

Noise and Airspace Community Forum (NACF)

Summary Minutes (26 Nov 2025, 13:00-16:00, Sheraton Skyline)

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
Cllr Guy Gillbe *	Bracknell Forest Council
Paul Quinn	British Airways
Cllr Wendy Matthews	Buckinghamshire Council
Alison King *	Buckinghamshire Council
Mark Izatt	CISHA
Laura Keith	CISHA
Tracey Waltho	CISHA
Tim May *	DfT
Margaret Majumdar	Ealing Aircraft Noise Action Group
Rob Buick	Englefield Green Action Group
Paul Conway	Englefield Green Action Group
Nigel Davies	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
Lisa Forshew	Heathrow
Samantha Fountain	Heathrow
James Martin	Heathrow
James Mackenzie	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Jonathan Pam	Heathrow
Pierre Sohier	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Steve Braund *	Heathrow Strategic Planning Group
Michael Thornton *	Heathrow Strategic Planning Group
Surinderpal Suri	London Borough of Ealing
Amanda Nicholls *	London Borough of Lewisham
Christian Hughes *	Longford Residents Association
Deborah Petty	Molesey Residents Association
Sebastian Frichot *	Plane Hell Action
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Cllr Michele Gibson *	Spelthorne Borough Council
Kathleen Croft *	Stanwell Moor Community Watch
Sue Janota *	Surrey County Council
Dave Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group

* Attended online

Apologies

Maryann Morgan (Sunninghill & Ascot Parish Council), Cllr Nirmal Kang (Surrey Heath Borough Council), Graham Young (Richings Park Residents Association), Darren Rhodes (CAA), Adrian Eaton (DfT), David Matthews (NATS).

Action Log

Date and paragraph	Description	Comments	Resolution date	Status
24/09/2025 para 2.4	Consider future agenda item on night flights	For 2026 agenda		In progress
24/09/2025 para 5.8	Forward comment about adapting polluter pays principle to DfT	Forwarded and awaiting response		In progress

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 announced that the summary minutes from the previous meeting had been finalised and went through the previous actions as set out in the Action Log above.

2 Expanding Heathrow Update

- 2.1 Becky Coffin (BC) announced that the Government had endorsed Heathrow's plan for a third runway, choosing it over the Heathrow West proposal. The plan will inform the Government's review of the Airport's National Policy Statement (ANPS) with a draft expected in summer 2026. She highlighted the need for clarity on the recovery of early costs before moving forward. She advised that further information was available on Heathrow's website [here](#) and the Community Relations team was available to answer any questions by [email](#) or phone.
- 2.2 Peter Willan (PW) asked if the proposal would be updated with appendices. BC advised that the level of detail he was seeking would be provided as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) submission following the ANPS review.
- 2.3 Armelle Thomas (AT) stated that residents wanted to be able to live peacefully in their villages with access to the services they needed. She asked if the promoters of the Heathrow West proposal would be involved in constructing the third runway. BC advised that delivery details would be shared following submission of the DCO application.
- 2.4 Stephen Clark (SC) noted that Heathrow had asked the CAA how the next phase of the project would be regulated. He asked what level of transparency would be provided. BC advised that details concerning Heathrow's economic regulation would be published by the CAA.

3 Data Dashboard

- 3.1 Samantha Fountain (SF) presented the Operations Dashboard for October 2025. The

dashboard is available on Heathrow's website [here](#). She noted that between January and October there were 166 nights without late runners (between 23:30 and 04:30), and the annual total was on track to surpass last year's figure of 189.

- 3.2 Nigel Davies (ND) asked about airline track keeping performance and consequences for persistent offenders. SF explained that airlines were ranked in [Fly Quieter and Greener](#) and that Heathrow regularly engages with airlines to resolve underlying issues.

4 Noise Action Plan Progress Update

- 4.1 James Mackenzie (JM), Pierre Sohier (PS) and Jonathan Pam (JM) gave a progress update on Heathrow's Noise Action Plan (NAP), focussing on the themes of Quieter Planes, Quieter Procedures, Land Use Planning and Mitigation, Operating Restrictions and Working with Communities, as set out below.

