

# Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 5 November 2015

## 2pm - 5pm Heathrow Academy - meeting notes

### Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough / Organisation</b>
Margaret Majumdar	Ealing
Paul Conlan	Ealing
Cllr Ted Plenty	Slough
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow
Graham Young	Richings Park and Iver
John Coates	Richmond
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Neil Spurrier	Teddington Action Group
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr Chris Turrell	Bracknell
Cllr Conrad Sturt	Surrey Heath
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Rosalie James	Aircraft 3 villages
Kate Mann	Ascot resident
Peter Sims	Runnymede
Neil Luxton	Elmbridge
Steve Bax	Elmbridge
Christine Taylor	HASRA
John Stewart	HACAN
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Isobel Pastor	DfT
Dan Foster	NATS
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Richard Norman	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Peter Rafano	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow

### Visitors

Henk Veerbeek	NLR
Mike Fairbanks	PA Consulting

### Apologies

Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Dean Plumb	BA
Ian Jopson	NATS
Dave Curtis	NATS
Cllr Amrit Mann	Hounslow
Kathleen Croft	Stanwell Moor Residents Assn
Natasha Fletcher	Teddington Action Group
Cllr Colin Davis	Spelthorne
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Ajit Bansal	Hounslow
Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Surrey Heath

## 1. Welcome and apologies for absence

- 1.1 Matt Gorman (MG) welcomed members and observers in the public gallery and noted apologies for absence (above).

## 2. Previous minutes and actions

- 2.1 The previous minutes were agreed.
- 2.2 **Route contours:** Darren Rhodes (DR) confirmed discussions are on-going with Heathrow regarding producing noise contours to reflect the impact of changes to the Compton route.
- 2.3 **Noise fines:** MG reported that there had been a delay to this data being published but that it would be available by the end of the year.

## 3. Community Noise Forum – reflection & future priorities

- 3.1 MG said that now that the CNF had been in existence for 6 months, he felt it was time to reflect on what had been achieved so far and set out future priorities for the Forum. He said this was particularly pertinent having received a letter from some of the community groups that sit on the CNF criticising Heathrow's engagement and the role of the CNF. MG said he had responded formally to this. A copy was handed out to Forum members and he summarised its contents.
- 3.2 Steve Clarke (SC) read out a statement from the community groups in response to MG's letter and gave a copy to him. He expressed dissatisfaction on behalf of some of the community groups of the progress of the CNF; that it was not transparent or collaborative; that the industry was not accepting responsibility for changes to flight paths; and that the Terms of Reference (ToR) should be revisited and amended.
- 3.3 David Hilton (DH) said that he appreciated the opportunity to understand the noise issues surrounding Heathrow. He requested an action plan setting out what changes to flight patterns had taken place, why and how they could be reversed. He wanted the CNF to clearly state their position on this.
- 3.4 Chris Turrell (CTu) wanted reassurance for residents that their concerns were being addressed, especially regarding early morning and late flights.
- 3.5 John Stewart (JS) said that he hadn't signed the letter as he thought the timing of it was wrong and wanted to wait for the analysis to be done. He said these were significant studies, and although they were paid for by Heathrow, residents had set out the brief through the steering group, and therefore should wait for the completion of those studies.
- 3.6 JS said the way Heathrow's engages is a world away from what it would have been a decade ago. He said he was convinced there had been incremental changes over time and welcomed the studies of flight patterns. He said that the studies should continue so that lessons can be learnt and actions can be taken.
- 3.7 Neil Spurrier (NS) said there had been a fundamental change to the height of planes in the last two years. He wanted Heathrow to acknowledge that it had now instructed

airlines to use stepped take-offs and wanted to know why airlines were not using Continuous Climb Operations.

