

## Noise and Airspace Community Forum (NACF)

### Summary Minutes (26 March 2025, 13:00-16:00, 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

Name	Borough / Organisation
Andreas Lambrianou	Chair
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Wendy Matthews	Buckinghamshire Council
John Burton *	CAA
Mark Izatt	CISHA
Laura Keith	CISHA
Ian Greene *	DfT
Gary Marshall *	DfT
Michael Deboo *	DfT
Robert Buick	Englefield Green Action Group
Paul Conway	Englefield Green Action Group
Tim Walker *	Forest Hill Society
Paul Beckford	HACAN
Christine Taylor	Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association
Armelle Thomas	Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association
Becky Coffin	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
James Mackenzie	Heathrow
James Martin	Heathrow
Lisa Forshev	Heathrow
Samantha Fountain	Heathrow
Jonathan Pam	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Michael Thornton *	Heathrow Strategic Planning Group
Cllr John Martin	London Borough of Ealing
Surinderpal Suri *	London Borough of Ealing
Christian Hughes *	Longford Residents Association
Deborah Petty	Molesey Residents Association
Robin Clarke *	NATS
Dave Matthews *	NATS
George Gibbs	Noise Consultants Ltd.
Bridget Bell	Plane Hell Action
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Robert Tudway	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Maryann Morgan	Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council
Sue Janota *	Surrey County Council
Dave Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Richard Harbord *	Windlesham Society

#### Apologies

Kathleen Croft (Stanwell Moor Resident's Association), Graham Young (Richings Park Residents Association), Nigel Davies (Englefield Green Action Group), Darren Rhodes (CAA), Ian Jopson (NATS).

## Action Log

Date and Paragraph	Description	Comments	Resolution Date	RAG status
27/11/2024 para. 2.3	Future agenda item on night flight dispensations	Include as part of next deep dive on night flights		
27/11/2024 para. 3.10	Noise and vibration monitoring in Longford	Discussions are ongoing outside of the forum so this will be closed as a forum action	26/03/2025	
27/11/2024 para. 3.19	Separate meeting to continue Noise Action Plan discussion	Heathrow's noise team is currently working on next steps		
05/02/2025 para. 2.3	Understand more about weather-related dispensed flights	Include as part of next deep dive on night flights		
05/02/2025 para. 2.6	Data on flights in the morning shoulder period	Responded in writing	13/03/2025	
05/02/2025 para. 2.6	Data on Continuous Climb Operations for individual runways	Responded in writing	04/03/2025	
05/02/2025 para. 4.8	Request to publish Frontiers Economics report on the economic impacts of Heathrow expansion	Heathrow will share much more about the project at the stage of a formal application including more details on the economic analysis	26/03/2025	
05/02/2025 para. 5.2	Call for deep dive topics	2025 timetable now drafted	26/03/2025	
05/02/2025 para. 6.1	Feedback Frontier Economics scoping study to DfT	Superseded 26/03/2025 para. 1.6	26/03/2025	
05/02/2025 para. 6.3	RN to discuss noise insulation scheme offline with CT	Discussed offline after forum	05/02/2025	

*Summary of previous open or recently closed actions*

## 1 Welcome and Introduction

- 1.1 Andreas Lambrianou (AL) welcomed members to the forum and noted apologies for absence. He paid tribute to former forum member David Hilton who sadly passed away on 3 March.
- 1.2 AL noted that the previous summary minutes had been finalised and published online. He reviewed the previous actions as shown in the Action Log above. These were discussed further as follows:

