

## Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 22 January 2020

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

#### Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough / Organisation</b>
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Richard Greer	Arup
Darl Sweetland	Buckinghamshire County Council
Stuart Lindsey	Civil Aviation Authority
Gary Marshall	Department for Transport
Ian Greene	Department for Transport
Margaret Majumdar	Ealing Aircraft Noise Action Group
Justine Foley	Elmbridge resident
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Rob Buick	Englefield Green Action Group
Armelle Thomas	Harmondsworth & Sipson Residents Association
Christine Taylor	Harmondsworth & Sipson Residents Association
Jakub Hajko	Heathrow
Lisa Forshev	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Michael Glen	Heathrow
Rachel Thomas	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Sam Williams	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Aaron Deary	ICCAN
Surinderpal Suri	London Borough of Ealing
John Coates	London Borough of Richmond
Bridget Bell	Plane Hell Action Group
Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Cllr Chris Howorth	Runnymede Borough Council
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks District Council
Clair Roser	Stanwell Moor Residents Association
Cllr Peter Szanto	Surrey County Council
Cllr Victoria Wheeler	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Alex Goman	Taylor Airey
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Kjeld Vinkx	To70
Tina Richardson	Windlesham Society

#### Apologies

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough / Organisation</b>
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Cllr Ralph Bagge	Buckinghamshire County Council
Bob McLellan	Englefield Green Action Group
John Stewart	HACAN
Andrew Bird	Heathrow
Robin Clarke	NATS
Tracey Willmott-French	Spelthorne Borough Council
Sue Janota	Surrey County Council
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 noticed that there were no airline representatives present and felt this was not helpful.

## 2 Previous meeting notes and actions

- 2.1 MG went through the actions from the previous meeting as detailed below.
- 2.2 **Future working group meeting on respite (2.5).** This has been added to the draft agenda for the next working group on 13 February.
- 2.3 **Future agenda item on the planning approval process (2.7).** This will be covered on today's agenda.
- 2.4 **Provide details of presentation inaccuracies (2.16).** Heathrow sent out a response to members on Monday which covered this and various other questions from the community around noise annoyance.
- 2.5 **Heathrow to reconsider nomination of Dave Gilbert (DG) to the Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG) (3.1).** MG advised that Heathrow had responded to Paul Conway (PC) in writing on this. PC was frustrated that the nomination had not been accepted but MG reiterated that he would not take another action to reconsider. He stressed that the Noise Envelope working group comprising HCNF members had the same standing as the NEDG. The groups are not decision-making bodies, but both will input into the noise envelope design process. MG noted that the NEDG had already met many times and PC asked if minutes were available. **ACTION AB**
- 2.6 Stephen Clark (SC) asked for the meeting dates of the Noise Envelope working group. Lisa Forshew (LF) advised that the dates for these and the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) meetings would be circulated shortly and would hopefully include some evening sessions following feedback from some members. **ACTION AB**
- 2.7 **Respite questions from Wendy Matthews (4.2).** This is covered in 2.2 above.
- 2.8 **Possible future agenda item on Compton route (5.5).** MG noted that an update would be given in future but there was currently nothing new to announce.
- 2.9 **Possible future agenda item on the economics of night flights (6.2).** MG advised that the Government will be consulting on the night flight regime soon and part of that process will be to consider the cost-effectiveness of night flights. He suggested continuing this discussion at that stage.
- 2.10 **Prepare an explanatory note on the night quota period (9.5).** This was circulated with the meeting notes.
- 2.11 **Consider request to provide masterplan report before DCO application (10.2).** MG advised that Heathrow will provide more detail at its upcoming Targeted Consultation in April which will be discussed later in this meeting. The final proposals will then be assessed in the Environmental Statement which will be available for examination following DCO submission. The SoCG sessions will also cover aspects of the Environmental Statement.
- 2.12 **SoCG – provide overview of what is required in DCO process (10.5).** This will be covered at the SoCG meetings.

- 2.13 MG advised that Heathrow has recently launched a new corporate website. This has provided the opportunity for Heathrow to review the best way to publish HCNF content that was previously hosted on the old website. As a result, Heathrow has decided to provide a dedicated stand-alone website, and this is currently being set up.
- 2.14 Armelle Thomas (AT) asked if ICCAN's minutes from last year's noise annoyance workshop were available yet. Aaron Deary (AD) handed her a printed copy. MG added that his PA would courier HCNF documents to her given she does not have email.