- 3.8 Christine Taylor (CTa) said she had signed the letter because she didn't feel the concerns of those closest to the airport in areas like Harmondsworth were being taken into consideration.
- 3.9 Margaret Majumdar (MM) said that areas east of the airport had always had a problem with easterly departure routes for 16.5 hours a day as well as late departures. She said that Ealing residents felt that planes were lower, especially 747s operated by British Airways.
- 3.10 Steve Bax (SB) welcomed comments from other speakers and MG's acknowledgement that there had been changes such as a trend in some areas for more lower flights. He said that residents found it difficult to understand how Heathrow didn't know what changes had taken place.
- 3.11 Peter Willan (PW) was upset that Heathrow had published a report that had not been discussed yet in the CNF. He thanked Heathrow for promptly taking the report down. He expressed concern that the CNF was being used by Heathrow to promote a third runway.
- 3.12 MG said that he acknowledged and understood that for some people noise is a very significant issue in their lives, and that in all of the comments he heard a desire to continue working at this. He said he had no desire to be a senior leader for a corporate company that was not seen to be transparent and he was not aware of areas where Heathrow was not being transparent.
- 3.13 He gave an example of the NATS change made to the Compton route – saying that he had been very upset to discover they had made a change, after making assurances to residents that nothing had changed. He explained that as soon as Heathrow became aware of the changes they immediately published the information and asked NATS to revert back to the original procedures.
- 3.14 Regarding the data analysis, MG said Heathrow had very deliberately included Forum members at every stage in the process of the data verification and flight analysis so that there was confidence in it. He explained that the trade-off of doing it that way was speed but he hoped that the results of the TAG analysis had showed that where changes have occurred, we will acknowledge them. He said he would challenge anyone to find an airport in the world that has done the level of analysis that Heathrow had done.
- 3.15 He acknowledged that although the analysis demonstrates that Government requirements are still being met, changes within prescribed constraints can still have an impact for some residents on the ground.
- 3.16 With regards to “stepped departures” mentioned by NS, MG said that he was genuinely not aware of any instructions from Heathrow to airlines to change departure procedures. DR confirmed that at the stage of flight over Teddington/Twickenham, airlines - not airports - determine their departure procedures.

- 3.17 SC said they had information that doesn't corroborate what the CAA says about A380s being quieter. He asked that the information from the mobile monitors in Strawberry Hill and NPL was made available as soon as possible. He said he was happy with the data verification and now wanted the noise modelled to show if the noise climate has worsened.
- 3.18 DH said when considering noise metrics, the number of aircraft overflying an area is important. He said Heathrow measures average noise levels but what people care about is public annoyance which may have little to do with average noise levels. He said that dispersion of flight paths was preferable to concentration and believed that technology could be used to help minimise annoyance.
- 3.19 MM said that Heathrow should ask airlines what they can do to improve the situation for local communities. MG said that Heathrow works very closely with industry partners, for example he explained NATS and BA are looking at why A380 profiles were lower than others. He also said that Heathrow needs to consider asking other airlines to be part of the Forum.
- 3.20 MG suggested that a separate meeting is set up to discuss a revised ToR and work programme for 2016. He said that if members thought it would be preferable to have an independent chair, this could be considered as well. **ACTION:** MG

#### 4. Date verification - presentation from NLR

- 4.1 Henk Veerbeek (HV) gave a presentation on the progress of the data verification process. NLR has made good progress and the work will be completed in time for the next CNF meeting. A copy of the presentation is available with the minutes of the meeting.
- 4.2 NS asked if modelling took into account the fact that planes were not always overhead when measured by noise monitors. HV confirmed it does.
- 4.3 SB asked about the range of the monitors and how it was possible to know the noise levels in Elmbridge without having noise monitors. HV explained that it wasn't necessary to put noise monitors in every location in order to model noise. NLR's role is to verify the accuracy of the modelling by using data from particular monitors.

#### 5. Data analysis - presentation by Mike Fairbanks, PA Consulting

- 5.1 Mike Fairbanks (MF) presented the flight analysis that had been carried out on 4 of the 'penetration gates' agreed by the sub-group. These covered areas around Bracknell, Englefield Green, Sunningdale and Lightwater.
- 5.2 MG said the analysis was useful and thanked the sub-group who had worked with MF on how to present this.
- 5.3 CTu noted that it pointed out increased intensity over Bracknell on easterly departures.
- 5.4 DH said that the commentary was not as detailed as the Teddington analysis. MF responded that the Teddington gates were smaller, and that these gates covered a

larger area. If necessary more detailed analysis could be done. MG agreed in principal but said this is only necessary if the analysis highlighted an area of change that needed further investigation.

- 5.5 MG suggested that members take away the information to examine further and that Heathrow would arrange follow up meetings for members to go through the analysis with the consultant. He said that the analysis would not be published until members had had the opportunity to question the findings in detail. He asked attendees not to publish it on their own channels either until the process was completed.

## **6. AOB**

- 6.1 MM asked if there could be a future item at the CNF on late running flights.

### **Date of the next meeting**

Monday 25 January 2016, 1pm - 4pm, Heathrow Academy.