- 1.3 **(27/11/2024 para. 3.10)** Christian Hughes (CH) advised that Hillingdon had previously deployed a noise monitor in Longford, but it was no longer operational. He has asked for it to be reinstated, or in the absence of this, for Heathrow to provide one.
- 1.4 **(05/02/2025 para. 4.9)** Armelle Thomas (AT) objected to the word “claimed”, adding that former Heathrow CEO John Holland-Kaye had said he would offer the same package to the five villages whether or not they were in the Compulsory Purchase Zone.
- 1.5 **(05/02/2025 para. 2.6)** Peter Willan (PW) noted that the data on flights in the morning shoulder period showed a shift towards more arrivals and less departures compared to previous data he had presented. He also asked about aircraft take-off weights and RN advised that maximum take-off weight data is published in the night restriction NOTAM.
- 1.6 **(05/02/2025 para. 6.1)** AL advised that DfT had received the Frontier Economics report “Health Impacts of Aircraft Noise” and associated summary minutes. Bridget Bell (BB) asked for DfT’s response to the report’s recommendations. **ACTION DfT**

## 2 Data Dashboard and Community Noise Monitor Update

- 2.1 Samantha Fountain (SF) presented the Operations Dashboard for February 2024. The dashboard is available on Heathrow’s website [here](#). She noted there had been two noise infringements in February and the airlines would be fined.
- 2.2 Robert Buick (RB) asked when an interactive version of the dashboard would be available. SF replied that Heathrow was currently working with suppliers on a new online portal. AL asked for a timescale to be provided at the next forum. **ACTION RW**
- 2.3 SF advised that Shepperton community noise monitor report has now been published on Heathrow’s website [here](#) and the Kiln Green report is expected in the summer. A potential location for a new community noise monitor in Stanwell Moor has been identified, subject to a site assessment, after the initial suggestion of the village hall was found to be unsuitable.
- 2.4 PW asked if the lowest noise level the monitors could measure was 40dB. James Mackenzie (JMac) advised that the monitors used were Type 1 Sound Level Meters which can measure well below 40dB. Noise data is analysed to determine whether each noise event is due to an aircraft, another noise source within the community, or a combination of both. This is done using track keeping data to relate each noise event to an individual aircraft and acoustic analysis of the data. PW asked if 40dB noise contours could be produced. Rick Norman (RN) explained that lower levels were associated with lower confidence, so Heathrow takes its advice from the CAA’s modelling experts who are responsible for producing strategic noise maps.
- 2.5 Wendy Matthews (WM) stated that Iver and Richings Park were not directly overflowed so the noise monitors were not triggered. AT added that any noise caused by Heathrow’s operations should be monitored and noted.

## 3 Ground Noise

- 3.1 WM discussed the impact of night-time engine testing on local communities. She advised that the issue has been going on for over twenty years and she was continually woken by it. She had deployed a sound level meter from NPL in her garden for two years and Christine Taylor (CT) had recorded the noise outside her window to demonstrate the problem. She said that ground noise was not classified as aircraft noise, so it was

not included in the noise contours but suggested it was covered by statutory nuisance legislation monitored by local authorities. She called on the forum to recognise that night-time engine testing affected the local community, asked what Heathrow was going to do about it, and proposed a meeting with Hillingdon to discuss the issue.