Quieter Planes

- 4.2 JM and PS highlighted work to review advancements in fleet technology, assess noise charges and improve data collection on vortex deflectors.
- 4.3 Deborah Petty (DP) asked how realistic fleet change was within the NAP timeframe. JM outlined plans to phase out the noisiest aircraft, noting few Chapter 3 planes remained and higher differential charges discouraged their use. The next target was to phase out Chapter 4 aircraft. Cllr Michele Gibson (MG) asked for further details. JM explained that Chapter 3 aircraft incurred 20 times the base charge. He added that Heathrow along with the Fleet Forecasting Forum (FFF) was looking at potential technology improvements and future uptake at Heathrow. RB asked if Chapter 3 charges applied to cargo flights. JM confirmed that they were based on the noise certification of the aircraft. AT asked if new entrants were required to use the quietest aircraft. JM stated that the same rules applied to all airlines.
- 4.4 Peter Willan (PW) asked if Heathrow has a carbon action plan. BC referred to the airport's Net Zero plan which focused on reducing carbon emissions from airlines, ground vehicles and infrastructure. She noted that the Carbon team worked closely with the Noise team to ensure the quietest and cleanest aircraft at Heathrow. RN added that the FFF included a member of the Carbon team and that Heathrow advocated on carbon and noise issues at the Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP), a technical body within the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) responsible for developing environmental policies and standards.
- 4.5 Surinderpal Suri (SS) stated that Heathrow should not have the authority to define the night period. RN explained that the Night Quota Period was set by the Government, while Heathrow establishes voluntary measures within that framework. He noted that although the regime permitted scheduled flights overnight at 02:00 or 03:00, Heathrow had a voluntary agreement in place for no flights to land before 04:30.
- 4.6 AT asked about progress on stopping operations between 00:00 and 04:30. JM highlighted the presentation, noting there were 287 nights without flights during that period in 2024. SS stated no flights should be allowed between 04:30 and 06:00. JM mentioned that DfT research on night noise impacts was underway, with a report due next year.

Quieter Procedures

- 4.7 JM and PS gave an overview of work to establish a Technical Engagement Forum (TEF),

link airline performance from Fly Quieter and Greener with TEF projects, enhance data extraction from Heathrow's Noise and Track Keeping system, conduct landing gear observation surveys, trial a landing gear deployment detection system and upgrade the Fly Quieter and Greener programme.

- 4.8 SC asked why departure profiles were not included in the NAP. PS explained that Heathrow had commissioned an ERCD study and a summary had been presented to the forum. He noted that results varied depending on the noise metric used and that the TEF was examining climb rates further.
- 4.9 SC stated that the study was inconclusive and DG added that validation was needed to confirm its suitability for low elevation angles. PW proposed raising the holding stacks to remove airspace constraints. PS encouraged members to review the CAA study CAP 2302 on arrivals which showed that higher altitudes were not always quieter. If an aircraft was too high it would need to use engines and deploy wing brakes to descend, increasing noise. In contrast, a clean configuration allowed it to glide more quietly, so there was no single solution.

Land Use Planning and Mitigation

- 4.10 JM and PS outlined work on a Memorandum of Understanding on Land Use Planning, the new Quieter Neighbourhood Support (QNS) programme and a Prioritisation Panel to review scheme implementation and progress.
- 4.11 PW asked if Heathrow accounted for population growth. JM confirmed this was covered in the annual noise contour reports. AT stated that Hillingdon's population had increased from 310,000 to over 319,000 but the number of people in HMOs was not known.
- 4.12 Sebastian Frichot (SFr) asked if QNS covered areas without respite such as Stockwell or Camberwell. JM explained that it focused on properties around the airport most affected by noise, determined using a composite contour. SS said Heathrow should consider the scheme's effectiveness in relation to BS8233 requirements for existing housing. RN explained Heathrow was focused on delivery within the current boundary, aiming to achieve 80% take-up and to demonstrate the scheme's effectiveness.

Operating Restrictions

- 4.13 JM and PS provided an update on work to discourage Chapter 3 aircraft and focus on nights without late running flights between 23:30 and 04:30.
- 4.14 AL asked if Noise Consultants Ltd would return to the forum to provide an update on Heathrow's Ground Noise Management Plan (GNMP), and JM confirmed that they would. Rob Buick (RB) asked if Heathrow could learn from Vienna International Airport's approach of insulating all houses within a 54dB contour. RN explained this was the purpose of conducting research, noting that airports adopted different measures, often influenced by the number of surrounding properties, and that no comprehensive study has been undertaken on the cost-effectiveness. He added he worked with Vienna on the ACI Noise Task Force.
- 4.15 Christian Hughes (CH) referred to a request for vibration monitoring, expressing concern about A-weighted measurements for low frequencies and noting that recent monitoring was not long-term. JM advised that C-weighting accounted for lower frequencies and had been used in certain assessments. He added that recent monitoring as part of the GNMP had been undertaken to study noise-induced vibration using six simultaneous attended monitors. This was carried out during westerly operations to ensure coordination with airside operations, as easterly departures on runway 09L were less

common and harder to predict. He agreed to continue the discussion offline.

