

## Noise and Airspace Community Forum (NACF)

### Summary Minutes (5 February 2025, 14:00-17:00, Leonardo Hotel)

---

*These summary minutes are not intended to be a verbatim record of the meeting, but a summary of the topics and views of forum members and a note of any actions agreed. They should be read in conjunction with a copy of the presentations given at the meeting.*

#### Confirmed attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough / Organisation</b>
Andreas Lambrianou	Chair
Wendy Matthews *	Buckinghamshire Council
John Burton	CAA
Colin Scott *	CAA
Sara Bonfanti *	CAA
Tracey Waltho	CISHA
Mark Izatt	CISHA
Laura Keith	CISHA
Ian Greene	DfT
Gary Marshall *	DfT
Hafsah Abid *	DfT
Margaret Majumdar	Ealing Aircraft Noise Action Group
Robert Buick	Englefield Green Action Group
Paul Conway	Englefield Green Action Group
Nigel Davies	Englefield Green Action Group
Paul Beckford	HACAN
Christine Taylor	Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association
Armelle Thomas	Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association
Becky Coffin	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Jennifer Sykes	Heathrow
James Martin	Heathrow
Lisa Forshev	Heathrow
Samantha Fountain	Heathrow
Jonathan Pam	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Michael Thornton *	Heathrow Strategic Planning Group
Steve Braund *	Heathrow Strategic Planning Group
John Lees *	Iver Village Residents Association
Cllr John Martin	London Borough of Ealing
Surinderpal Suri *	London Borough of Ealing
Paul Baker *	London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
Amanda Nicholls *	London Borough of Lewisham
Megan Kidd	London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
Christian Hughes *	Longford Residents Association
Deborah Petty	Molesey Residents Association
Robin Clarke *	NATS
Dave Matthews	NATS
Bridget Bell	Plane Hell Action
Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Paul Bethel	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Cllr Mark Howard *	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

Kathleen Croft  
Sue Janota \*  
Dave Gilbert  
Stephen Clark

Stanwell Moor Resident's Association  
Surrey County Council  
Teddington Action Group  
Teddington Action Group

## Apologies

Cllr Guy Gillbe  
Spencer Norton  
Darren Rhodes  
Maryann Morgan

Bracknell Forest Council  
British Airways  
CAA  
Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council

## Action Log

Date and Paragraph	Description	Comments	Resolution Date	RAG status
27/11/2024 2.3	Future agenda item on night flight dispensations	Include as part of next deep dive on night flights		
27/11/2024 3.7	Question about 57 dBA arrivals contour and fleet take-off weights	Responded in writing	07/01/2025	
27/11/2024 3.10	Noise and vibration monitoring in Longford	Heathrow's noise team is currently in discussion with Longford Residents Association		
27/11/2024 3.11	Overview of groups and their roles	Responded in writing with link to list on CISHA website and description of DfT, CAA and NATS roles	17/12/2024	
27/11/2024 3.12	Question about members of public joining, watching and recording meetings	Responded in writing. Members of public can apply to attend public gallery but not permitted to join, watch or record meetings online	07/01/2025	
27/11/2024 3.19	Separate meeting to continue Noise Action Plan discussion	Heathrow's noise team is currently working on next steps		
27/11/2024 4.8	CAA to respond to questions about UKADS	Response circulated to members	12/12/2025	

## 1 Welcome and Introduction

- 1.1 Andreas Lambrianou (AL) welcomed members to the forum and noted apologies for absence, including Beth White from the US Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) who had planned to give a presentation but was unable to attend.
- 1.2 AL advised that the summary minutes from the previous meeting had been finalised and uploaded to Heathrow's website. He went through the actions from the previous meeting, noting that these would now be provided in an Action Log (see above) following

feedback from community groups.

- 1.3 Armelle Thomas (AT) asked for clarification around departures being allowed to operate until 01:00 as she thought they should stop at 23:00. The topic is covered later in the meeting.