- 3.2 JMac gave an overview of Engine Ground Run (EGR) management. The presentation was circulated to members before the meeting. He explained that the process for EGR approval was set out in Heathrow's Operational Safety Instruction OSI 061, including requirements for location, duration, operational safety and limits for total duration of engine running during the night period. AL asked if adherence to the rules was recorded.  
**ACTION JMac**
- 3.3 CT said she could hear ground noise in Harlington and was woken in the summer when her windows were open, but her property had never qualified for Heathrow's noise insulation schemes. RN confirmed the schemes were based on air noise. AT said that the former CISHA chair had said she would be in charge of the noise insulation scheme process and would make sure things changed. She called for night-time engine testing to be banned.
- 3.4 JMac explained that high power engine runs during the night period must be carried out in an engine run pen. DP asked how many pens there were. JMac explained there were two pens managed by British Airways. Spencer Norton (SN) explained that other airlines use the pens on request. He added that most tests are done at idle power, and that high power is not used unless absolutely necessary.
- 3.5 George Gibbs (GG) discussed ongoing work to develop a Ground Noise Management Plan (GNMP) as part of Heathrow's Noise Action Plan (NAP). He explained that the GNMP would be a strategic document that would focus on monitoring, managing, and mitigating noise from activities such as aircraft taxiing, engine testing, ground service equipment, and auxiliary power units (APUs). The presentation was circulated to members before the meeting.
- 3.6 PW noted that the planning application for Easterly Alternation Infrastructure was currently with Hillingdon and asked why recent noise monitoring mentioned in the presentation had not been submitted as noise evidence. RN explained that an application could only contain what was understood at that point in time and that the GNMP was about improving that understanding. JMac added that a ground noise assessment was included in the Environmental Impact Assessment that was submitted as part of the application.
- 3.7 GG discussed the use of Ground Power Units (GPU) and Pre-Conditioned Air (PCA) instead of running APUs to reduce noise and emissions. SN explained that an APU is a small jet engine located at the back of an aircraft which provides electrical power and cooling air when the main engines are not running. Before the main engines are shut down the APU is started to maintain electrical power. When the APU is not used then PCA is piped in through yellow pipes attached to the aircraft. SC asked how significant APU noise was. AL said that would come out in the study.
- 3.8 Dave Gilbert (DG) asked if the GNMP would look at how far out noise was impacting communities and suggested locating a monitor at Richings Park. RN advised that there had previously been a monitor there, but the first step would be to understand the activities on the airfield and relate those to noise measurements.
- 3.9 DG asked if the Government's Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) tool took account of ground noise. RN advised that TAG was a tool to inform decisions, but they were not made solely on the basis of TAG.

- 3.10 Michael Thornton (MT) asked if the GNMP would be used to model operational changes resulting from Easterly Alternation. GG explained that the GNMP was designed to look at existing impact as specified in the NAP.
- 3.11 CH asked if it was possible to get data from monitor N3 near Longford. AL asked CH to contact JMac as part of their ongoing discussions outside of the forum.
- 3.12 WM asked how Heathrow would apportion noise in terms of sources and times. GG replied that it was complicated but there were a number of methods such as ground radar to locate an aircraft's start of roll and frequency analysis to identify road traffic.
- 3.13 Becky Coffin (BC) added that ground noise was in the NAP because Heathrow understood it was an important issue for local communities. She thanked members for a constructive discussion.

## **4 CISHA Engagement Review**

- 4.1 Mark Izatt (MI) discussed CISHA's interim report on mapping the diversity, representativeness, and accountability of the NACF which was circulated confidentially to members before the meeting. Recommendations included the development of a comprehensive outreach programme to attract a diverse range of new participants, looking at how it can support forum participants in their work and in disseminating information and capturing views, and looking at how it can better engage non-native English speakers. He noted that the review process had been made more complicated due to a lack of trust from some members. He asked members to provide feedback prior to publication of the final report.
- 4.2 AT said that she had provided feedback to CISHA. She complained that Heathrow had not offered an option to attend the last Local Community Forum (LCF) online and that NACF members were now required to request a link to attend online. MI explained that there had been specific reasons for the format of the LCF meeting and that the forum chairs were constantly looking at how to improve engagement. He stressed the importance of virtual engagement to allow people to be included.
- 4.3 PW noted that some of the survey questions had been hard to answer as Richmond Heathrow Campaign has no physical address despite a membership of 2,000 people.
- 4.4 RB enquired about the status of the noise complaints proves review. MI replied that a second phase was still possible.
- 4.5 Paul Conway (PC) added to earlier words of tribute to the late David Hilton.