## PART 1 – COMMUNITY

### 3 Co-ordinator's opening remarks

- 3.1 Paul Conway (PC) introduced the community agenda. He was pleased with the work being carried out by the forum's independent technical advisor Kjeld Vinkx (KV). He noted that Bridget Bell (BB) had written to Heathrow to ask for a flight density study over Camberwell. MG asked for emails to be copied to [hcnf@heathrow.com](mailto:hcnf@heathrow.com) to ensure they are properly logged. LF advised that Heathrow would respond. **ACTION RW**
- 3.2 PC asked for an update on Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA). MG noted that Heathrow had received a lot of feedback on the issue which was currently being reviewed and members would be advised of the next steps in due course.

### 4 Night Flight and Shoulder Periods (Part 2)

- 4.1 Peter Willan (PW) gave a presentation on night flights. He explained that it was a continuation of his presentation from the last HCNF which had been too long to finish.
- 4.2 PW called for immediate action to reduce night flight noise by reducing late runners and other unscheduled flights, reducing flights in the early morning shoulder period and reducing the noisiest aircraft by banning the use of unscheduled QC4 aircraft between 23:00 and 07:00. He also proposed an 8-hour ban on all scheduled and unscheduled night flights between 23:00 and 07:00.
- 4.3 MG noted there were several points across several presentations today that could be debated and asked how the community groups would like to best make use of the time. He explained that Heathrow has clearly stated public commitments to reduce the impact of night flights and works within a clearly defined Government framework. He noted that Kathryn Leahy (KL) had provided an outline of the topic at the previous meeting and that Heathrow's latest night flight data would be circulated to members.
- 4.4 PW felt there was no economic or other reason for night flights. MG responded that the Government had concluded that the UK needs hub airport capacity. He explained that aircraft depart and arrive around the world at different times, and while many hub airports have a degree of operations during the night, Heathrow stops each night. He added that Heathrow has agreed to push back the early morning arrivals with an expanded airport, but they still have a role, not only financially but also operationally to provide transfers. He was aware that some members were calling for an 8-hour ban, but this was not supported by Heathrow. PW stated that he had done a lot of research on transfer flights and found that many of the less popular routes were only viable because of transfer passengers. MG responded that the Airports Commission (AC) had drawn its conclusions and parliament had already voted, so there was little value in debating the merits of a hub airport at this forum. Chris Howorth (CH) asked if there should be a review of the AC report. MG noted that parliament had only voted just over a year ago and any call for a review would be the Government's prerogative.

## 5 Heathrow Late Evening Departures Noise Impact

- 5.1 Justine Foley (JF) gave a presentation claiming that aircraft were flying lower and louder in 2019 than 5 years ago to the detriment of communities. She added that aircraft are more concentrated and called for a return to pre-2014/16 heights and dispersion. She asked the DfT to propose new legislation and requested aircraft to climb more steeply, especially in the shoulder period. She referred to DfT guidance that noise should be a priority up to 4,000ft. She also referred to CAA report CAP1691: Departure Noise Mitigation and said that aircraft are flying lower, so communities are hearing more noise events further out.
- 5.2 Ian Greene (IG) suggested it was worth looking at CAP1691 in more detail, as although it shows trends of aircraft becoming lower over time, it is comparing different types of aircraft. He noted that aircraft heights and noise levels were not directly correlated and that using high thrust will create more noise than low thrust. Regarding noise being a priority up to 4,000ft, he explained that this was an altitude-based priority in the airspace change process for when an airport is looking to develop a new flight path and was not for assessing the current situation. He explained that one of the issues was to try and get aircraft to use continuous climb procedures and echoed MG's earlier comment that it would be useful to have airline representatives in the room. He recapped current rules which state that there is a 4% minimum climb gradient once aircraft have reached 1,000ft.
- 5.3 JF wondered if some flights such as Virgin Atlantic VS 411 were not meeting the 4% minimum climb gradient. Rachel Thomas (RT) advised that 99.9% of all flights were meeting this requirement. She added that VS 411 had only failed to meet the 4% requirement on two occasions since January 2019. The 4% requirement is a DfT rule and Heathrow's job is to monitor adherence to it. If an airline fails to meet this requirement, Heathrow will engage with them to improve their performance.
- 5.4 JF felt that concentration of aircraft along a departure route should not be allowed. RT advised that if aircraft are flying within the Noise Preferential Routes (NPR) then they are following DfT rules and Heathrow had no power to intervene. MG acknowledged that there has been a natural process towards increased concentration as aircraft have become better at flying the routes due to improvements in aircraft technology. He noted that different airlines code the routes in different ways.
- 5.5 Chris Howorth (CH) observed that there is population everywhere and expressed concern about the impact that higher engine thrust would have on communities closer to the airport if aircraft were required to climb more steeply.
- 5.6 Rob Buick (RB) observed that departures started flying lower over Englefield Green in 2015. Having read a report by Imperial College he now believed this was due to the use of reduced thrust take-offs at Heathrow to reduce engine wear and emissions. He offered to provide a link to the report. **ACTION RB**

## 6 Update on SoNA/PBN

- 6.1 DG and SC gave a presentation on the Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA) and Performance Based Navigation (PBN). DG noted that Heathrow had sent a response covering noise annoyance and SoNA to members on Monday and hoped this could be discussed further. Richard Greer (RG) proposed this could be covered at the SoCG meetings which would be attended by NERG.

