would monitor and provide over-sight to ensure compliance with Environmentally Managed Growth commitments made as part of the expansion DCO. Secondly, although Heathrow's situation is different to Luton Airport's as JS pointed out, they are important issues to consider.

## 8 Future runway operations

- 8.1 Dale Reeson (DR) provided an overview of Heathrow's Airport Expansion Consultation proposals for how the airport will manage runway alternation and night flights with a third runway. He said that future runway operations are key to how Heathrow will provide respite and look to create the best outcomes for local communities.
- 8.2 DR explained the meaning of runway alternation and outlined the proposals which Heathrow has outlined in its current consultation documentation. Heathrow's proposals, he continued, also include the introduction of reflective alternation. He explained this in further detail and how this will allow Heathrow to offer the predictable respite which communities value.
- 8.3 DR explained Heathrow's proposals around night flights. He described Heathrow's current restrictions and explained how these compare with the proposed 6.5-hour ban on scheduled night flights. He also outlined the difference between scheduled and runway times, as published in the consultation documentation.
- 8.4 DR went into further detail, saying that, when combined, Heathrow's proposals aim to provide all communities with at least 7 hours' respite between 22:00 and 07:00. MG asked DR to clarify this for members. DR said that with runway alternation and the night-time restrictions, if communities are to be overflowed by early morning arrivals from 05:15, they will not have been overflowed by night flights during the previous evening. Likewise, if communities are overflowed into the recovery period at night, then they will not be overflowed early the next day.
- 8.5 DG queried whether Heathrow can confidently state that the airport will restrict noisier aircraft when they will allow A380s to fly at night. DR said that A380s are permitted to fly at night as this aircraft type is considered in a quieter QC category than other heavy aircraft. DR added that Heathrow will restrict noisier aircraft using the QC guidelines – these proposals will be included in Heathrow's DCO application submission and will form part of its noise envelope.
- 8.6 Margaret Majumdar (MM) said she felt that communities are pinning too much hope on respite – with a third runway, she said, residents in some areas will hear noise from at least one runway. DR sought to assure MM that everything that was consulted on during Heathrow's Airspace and Future Operations Consultation earlier in the year (January-March) still stands: in addition to runway alternation, airspace alternation will be provided so that communities further away from the airport will receive respite like those who live closer in. He added that Heathrow is proposing to publish an airspace alternation pattern that will be helpful to residents.
- 8.7 Wendy Matthews (WM) questioned the respite that residents in Richings Park would receive following Heathrow's expansion. Lisa Forshew (LF) sought to assure WM that the combination of runway alternation and night-time flight proposals will make a difference. More details around flight path options will be available in 2022.

- 8.8 During the presentation, DR explained that during the night recovery period, the airport could use two runways in future as opposed to using one today. SC was critical at the suggestion that with a third runway the airport's recovery time could be extended – he said this was a step back for health benefits. MG responded to SC's comments, saying that there are very clear UK and EU rules around night flights which Heathrow follows. He said that the recovery period is not being proposed with the intention of using it. He encouraged communities to provide their feedback on all these topics via the consultation.
- 8.9 Peter Szanto (PS) said that he understood that Performance Based Navigation (PBN) is being introduced with expansion. He asked, instead of placing just one PBN route over the same houses all of the time, whether it would be possible to create numerous routes to allow dispersal. DR responded by saying that Heathrow did propose this during January-March's Airspace and Future Operations Consultation and has committed to introducing at least three routes per departure design envelope presented in the consultation.
- 8.10 Kathleen Croft (KC) said that she was suspicious at Heathrow's proposal to change the current day runway alternation time from 15:00 to 14:00. DR sought to assure KC that there was no secret motive for this and that Heathrow had no preference for the time at which we switch runways; the suggestion had come about through feedback received from previous consultations, and everyone is encouraged to have their say on this in the consultation.
- 8.11 Linda Burke (LB) asked what penalties Heathrow enforces on airlines for noise breaches at certain times. MG said that this information is available and will be shared with LB.  
**ACTION CD**
- 8.12 DH said that the PEIR and NERG seemed to provide different definitions of respite, adding that communities need to be convinced that respite will have value. MG responded to this, saying that Heathrow continues to build the evidence of what communities around the airport want in terms of respite. DH observed that the difference between Heathrow and the NERG's communications is around wording of 'valued' and 'significant' respite. RG said he was happy to speak to DH directly about this but that he was confident, from many meetings with NERG, that there was no difference of opinion between NERG and Heathrow with regard to respite - CD could link them up via email.  
**ACTION CD**
- 8.13 On the topic of night flights, Armelle Thomas (AT) said that communities need 8 hours of sleep in accordance with World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines. DR reiterated that the airport fully intends to implement a longer ban on night flights than currently exists.

## 9 Overview of planned airspace changes

- 9.1 LF provided an update on Heathrow's airspace change proposals including expansion; introduction of Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA); permanent implementation of Slightly Steeper Approaches; and redesign of the easterly Compton departure route.
- 9.2 LF explained the CAA's airspace change process which Heathrow is required to follow, and described each airspace change proposal, with an indicative engagement and consultation timeline for each proposal.

- 9.3 LF stated that Heathrow will begin the airspace change process for the introduction of runway alternation on easterly operations later in 2019 – this is separate to the required taxiway works which will be pursued through Heathrow’s Development Consent Order (DCO) for expansion.
- 9.4 PW asked when feedback will be provided following the workshops on IPA held in May and June - these explained Heathrow’s methodology to developing a comprehensive list of flight path options for IPA. LF said that a Q&A document will be provided in August or September.

## 10 AOB

- 10.1 JF asked why departures had recently become lower over the Elmbridge area, and claimed that these are one of the lowest climbs in the world. MG disagreed with this claim, adding that Heathrow continually considers approaches to implementing steeper climbs but to achieve this should not come at the disadvantage to other communities by moving noise around. MG suggested to Kjeld Vinkx (KV) that this could be a useful topic to consider with communities. KV responded that To70 did not have evidence on what is being done at Heathrow but that he could look into this.
- 10.2 TR asked if Heathrow’s airspace change proposals relating to the easterly Compton route and introduction of IPA will form part of Heathrow’s DCO application for expansion. LF confirmed that this was not the case.
- 10.3 CD highlighted to members that should they wish to request hard copies of documentation related to the ongoing Airport Expansion Consultation, they can do this by emailing [info@heathrowconsultation.com](mailto:info@heathrowconsultation.com).
- 10.4 GY asked whether, over the previous weekend when Northolt Airport was closed, Heathrow may have taken advantage of the available airspace to direct flights over these areas. CD said that he would be surprised if this was the case but would look into it.

### **ACTION CD**

## Date of next meeting

Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> September 2019 (1:00pm - 4:00pm), Heathrow Academy.