

Noise and Airspace Community Forum (NACF)

Summary Minutes (29 May 2024, 13:00-16:00, London Heathrow Marriott)

Confirmed attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Andreas Lambrianou	Chair
David Hilton *	Ascot Parish Council
Cllr Guy Gillbe *	Bracknell Forest Council
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Darren Rhodes	CAA
John Burton	CAA
Mark Izatt	CISHA
Laura Keith	CISHA
Margaret Majumdar	Ealing Aircraft Noise Action Group
Robert Buick	Englefield Green Action Group
Paul Conway	Englefield Green Action Group
Christine Taylor	Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association
Armelle Thomas	Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association
Hannah Burgess	Heathrow
Lisa Forshew *	Heathrow
Samantha Fountain *	Heathrow
Mike Glen	Heathrow
Natalie Wallis *	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Sarah-Jane Pickthorne	Heathrow
Jennifer Sykes	Heathrow
Pierre Sohier	Heathrow
Michael Thornton *	Heathrow Strategic Planning Group
Colin Stanbury *	Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council
Cllr John Martin	London Borough of Ealing
Surinderpal Suri *	London Borough of Ealing
Amanda Nicolls *	London Borough of Lewisham
Deborah Petty	Molesey Residents Association
Robin Clarke *	NATS
David Matthews *	NATS
Bridget Bell	Plane Hell Action
Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Dave Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Richard Harbord	Windlesham Society

Apologies

Cllr Dr Wendy Matthews	Buckinghamshire Council
Ian Greene	DfT
Tim May	DfT
Nigel Davies	Englefield Green Action Group
Tim Walker	Forest Hill Society
Richard West	Heathrow
Cllr Mark Howard	Windsor & Maidenhead

1 Welcome and Introduction

- 1.1 Andreas Lambrianou (AL) welcomed members to the forum and noted apologies. He advised that DfT members were unable to attend due to the Cabinet Office's general election guidance for the Civil Service. He noted that the summary minutes from the previous meeting had been finalised and all actions were completed.
- 1.2 Bridget Bell (BB) raised a previous request for noise complaints reports prior to 2018 to be published online. Heathrow circulated reports from 2015-2017 to members on 20 February 2024 and provided the following written response on 13 March 2024: *"We aim to find the right balance for how much data we provide on our website. We have not received any other requests for older noise complaints reports and our website analytics indicate that very few people download the older reports, but we will continue to make them available on request. Prior to 2015 noise complaints were not reported in the same way, but if there is any specific data you require, please let me know."*

2 Data Dashboard

- 2.1 Mike Glen (MG) presented Heathrow's data dashboard for April 2024 as published on Heathrow's website [here](#) and summarised the key metrics. He advised that there had been 77 nights without late runners in the first four months of the year compared to 59 for the same period in 2023. He added that there were 15 nights without late runners in April.
- 2.2 Armelle Thomas (AT) asked what efforts were being made to stop flights between 23:00 and 23:30. MG explained that during the 23:00 and 23:30 "shoulder period" no flights were scheduled but flights are allowed to fly so some flights should be expected. AL asked if the number of flights in the shoulder period had increased or decreased. MG offered to provide data at the next forum. **ACTION MG**
- 2.3 Deborah Petty (DP) stated that a local resident had carried out climb rate analysis on Heathrow's xPlane tool which suggested some heavy aircraft were lower than others over Molesey. MG asked her to share the analysis so he could investigate. **ACTION DP**
- 2.4 Rob Buick (RB) asked if the data dashboard would be published online so that users could drill down into the data. MG advised that the first stage had been to put the dashboard online as a PDF and the second stage to make it more interactive was a work in progress.
- 2.5 Peter Willan (PW) asked if late runners were classed as unscheduled flights. Rick Norman (RN) explained that some flights scheduled before 23:00 operated off the runway after 23:00, for example a flight scheduled at 22:50 would have a taxi time of around 23:05. Similarly, a 07:05 arrival would touch down at around 06:50 as the scheduled time was the time it reached the stand. MG added that the night quota period related to runway time, with no flights allowed to take off after 23:30 without prior approval. PW suggested it would be helpful to distinguish between stand time and runway time. AL proposed providing clarity as to which (ST or RT) was being used when information was being provided. **ACTION AL**
- 2.6 Mark Izatt (MI) announced that Heathrow had been invited to present on night flights at the next Council for the Independent Scrutiny of Heathrow Airport (CISHA) meeting. AL would be in attendance.