- 6.2 DG recapped on the issues that he had previously identified with SoNA which included sampling issues, the choice of LOAEL (Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Level), the approach to identify the most appropriate metrics and the fact that it was a static survey. He said that Heathrow's written response would be studied to see if satisfactory answers had been provided or whether substantial differences of data interpretation remain. He felt that Slough and Hounslow were over-represented in the SoNA work, concluding that a simplistic averaging approach to noise annoyance was not appropriate and that Heathrow was proposing to increase noise in areas where SoNA shows the greatest noise sensitivity. CH responded that the health impact in areas such as Slough was the same as in more affluent areas. He felt that the focus should be more on health impacts and making use of World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines. IG added that it would not be possible to set different policies for different areas, so it was necessary to look at averages. He explained that the WHO guidelines recommend looking at local studies for annoyance so that is what is being done. However, annoyance is not the only measure, there are a range of health impacts and DfT has recently published papers on the DEFRA website on evidence that has come out since the WHO guidelines. He advised that DfT has also asked the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) to look at SoNA and would like to make sure that any future studies are accepted by all parties involved.
- 6.3 IG explained that the SoNA sampling was independently designed by Ipsos MORI who had conducted the survey. AT said she had worked at MORI for 20 years and understood that it was the client who decides which areas should be surveyed and who should be interviewed. IG responded that the SoNA survey board had set the parameters under which Ipsos MORI had designed the survey.
- 6.4 SC then discussed PBN. He claimed that recent experience in the US and elsewhere had proved that concentrated PBN is unacceptable over residential areas, that Heathrow has insufficient airspace to make PBN acceptable through respite and that there is no proof that effective respite can be achieved. He felt that few politicians were aware of the issues and asked who would be held accountable for imposing unacceptable living conditions on millions of people. IG recalled that this question had been answered at a previous forum and that everybody has a shared collective responsibility for aircraft noise.

## 7 Airspace Change for Expansion workshop update

- 7.1 LF gave a verbal update on workshops that had been held over the previous two weeks, looking at a comprehensive list of flight path options for an expanded Heathrow. She thanked those who had attended so far and advised there were further sessions to follow on 23rd and 28th January if anyone would like to attend.
- 7.2 David Hilton (DH) advised that he had attended a workshop and wanted Heathrow to produce a map showing areas where respite is possible and areas where it is not. He also wanted Heathrow's sound booth at the next consultation to show what it would be like to have a PBN flight path overhead, as residents just want to know how they will be affected. LF responded that Heathrow will be able to tell people how they will be affected at the final consultation once proposed flight paths are known. PW added that any reference to respite must be about meaningful respite. He disagreed with the definition of overflight, as although he lives near the flight path for the southern runway he can still hear flights using the northern runway. BB said that Heathrow needed to base its forecasts on how people experience overflight, not using computer models which do not show the real picture. AT complained that the workshop had only covered flight paths for an expanded airport. She said it was very clear that Heathrow would not get a third runway so the whole process would have to be repeated for a two-runway airport.

## 8 Airspace Modernisation update

- 8.1 RT gave a recap of the Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) and Development Consent Order (DCO) processes and how they work together. She also gave an update on the UK's airspace modernisation programme, explaining that Heathrow's ACP is part of a broader programme of airspace modernisation across Europe. Heathrow is working with NATS and surrounding airports to bring together the separate airport ACPs and develop a masterplan to deliver a coordinated programme of airspace modernisation in the South East of England. She advised that 18 airports were involved in FASI-S (Future Airspace Strategy Implementation South) and Heathrow was also in contact with nearby General Aviation (GA) airports such as West Waltham and Denham that are not part of FASI-S.
- 8.2 DG asked if cumulative effects would be shown. SL confirmed that they would be identified but that stage had not yet been reached. SC asked when responses to Heathrow's Airport Expansion Consultation (AEC) would be made public. LF advised that a consultation feedback report would be produced as part of the DCO application. MG added that Heathrow would report back on what information will be published and when this will happen. **ACTION LF**
- 8.3 PW noted that the schedule for Heathrow expansion had now slipped, so the reason for keeping the DCO and ACP processes in parallel had diminished. He suggested there was now a case for combining the two processes so that the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) could see the full flight path plans. RT explained that Heathrow could not design flight paths until they had the boundaries set by the DCO. PW replied that PINS would need the flight paths to define those boundaries. RT explained that this was why several test cases had been developed. She added that Heathrow had to follow the CAA's airspace change guidance CAP1616. PW asked if IG could inform DfT colleagues that communities were concerned about the ACP and DCO processes running in parallel. IG confirmed that he would take this information and feedback through these channels. **ACTION IG**