## 2 Data Dashboard

- 2.1 Samantha Fountain (SF) presented the Operations Dashboard for December 2024. The dashboard is available on Heathrow's website [here](#). She noted that there had been 189 nights without late runners after 23:30 in 2024, making it the best year on record.
- 2.2 SF advised that Heathrow had written to the Department for Transport (DfT) in December to update them on Heathrow's dispensations for summer 2024, in accordance with the DfT's updated guidance on night flight dispensations. The letter is available on Heathrow's website [here](#). Ian Greene (IG) added that the purpose of the letter was to provide more transparency around dispensations and encouraged members to provide feedback on how it could be improved via the NACF inbox.
- 2.3 Paul Beckford (PB) welcomed the move towards greater transparency and wanted to understand more about weather-related delays. SF advised that this could be revisited in the next deep dive on night flights. **ACTION SF**
- 2.4 Christine Taylor (CT) asked what constituted an emergency. SF explained this referred to a risk to life or death, noting that if an ambulance was called then the flight would be dispensed under the regime. AT asked who verified the figures. SF advised that the DfT had oversight. IG added that dispensations were reported to the DfT within a week, normally the next day, and DfT would contact Heathrow for clarification if they had any questions. Rick Norman (RN) added that Heathrow's Noise Action Plan included an auditing process and Heathrow was looking to involve CISHA in that process, including the selection of independent auditors.
- 2.5 Wendy Matthews (WM) noted that seven late runners had not been dispensed in December and asked for the reasons. SF advised that late runners were deemed not to be dispensable if the reason for the delay was within the control of the airlines, such as a technical issue with an aircraft. CT asked if Heathrow knew the issues for individual aircraft. SF confirmed that the duty team would be aware and would work with the airline to try and mitigate any issues. AL added that all non-dispensed flights would be counted towards Heathrow's movement limit which restricts the total number of flights that can take place between 23:30 and 06:00.
- 2.6 Peter Willan (PW) asked if Heathrow could provide data on the number of flights in the morning shoulder period (06:00-07:00). **ACTION SF**
- 2.7 Robert Buick (RB) asked if the dashboard would be moved online in future. AL advised that the dashboard was already published online, and work was ongoing to make it more interactive in future.
- 2.8 Michael Thornton (MT) asked why the percentage of Continuous Climb Operations (CCO) was so much lower than the other metrics on the dashboard. SF explained that current airspace constraints restricted the ability of some departures to climb continuously until they have passed the holding stacks. MT asked if it was possible to see compliance data for individual runways. **ACTION SF**
- 2.9 Surinderpal Suri (SS) felt that 189 nights without late runners was a low number and

asked who set the targets. AL responded that Heathrow had set a target in its Noise Action Plan and that he would be challenging them to make sure it was sufficiently ambitious.

- 2.10 RN explained that non-dispersed flights were part of the night flight regime, with around 10% of night flights being those that operated after 23:30. He acknowledged that some members did not accept the regime but that was a question of policy. He noted that Heathrow was looking to introduce a voluntary ban on flights between 00:00 and 04:30 (excluding dispersed operations) as part of the Noise Action Plan, replacing an informal local rule that flights should only be given approval to operate after 01:00 in operationally exceptional circumstances. He explained that the number of night flights may remain the same but moving them to pre-00:00 would be an improvement alongside efforts to minimise the overall number. He recognised that some members would prefer no flights between 23:00 and 07:00 but that was not Heathrow's position.

### **3 Community Noise Monitor Deployment Plan**

- 3.1 SF gave a presentation to discuss Heathrow's community noise monitoring programme for 2025. The presentation was circulated to members before the meeting. She explained that the programme has been in place since 2011 and was a voluntary commitment, deploying up to four noise monitors a year and publishing reports online. She advised that Heathrow had received twelve requests for noise monitors from local residents in 2024 and the forum was tasked with assessing the requests and agreeing the final four locations.
- 3.2 SF proposed deployment of one monitor in Stanwell Moor, one in Richmond Park, one in either Wandsworth or Herne Hill and one in either Wood Green or Walthamstow, subject to suitable locations being found. If those locations were not possible then Bagshot or Longford could be considered instead.
- 3.3 No objections to the proposals were raised. Megan Kidd (MK) supported the Wandsworth location and Bridget Bell (BB) supported the Walthamstow location.
- 3.4 Stephen Clark (SC) asked if noise monitor data was used to verify the noise contours. RN explained that the CAA would look at the data and decide whether to use it to verify the aircraft noise contour model (ANCON) but it would depend on the quality of the location. IG added that today the CAA had published its annual report on noise monitor positions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted Airports [CAP1149](#) and this provided further detail on how data was used to validate the ANCON model.
- 3.5 SF explained that there were twelve noise monitors (known as AIP monitors) at fixed locations around the airport and airlines were fined if they breached departure noise limits at these locations. BB asked why there were not similar limits for arrivals. RN explained that arrivals used a fixed approach path, and the focus was on safely slowing down the aircraft and maintaining spacing, so there was little an arriving aircraft could do to reduce its noise level other than changing where it deployed its landing gear.
- 3.6 Deborah Petty (DP) asked how far a monitor might have to be located from the original requested location as a result of technical constraints. SF advised there was no specific radius. She highlighted the recent noise monitor in Shepperton which had originally been requested for Walton on Thames but was deployed a few hundred metres north in Shepperton as a closer location could not be found.
- 3.7 Christian Hughes (CH) advised that Hillingdon Scientific Services had deployed a noise monitor in Longford many years ago and asked if the same location could be used again.