Working with Communities

- 4.16 JP advised that Heathrow would soon be adding a new suite of tools to its website to make noise-related information easier to access and understand, as previewed at the NACF earlier this year. He also confirmed that Heathrow's community engagement review and redesign project would start in January, with benchmarking to be presented at the next NACF on 4 March ahead of a final report in Q2 2027.
- 4.17 AT raised concern about reducing the number of meetings and asked if the next forum could be moved to February. **ACTION AL**

5 Noise Impact from Expansion

- 5.1 Paul Beckford (PB) highlighted community concerns about expansion, citing uncertainty for homeowners and potential impacts from flight paths. He discussed health impacts, mitigation plans and assessment methods and asked how the Government would engage with communities as part of the ANPS review. He noted the concerns were raised as a prompt rather than for a discussion.
- 5.2 AL proposed a joint response to the ANPS consultation from community members. DP asked what happened to consultation responses, and TM explained that all responses were reviewed by policy officials. DP asked if submissions from bodies or business groups carry more weight. TM advised there was no formal weighting. ND asked if feedback was provided. TM noted that individual feedback was not given, but a summary document was published showing how responses were considered.
- 5.3 BC explained it was too early to provide detailed answers on expansion. She confirmed there would be engagement and this would be outlined and shared with the forum. She added that many of the points raised would be covered in the Environmental Impact Assessment.
- 5.4 Tracey Waltho (TW) added that CISHA was responsible for setting up a community engagement board for expansion and had agreed to hold local stakeholder roundtables. She noted CISHA would approach the DfT to ensure the entire area within the noise footprint of an expanded Heathrow was considered, noting that the NACF did not cover the whole area. SC asked who funded CISHA. TW explained that Heathrow funded the consultative committee function, noting that discussions with the DfT were underway about future arrangements should there be two promoters. She added that CISHA had launched a micro site heathrowexpansionwatch.org.
- 5.5 PW noted that aircraft noise impact depended, among other things, on the number of flights but also the weight of the fleet. He referenced a report from Frontier Economics which suggested significantly larger loads by 2050 and 2082 and therefore larger and heavier aircraft.

6 Drones and Airspace

- 6.1 DP highlighted safety concerns, regulatory challenges and strategic questions about integrating drones into airspace while mitigating risks of incursions and disruption.
- 6.2 JM noted that the airport's Operations team had advised that its security regime was not appropriate for discussion in a public forum. For further insight into the risks associated

with drones it may be more suitable to ask the CAA. AL noted that most of the questions were for the CAA and suggested that while the forum awaited the appointment of a new representative, the slides could be forwarded to them for comment. **ACTION AL**

7 Community Questions

- 7.1 DG asked why the noise change categories used in Heathrow's 2019 Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) were based on road noise, specifying a 1-3dB LAeq change as 'low' when this was equivalent to a 25-100% increase in flights of a similar noise magnitude, so should be a 'high' change scenario.
- 7.2 JM advised that the category levels had come from the CAA, namely CAP1616A as identified in the report, and that Heathrow would submit its assessment methodology to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) as part of the DCO process.
- 7.3 DG argued that the methodology used in the scoping document was wrong. BC advised this was the Scoping Opinion consulted on with Local Authorities. She noted the heavy use of terminology and that most members were not planning experts. She suggested inviting specialists if it was considered a suitable topic for a future forum. RN added that Heathrow had heard DG's comments. He explained it was an ongoing process being looked at by Heathrow's consultants and the forum would be informed of the assessment methodology used.

8 Benchmarking Airport Noise Monitoring Practices

- 8.1 AL advised that he had commissioned Arup to undertake a study benchmarking airport noise monitoring practices, looking at how leading airports in the UK and internationally monitor aircraft noise and how their approaches compare to Heathrow in terms of technology, transparency, community engagement and effectiveness.
- 8.2 AL noted that he had received comments from members and was happy to engage on those. DP confirmed she had provided feedback and stressed the study should be fair and transparent. SC and AT questioned the independence of the supplier but AL pointed out that most specialists had worked for Heathrow or other airports.
- 8.3 DG was concerned about monitors capturing all events and asked if background data used to set thresholds could be provided. SF agreed to ask the consultants if this could be shared. **ACTION SF**
- 8.4 DG mentioned photographs of monitors compromised by foliage. The photographs were requested following the meeting. **ACTION DG**

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 4 March 2026 (13:00-16:00)