3 Deep Dive: Departure Profile Study

- 3.1 Darren Rhodes (DR) presented a study commissioned by Heathrow and undertaken by the CAA's Environmental Research and Consultancy Department (ERCD) to investigate the effects of choosing between Noise Abatement Departure Procedure (NADP) 1 and NADP 2. He explained that the principal effects investigated were noise, emissions, monetised impacts and the potential effects on departure separation. His presentation was circulated with the summary minutes.
- 3.2 DR explained that under UK law there was a requirement to only have two departure procedures. With NADP 1, engine thrust was reduced followed by acceleration, while with NADP 2 acceleration was initiated first followed by thrust reduction.
- 3.3 DR noted that Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) showed different monetary outcomes depending on the noise metric used. He explained that there was no difference in NOx emissions below 1,000ft because the two procedures did not differ below 1,000ft. He added that changes above 1,000ft were unlikely to have a practical effect on local air quality NOx emissions. However, he noted that NADP 1 caused an increase in fuel burn and CO₂ emissions. He warned that operating all aircraft on NADP 1 would create a wider issue with 'catch-up' between long-haul and short-haul aircraft causing progressive delay.
- 3.4 DR presented an overall scorecard summary showing that some indicators were favourable for NADP 1 while others were favourable for NADP 2. It was therefore unclear which procedure provided the best outcome and he commented that if it had been a clear-cut case then it would probably have been considered many years ago.
- 3.5 Dave Gilbert (DG) provided his overview of the study. He showed that aircraft had been flying lower since 2014 and that using NADP 1 to fly higher would reduce loudness and have other benefits. He cited a To70 study commissioned by the forum which showed benefits for A320 aircraft. He suggested there were limitations to the CAA/ERCD study relating to modelling, monetisation, the use of average noise levels and not modelling single mode. He concluded that NADP 1 would improve the noise environment for communities.
- 3.6 AL observed that DG had reached different conclusions to DR using the same data.
- 3.7 Spencer Norton (SN) advised that 85% of airlines chose NADP 2 and the majority of airports that he visited were moving to NADP 2 because NADP 1 was designed for jet engines and not turbo fan engines. He added that the catch-up effect would delay departures into the night period because the schedule would run behind. David Matthews (DM) agreed that the delays would not be insignificant and added that any elongation of duration would require a safety assessment as it may have capacity implications.
- 3.8 DG suggested that NADP 1 would be needed for the introduction of Performance Based Navigation (PBN). However, DR disputed that such a conclusion could be drawn. He added that for the angles being considered ground assumptions would have no effect on the calculations. DG did not agree and asked for this to be followed up.
- 3.9 Stephen Clark (SC) asked if it was true that British Airways (BA) was not allowed to use NADP 1 at Heathrow. SN advised that this was not correct, noting that Heathrow did not mandate NADP 1, and that BA used NADP 2 for the benefits it provided. He explained that modern aircraft were designed to fly NADP 2. He noted that NADP 1 was used at Madrid because of local mountains, but Venice, Amsterdam and Frankfurt all used NADP 2.

- 3.10 BB Asked if it would be possible to standardise engine power settings. SN explained it would not be possible because every engine manufacturer was different. He added that the two criteria for designing new engines were to make them quieter and more efficient.

4 CISHA Engagement Review

- 4.1 MI explained that part of CISHA's oversight work was to look at how effectively each forum represented and engaged with the local community. CISHA was therefore carrying out some analysis to geographically and demographically map out the membership of each forum to establish who each member represents, how they communicate with them and whether they require any assistance with that communication. He advised that the NACF would be reviewed first followed by other forums overseen by CISHA. He explained that a specialist agency had been commissioned to conduct a telephone survey of members with an opportunity to provide feedback in confidence. He added that there would be some follow-up actions to help members represent more transparently and more thoroughly.
- 4.2 AL added that the review would help to identify gaps, strengthen the process by which opinions came to and from the group and improve how the forum operated. He observed there was much to be done to improve representation in terms of diversity, ethnicity and age, and added that the method of engagement may also need tailored to suit different demographic groups.
- 4.3 MI noted that Ruth Cadbury MP (RC) was in attendance in the public gallery and suggested she may have some insights on how to engage with the wider community. RC explained that there were different types of consultation and participation; two-way engagement with membership as in the NACF, public open events, and communication with those who are stakeholders by function such as MPs and council leaders where there should at least be one-way communication.
- 4.4 DP welcomed more comprehensive representation but cautioned that membership was not for the faint-hearted due to the technical nature of the topic.