SF was not aware of the specific location but agreed it could be considered if no suitable sites were found in the shortlisted areas.

- 3.8 SS advised that he had previously requested a noise monitor in Ealing in 2019. SF advised that he was welcome to submit another request but noted there were already two non-AIP noise monitors close to Ealing.
- 3.9 Nigel Davies (ND) asked if the non-AIP monitor in Englefield Green would remain in place. SF confirmed it would. RB asked if another report would be produced for that location. SF advised that she was working with suppliers on a website to allow users to enter their postcode, find their nearest noise monitor and look at the data. She hoped the website would be ready to launch in the summer.

## 4 Business Update

- 4.1 AL advised that the government had announced its support for a third runway at Heathrow last week. He asked IG to summarise the government's position.
- 4.2 IG confirmed that the Chancellor had announced that the government supported a third runway at Heathrow and had invited proposals to be brought forward by the summer. He advised that once any proposals had been received the government would move at speed to review the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS). He explained that the ANPS provided the basis for decision making around the granting of development consent for a new runway at Heathrow. The proposals would need to demonstrate that they contributed to economic growth as the number one priority of government; that they were delivered in line with the UK's legally binding climate commitments; and that they met environmental requirements on air quality and noise pollution.
- 4.3 Becky Coffin (BC) added that Heathrow CEO Thomas Woldbye had previously stated publicly that he was waiting for a clear steer from government, and this had been provided last week. She confirmed that Heathrow had been invited to bring forward a proposal for consideration by the government, under the ANPS, which would be reviewed in the light of the airport's proposal. This would be followed by consultation and engagement as set out in the Development Consent Order (DCO) process. Under the current ANPS the question to be considered by the DCO process would be how the airport would provide the third runway and whether the proposals were compliant with it. The debate would not be whether a third runway was required.
- 4.4 BC discussed the timescale, explaining that if the previous proposals paused in 2020 were put forward the process may be able to move forward quickly enough to fulfil the government's ambitions, but if changes were made it would take longer. She explained that the aim was for planning permission to be secured by end of this parliament. She added that Heathrow did not currently have a project team working on plans for a third runway. We were expecting to look at options for increasing passenger capacity through work within the perimeter fence, and a new expansion team would need to be established.
- 4.5 BC explained that Heathrow would require further clarity from the government on a number of issues: the criteria for the four tests should they be added to the ANPS; whether the airspace change process would be accelerated to work for these plans; how the proposed changes to the national planning policy would speed up the process; and how the current economic regulation framework would be updated to become fit for purpose for a major infrastructure project like the third runway.
- 4.6 Graham Young (GY) noted that IG had used the word "proposals" and asked if previous

alternative proposals would be resubmitted. IG advised that other promoters were welcome to put forward proposals by the summer. Michael Thornton (MT) asked if the government would be strongly supporting one scheme over another to proceed to DCO. IG thought it would be unusual to have competing projects going forward to DCO but advised that the ANPS would address any situation where that could arise.