## **5 Community Feedback**

- 5.1 In December 2025, Heathrow sought feedback from members to understand what was valued about NACF meetings, what may need improving and different ways to engage with Heathrow's local communities. DP provided an overview of collated responses from seven community groups. She advised that the forum was valued as a direct opportunity to engage with Heathrow, BA, DfT, CAA and other members. The seniority of attendees was appreciated and the opportunity to hold smaller meetings for technical issues was also welcomed. She noted that tangible outcomes were often small and few and far between and there was concern that a new UK Airspace Design Service (UKADS) would dilute engagement and disenfranchise communities. There were some concerns about whether the minutes reflected enough detail and whether actions were being followed

up, so the recently introduced action log and more detailed minutes were appreciated. There were also calls for the process of allocating research funds to be more consultative and open. Overall, members wanted the time and effort they put into the forum to have a positive benefit and contribute to a better noise environment for those who live around the airport.

- 5.2 AL thanked DP for the overview. He advised he was happy to take advice from members on how the research budget should be spent.

## 6 Annoyance from Plane Noise

- 6.1 DG gave a presentation on annoyance from plane noise. The presentation was circulated to members before the meeting. He asked if minimising annoyance at Heathrow was factored into decision making, if Heathrow's locational characteristics were understood and recognised in policy, and what needed to be done to understand its impacts better. He also asked how the CAA-led Aviation Noise Attitudes Survey (ANAS) could be used to contribute to a better understanding on key decisions and whether the data could be used for Heathrow's local noise attitude survey.
- 6.2 AL reminded DG that the forum would hold a deep dive on annoyance to coincide with the publication of ANAS.
- 6.3 RN advised that Heathrow's survey of noise attitudes would be complimentary to ANAS but would be a different survey with a different timeline. DG said he had pushed for ANAS to follow ISO standards which was not the case for the 2014 Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA). RN advised that Heathrow would be looking at the same guidelines and pointed out that all research is criticised by people who say they would have done it differently.
- 6.4 SC was concerned that the analysis would not be available to assess upcoming changes to airspace. AL replied that it was only possible to use the evidence available at the time.
- 6.5 DP asked if Heathrow was contemplating introducing a tracker that was revisited on a quarterly basis. RN advised that Heathrow was looking to make the survey a regular feature of future NAPs. SS suggested making the survey more objective by asking which factors contributed most to annoyance.
- 6.6 Ian Greene (IG) was unable to respond at the time, but commented after the meeting that as DG knows he disagrees with many of the assertions in his presentation, but would like to reassure him that, with the CAA, DfT are actively looking at how to make the best use of the vast amount of data collected as part of ANAS. That could be through making it available to third parties or commissioning further analysis ourselves. Advice on this specific issue went to the Aviation Minister last month. However currently the data is still being processed and is not yet in an appropriate state where it could be used for further analysis.

## 7 Airspace Update

- 7.1 **Easterly Alternation:** JMar reported that the consultation period for the ground infrastructure Town and Country Planning Act application had closed. He advised that a response was anticipated from London Borough of Hillingdon around 30 April although that might extend as late as October. He confirmed that the airspace work was following the CAA's CAP 1617 process and Heathrow anticipated consulting on the airspace elements in early 2026.

- 7.2 **Airspace Modernisation:** JMar confirmed that a Methods and Metrics Workshop was planned for 30 April. He noted it would likely be of interest to the more technically minded stakeholders. He added that details would be emailed to forum members shortly.
- 7.3 DP asked about prioritisation of Airspace Modernisation and whether Modernising Heathrow (enhancing airport infrastructure within the two-runway envelope) would operate within the current 480,000 movement cap. On the former, Lisa Forshew (LF) noted that the Airspace Team was continuing with the programme of work, including the Methods and Metrics Workshop. On the latter, JMar noted that it was difficult to predict the future, but that his understanding of the initial assumptions was that the movement cap would remain in place for the Modernising Heathrow project.

## **8 AOB**

- 8.1 AL encouraged members to attend in person where possible, as he felt there was much to be gained from having people in the room, and to only revert to online attendance where personal circumstances around particular meetings made it unavoidable.

### **Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 28 May (13:00-16:00).