5 CAA Update

- 5.1 John Burton (JB) advised that Harry Armstrong had been appointed as head of Environmental Sustainability and would attend a future forum. He explained that the CAA was continuing to define the scope of the Noise Action Plan review and was appointing a consultancy to conduct the review to be concluded by mid-2025. In relation to consumer information provision, he advised that the CAA was launching stakeholder engagement and consultation on draft principles and potential implementation options. A summary of responses to the 2023 consultation had been produced and members should contact environment@caa.co.uk for access once it has been published. He noted that the outputs of the DfT consumer research around aviation labelling were currently being reviewed with an aim to publish recommendations in Spring 2025. He advised that the team was currently working on biodiversity reports and would later switch focus back to the aviation environmental review. He announced that both waves of fieldwork for the Aviation Noise Attitudes Survey (ANAS) had now been completed and had met their response targets. SS asked for the sample sizes. **ACTION JB**
- 5.2 AL advised that the DfT was in the process of analysing responses to the night flight restrictions consultation which closed on 22 May. JB added that the next ANEG meeting had been cancelled.

6 Community Slot

- 6.1 AL advised that Peter Willan's (PW) planned presentation on optioneering was highly detailed so a separate meeting would be arranged with Heathrow's airspace team to discuss it.
- 6.2 SC presented a response to Heathrow's further engagement on the shortlisting of Stage 2 options for its Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) for airspace modernisation. He claimed there were major flaws in Heathrow's previous Stage 2 submission. He offered a number of proposals for the resubmission and further work in relation to the ACP. He also called for the Stage 2 resubmission timeline to be extended.
- 6.3 Lisa Forshow (LF) explained that the stakeholder feedback period had been extended by two weeks in response to feedback and that Heathrow had requested an extension of the gateway submission date by two weeks to coincide with this. BB observed that the extension had only been announced after most people had responded.

7 Heathrow Updates

- 7.1 Jennifer Sykes (JS) advised that 30 stakeholders had provided feedback to Heathrow's further engagement on the shortlisting of Stage 2 options and thanked everyone who took part. She advised that a summary of feedback related to the shortlisting methodology would be shared and that Heathrow has now taken a fresh approach to the methodology and would share the outcome. She added that Heathrow was currently on track to submit the updated Stage 2 material to the CAA on 7 June.
- 7.2 Hannah Burgess (HB) gave an update on the infrastructure required to enable easterly alternation at Heathrow. She explained that easterly alternation would bring predictable periods of respite from aircraft noise to thousands of people in the local community when the airport is on easterly operations, something that is not possible today. She advised that the infrastructure element included a noise barrier and some adjustments to the taxiways. She explained that local engagement had begun in April 2023 and the next stage would use various channels to inform local communities of the project and provide an overview of proposed changes. She added that Hillingdon Council was the planning authority and would conduct a public consultation once the planning application has been submitted.
- 7.3 Margaret Majumdar (MM) asked how widely it would be publicised and when the planning application would be submitted. HB explained that the boundary would be informed by the environmental assessments and expected the planning application to be submitted in the last quarter of 2024.
- 7.4 MI added that the Easterly Alternation Consortium would meet towards the end of June for local authority representatives to discuss the topic further.
- 7.5 RN gave an update on Heathrow's Quieter Neighbourhood Support programme. He advised that contracts were being finalised for a new supplier to deliver the noise insulation scheme and that 450 homes in Longford had been invited to register for the pilot phase of the scheme with a target take-up of 80%.
- 7.6 SS asked if noise insulation would be offered to communities newly overflowed as a result of easterly alternation. RN explained that this would be considered as part of the noise mitigation package in the planning application. He added that Heathrow's Quieter Neighbourhood Support programme used a dynamic boundary that would take account

of changes to airspace.

- 7.7 Pierre Sohier (PS) advised that Heathrow was still waiting for the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to approve Heathrow's Noise Action Plan (NAP) for the period 2024 to 2028 but this was not expected in the short term due to the General Election. He added that Heathrow was considering publishing a draft NAP and executive summary under Section 29 of the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006.
- 7.8 AL asked if the approval delay would have any impact on the work to be conducted within the framework of the NAP with NACF. PS explained that the collaboration could continue as planned, considering the collaborative nature of the topics discussed and the scope of work expected, as discussed during the NAP presentation at the last NACF meeting.
- 7.9 Christine Taylor (CT) noted that some areas close to the airport were affected by ground noise but were not eligible for noise insulation. She added that it had previously been decided that ground noise would be covered at the Local Community Forum (LCF) and asked if it could also be covered at the NACF. AL confirmed that it could. RN advised that some of Hillingdon was inside the new boundary and noted that the NAP included an action to look what could be done from a ground noise perspective. He offered to discuss further with her after the meeting. **ACTION RN**

8 AOB

- 8.1 RB asked for an update on the noise complaints process review commissioned by CISHA. MI advised that Stage 1 of the review was complete, and a working group was being drawn up for Stage 2.
- 8.2 DG asked for an update on the health impact study by Frontier Economics. AL advised that the report was complete, and he hoped to bring it to the next forum.

Date Of Next Meeting

Wed 24 July 2024 (13:00-16:00) – London Heathrow Marriott Hotel, Hayes, UB3 5AN.