- 4.7 SC commented that the Transport Select Committee had recommended 25 conditions for the ANPS and Chris Grayling had ignored 24 of them. He asked if expansion plans for Gatwick, Luton and Stansted airports would be held back by the ANPS. IG explained that the ANPS was specifically about Heathrow expansion, so decisions relating to other airports would fall under the government's policy of making best use of existing runways. Those decisions were being considered by the Secretary of State and were a separate process. Peter Willan (PW) asked if the expansion plans of Gatwick or Luton airports would affect airspace modernisation. IG understood that neither project would require changes to airspace, whereas Heathrow expansion would require some level of airspace change.
- 4.8 SC asked why Heathrow had commissioned a report from Frontier Economics on the economic impacts of Heathrow expansion if it had not been working on detailed plans in the background. BC explained that the work had been conducted last year to review the expansion project as a concept. PW noted there was only a summary report on Heathrow's website and asked if it was possible to see the whole report. BC agreed to take the question away. **ACTION BC**
- 4.9 AT claimed that a third runway would result in the destruction of five villages and 4,500 homes and complained that the area had been referred to as a piece of tarmac on the BBC's Question Time programme. BC agreed that the area was not just a piece of tarmac. She acknowledged that last week's announcement would have been unwelcome for many residents but hoped that providing greater certainty would be helpful. She advised that, as set out in the ANPS, around 600-700 homes would need to be compulsory purchased. AT responded that the five villages would be unable to survive. CT added that expansion was affecting her prospect of moving house and asked if Heathrow would be able to find her a house that was comparable to what she had now.
- 4.10 AT asked who would pay for the project. IG explained that it would depend on the proposals put forward. BC confirmed that Heathrow's proposals would be privately funded. DG asked if Heathrow would only pay for infrastructure within the airport boundary. BC noted that under the previous proposal Heathrow would have contributed to the Western Rail Link to the extent that Heathrow users would benefit from it, with contributions from others where they would benefit.
- 4.11 DP asked what the implications would be for the current airspace modernisation programme. IG advised that the consultation on proposals to create a UK Airspace Design Service (UKADS) had taken place in 2024 and responses were now being reviewed. He added that airspace modernisation was currently progressing as before. AL asked if there would be any change to the CAA's CAP1616 airspace change process. IG explained that it would depend on the outcome of the consultation. DP expressed concern that communities would be disenfranchised by the UKADS process.
- 4.12 Jennifer Sykes (JS) stated that Heathrow remained committed to modernising its airspace as part of the government sponsored UK airspace modernisation programme. Given the government announcement last week, Heathrow was working through what that meant for its programme of airspace changes. She noted that Heathrow was supportive of the principles of the UKADS proposal and believed that changes were necessary to deliver the ambitions for UK airspace modernisation. She advised that

consideration of the airspace required for expansion would only strengthen that need for changes to the airspace change process. She noted that whilst Heathrow was working through the details, it remained focused on delivering the improvements that both airspace modernisation and easterly alternation would bring and remained committed to ongoing stakeholder engagement. She added that the input provided by stakeholders to date was extremely important and helpful as Heathrow developed this work.

- 4.13 PB asked whether Heathrow would need to restart its current airspace proposal or start a new one. JS replied that it was too early to say.
- 4.14 Mark Howard (MH) asked if CISHA and Heathrow would request a more rigorous scrutiny panel that promised to deliver and build trust between residents and the airport. Mark Izatt (MI) noted that the challenge was to not allow expansion to crowd out the day to day scrutiny of Heathrow, adding that CISHA was looking to create resource to fulfil both roles at the same time. Tracey Waltho (TW) added that CISHA had a very clear role as Airport Consultative Committee and that the DfT had also given them the role of ensuring good community engagement as part of the ANPS. She noted that CISHA was currently looking to gain a clearer understanding of the stages of the process and points of influence. She was deeply sympathetic to impacted residents and stressed the need to maintain independence and ensure communities were equipped to provide feedback. She noted that CISHA's Terms of Reference made mention of ensuring there was an expansion focussed subgroup. She understood that the decision on a third runway would be made by government and CISHA's role would be to provide scrutiny of the analysis used by government for any decision.
- 4.15 MT asked if it was correct that the review of the ANPS would follow the submission of proposals. IG explained that proposals would be relatively high level and would help to inform any changes that may be required to the ANPS. He added that decisions would not be made until the DCO stage which was when the detail would come in.
- 4.16 CT asked when there would be a health impact assessment on noise and pollution. IG explained that environmental impacts would be considered in detail in the DCO process.
- 4.17 MH suggested that any promises on flight paths and noise levels should be enforced by an ombudsman. AL noted that discussions were currently taking place on how best to scrutinise Heathrow's Noise Action Plan and TW added that CISHA was already involved in the scrutiny of Heathrow's existing operation.
- 4.18 BC closed the discussion by encouraging members to contact Heathrow's community engagement line at [communityschemes@heathrow.com](mailto:communityschemes@heathrow.com) if they wish to raise any further concerns.

## 5 Community Slot

- 5.1 Paul Conway (PC) noted that a recent request from a campaign group to join the forum had been declined on the grounds that the London Borough of Richmond was already the most strongly represented borough at the forum. AL explained that he was keen to ensure fair and proportionate representation of those affected by Heathrow's operations, both geographically and demographically, and was working with Heathrow on some proposals. PC asked for more time on the agenda for community groups to raise their concerns. AL explained that his approach since joining the forum had been to facilitate joint discussions on key issues such as today's session on expansion, as well as allowing a dedicated community slot for communities to raise a range of other issues where time allowed. PC referred to the budget allocated to the chair for independent advice, calling for the sum to be provided unfettered to community groups to put forward

their points. AL reminded him that the funding for consultancy support was for the benefit of the forum as a whole, not just to support communities. AT added that funding had always been a problem and that nothing had come out of the work by Frontier Economics or UKHSA to improve the lives of communities.