## 9 Airspace Classification review

- 9.1 Stuart Lindsey (SL) informed members of a CAA consultation that is currently underway to identify volumes of controlled airspace in which the classification could be amended to better reflect the needs of all airspace users on an equitable basis. He advised that it was not about routes, numbers of aircraft or times of operation and that it was highly unlikely to impact anything around Heathrow. SC asked if it would affect helicopter routes. SL advised that it would not, it related to light aeroplanes.

## 10 April Targeted Consultation update

- 10.1 LF advised that Heathrow will run a targeted consultation for 8 weeks, expected to start in April. She explained that following last summer's AEC, Heathrow had made some changes to its expansion proposals, as well as continuing to develop the design and assessment information. Some of these changes are material and need to be taken back to the public for consultation, whilst some of them are updates to the AEC proposals. The targeted consultation is expected to cover changes to the masterplan and forecasts, updates on construction, mitigation and compensation, surface access, property policies and apprenticeships. Heathrow expects to make its application for development consent in Q4 2020. LF also noted that an updated Statement of Community Consultation is currently with host local authorities to seek feedback on Heathrow's proposed approach to the consultation.

- 10.2 SC thought it would be useful to know more about the surface access and property policy updates and various members wanted to know if there would be consultation events in their boroughs. LF hoped that more information would be available to answer these questions at the next HCNF on 25 March. **ACTION LF**
- 10.3 BB asked why the consultation was targeted. MG explained that it would be focussing on specific changes in the masterplan. PW asked if runway alternation patterns would be included. LF responded that they would not. Margaret Majumdar (MM) felt that local information provided at consultation events needed to be better. AT noted that two million leaflets had been sent out for last January's consultation but only 20,000 responses had been received. She felt this was a very small response for deciding on Heathrow's plans.
- 10.4 DG claimed that delaying the opening of the third runway would cut the value of Heathrow expansion by £2bn and asked DfT to confirm if there was now a negative financial case to expand Heathrow. MG asked DfT colleagues to feedback on this at the next HCNF. **ACTION IG**

## 11 AOB

- 11.1 PW was concerned that Heathrow was seeking to form SoCGs with members before they see the DCO application. MG explained that Heathrow was expected to try and reach SoCGs wherever possible. RG added that PINS encourages SoCGs as soon as possible as an ongoing process, particularly pre-application to go through the calculation methodology to see where interested parties stand in those areas.
- 11.2 CH asked when a decision would be made about the dispersal of flight paths. RT recapped that the introduction of PBN was Government policy. She noted that managed dispersal was one of many options, but the answer would come as part of the CAP1616 process in due course. LF added that more information would be published by the end of the year followed by the final public consultation in 2022.
- 11.3 CH noted that he would prefer to receive presentations in advance where possible. Richard West (RW) encouraged members to submit their presentations earlier and MG thought it should be reasonable to circulate them on the Monday before the meeting. AT agreed and thanked LF for providing print-outs of today's presentations. She asked what period of the night was used when describing the number of nights with no flights at the last forum. MG responded that this was from 23:30 to 04:30.
- 11.4 SC asked when Taylor Airey's PBN study would be published. Alex Goman (AG) advised that a workshop will be held in February followed by a report before the end of the month.
- 11.5 DH was keen to be involved in the Noise Envelope workshops and wanted to understand how PBN would be managed within the noise envelope in the context of noise being no worse than in 2013.
- 11.6 RB suggested that it would be useful for all three screens in the room to be linked up to show the presentations. RW advised that this was being investigated. **ACTION RW**
- 11.7 BB reiterated her request (3.1) for a flight density study to be carried out in the vicinity of the noise monitor in Camberwell including flight paths over Eltham, Greenwich, Dulwich/Herne Hill, Peckham, Camberwell and Vauxhall.

## Date of next meeting

Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> March 2020 (1:00pm - 4:00pm), Heathrow Academy.