- 5.2 PC called for the selection of deep dive topics to be shared with communities and industry. AL advised that he was keen to set out this year's topics in advance and asked community groups to provide any suggested topics following the meeting. **ACTION ALL**
- 5.3 SC gave a presentation discussing the CAA's proposal to create UKADS to coordinate and sponsor future airspace changes. The presentation was circulated to members before the meeting. He advised that he did not necessarily object to the creation of UKADS in principle but objected to the basis proposed. He called for an independent Environmental Impact Assessment for UK airspace modernisation, an audit of the Statement of Need, application of Treasury Green Book best practice, specific parameters around the role of NATS, airspace change proposals in lower airspace to be locally led and specific duties of care to be placed on the CAA, NATS and airspace change sponsors in relation to airspace modernisation impacts.
- 5.4 SC asked when the results of the UKADS consultation would be published. IG commented that SC's presentation demonstrated the benefits of consulting, as there were so many views from different stakeholders and the presentation highlighted some of those that were being considered. He added that the outcome of the consultation would be set out shortly.
- 5.5 BB asked if the points put forward today would be considered. IG said he assumed that SC had submitted those views in his consultation response so they would therefore be considered in the round.
- 5.6 Robin Clarke (RC) cautioned that SC's presentation misrepresented NATS' consultation response and encouraged members to read the response in full, noting that NATS was supportive of UKADS but with caveats.
- 5.7 MT stressed the environmental impact of advanced air mobility, noting that the UK Future of Flight Action Plan set out by the previous government still applied and work was ongoing to develop a noise policy.
- 5.8 PW raised a number of issues around Heathrow expansion. He expressed concern about the huge levels of growth in terms of runways, terminals, airspace and surface access. He claimed that Heathrow was nowhere near full and that the UK did not need a hub airport, noting that many of Heathrow's passengers were international transfers and could be replaced by passengers terminating in the UK. He stated that regional airports were losing passengers and feared some would go out of business. He was concerned that Heathrow expansion would reduce the number of inbound tourists and would not increase the total number of destinations. He stated that Heathrow was the most expensive airport in the world and that expansion would make it worse. He cautioned that most of the cost would have to be debt financed and the money would be better spent improving connections across the UK. He claimed there were gaps in the Airports Commission evidence that needed updating. He also warned that a third runway at Heathrow would result in mixed-mode operations which would reduce respite to local communities.
- 5.9 DP noted that Heathrow had asked members to provide feedback on the forum and how Heathrow engaged with local communities. She advised that she would be happy to share feedback at the forum if that would be useful, noting that members wanted their participation to have a tangible benefit for their communities.

## 6 AOB

- 6.1 BB asked if AL had contacted the DfT to provide feedback from the Frontier Economics report. **ACTION AL**
- 6.2 CH advised that he was currently in discussion with Heathrow's noise team regarding a request for vibration monitoring in Longford village, noting that vibration from large A380 aircraft was quite considerable at properties 250 metres away.
- 6.3 AT proposed that noise insulation should be discussed at the Local Community Forum (LCF) as those were the communities who would benefit. AL advised that he had spoken to the LCF chair to ensure there was a suitable link between the two groups. MI added that a presentation on the topic had been given at CISHA and could also be requested for LCF. CT noted that some LCF members did not want to discuss noise issues. She felt Heathrow's website could be clearer about who qualified for noise insulation and criticised the phased roll out of the scheme. RN agreed to discuss her concerns offline. **ACTION RN**
- 6.4 SS noted that the noise insulation scheme did not extend to Ealing. He expressed concern that increased noise could stop new or recently built homes from meeting the required standards. He called on government to apply the polluter pays principle and proposed a £5 surcharge on airline tickets to fund noise insulation for 9,000 homes. MI advised that Heathrow was a regulated airport and was working on the next regulatory process. He referenced his role as chair of the Heathrow Passenger Forum (HPF) and noted that the CAA had accepted the concept of holding deep dive sessions with passengers to ask what they would and would not be happy to pay for. IG added that the Environment Act 2021 required ministers who made policy decisions to take account of five principles and these included the polluter pays principle.

## Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 26 March (13:00-16:00).