

# Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 14 April 2016

## 9am – 12pm Heathrow Academy - meeting notes

### Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
John Coates	Richmond
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Cllr Paul Conlan	Ealing
Neil Luxton	Elmbridge
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow
Cllr Conrad Sturt	Surrey Heath
Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Surrey Heath
Kate Mann	Ascot resident
Graham Young	Richings Park and Iver
Geoff Paxton	Bracknell Forest
Robert Buick	Englefield Green
Kathleen Croft	Stanwell Moor RA
Christine Taylor	HASRA
John Stewart	HACAN
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Isobel Pastor	DfT
Rebecca Roberts-Hughes	DfT
Ian Jopson	NATS
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Richard Norman	Heathrow
Peter Rafano	Heathrow
Mike Glen	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Zoltan Bazso	Heathrow

### Apologies

David Sleight	Wokingham
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Margaret Majumdar	Ealing
Chris Turrell	Bracknell Forest
Rosalie James	AN3V
Dean Plumb	BA
Dave Curtis	NATS
Dan Foster	NATS
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow

## 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 **Heavily populated areas:** Isobel Pastor (IP) confirmed that she would circulate a formal response regarding what DfT considers to constitute a heavily populated area.  
**ACTION IP**
- 2.3 **Heathrow Governance of Noise:** In response to the previous minutes (25 January 2016, 3.6) MG summarised the governance structure of noise and discussed the role of the various forums involved (the slide can be found [here](#)).
- 2.4 MG explained that the HCNF is the only group to involve such a geographical range of council and community representatives on noise issues in such detail. HACC covers a whole range of issues so it doesn't have the capacity to get into such detail on noise, while the HNF takes a more strategic overview and is not designed to be so geographically representative.
- 2.5 Peter Willan (PW) was interested to know why there was no mention of the respite group or the Noise and Track Keeping (NTK) group. MG explained that the respite research was a separate piece of independent work that would report regularly to the HCNF as well as other Forums. The NTK group had been superseded by the EHO Group.
- 2.6 Stephen Clark (SC) raised the issue of the number of sub-groups of the HCNF and as a result some only had one or two community representatives. He suggested that they may benefit from being rationalised as they're all addressing the same issue in slightly different ways.
- 2.7 MG acknowledged the time commitment involved, however he felt they addressed a number of distinct areas that were tackling issues raised as a result of the analysis carried out last year. He said that all HCNF members would be kept updated with notes from the meetings and important decisions would be taken by the Forum as a whole.
- 2.8 PW referred to previous discussions regarding the role of the HCNF to influence policy and was interested what weight was given to the Forum's views. MG explained that community views are already influencing policy for example the CAA's review of the Airspace Change Process was a result of concerns raised by communities during the airspace trials. Isobel Pastor also explained that the views of the HCNF and community representatives will be important in shaping aviation and airspace policy when they formally consult on it.

## 3 HCNF Membership

- 3.1 The topic of membership was being raised as MG had received a handful of expressions of interest from organisations to join the Forum. These include Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC), Murray Barter (MB) of Residents Against Aircraft Noise (RAAN) and Henley.

- 3.2 MG set out the background to the Forum which was set up as a result of concerns raised from the airspace trials and said that the current geographical spread of its members reflects this. However he said that as the group starts to look at airspace strategy more broadly it may need to expand slightly while still remaining at a manageable size. He suggested there is a balance of representation from the east and west, as membership is currently more weighted in favour of the west.
- 3.3 He suggested inviting the London boroughs of Hammersmith & Fulham and Wandsworth and allowing LAANC to attend. This was agreed.
- 3.4 David Hilton (DH) said that the HCNF sub-groups provided an opportunity for local residents to be involved if they have specific areas of interest, citing MB's current involvement in the Compton route sub-group as a good example.
- 3.5 John Stewart (JS) agreed that more representation was needed from the east such as Hammersmith & Fulham and Wandsworth and one more from south-east London. MG confirmed that Heathrow would put forward a proposal at the next meeting and invite LAANC to attend. **ACTION MG**

## 4 CAA Consultation on the Airspace Change Decision-Making Process

- 4.1 Rebecca Roberts-Hughes (RRH) gave a presentation about the CAA consultation on the airspace change decision-making process (copies of the slides can be found [here](#)).
- 4.2 The consultation refers to the Airspace Change Process itself rather than actual airspace changes.
- 4.3 SC asked whether, in the future, the CAA could put forward its own proposals on airspace changes if they felt there were better options that balanced the community and industry interests. Stuart Lindsey (SL) explained that part of the CAA's approval process is to ensure the sponsor of an airspace change has taken environmental considerations into account, but the CAA does not propose airspace changes of its own because that would be like "marking their own homework".
- 4.4 PW wanted to know who was on the side of the residents. IP said that the Aviation Policy Framework (APF) sets out policy in relation to noise and that is there to ensure community interests are being considered. The CAA's role is to ensure policy is adhered to. JS suggested this could be a possible role for an independent noise authority (IANA). MG agreed that an IANA would be an important addition to this debate.
- 4.5 DH added that how aircraft are operated affected how noise is generated. Darren Rhodes (DR) explained that the CAA has a duty to assess noise, but day to day operations are set by Government. He added that there was no such thing as an optimum solution because noise, carbon and air quality all needed to be balanced.

## 5 SID Climb Gradient Study

- 5.1 Mike Glen (MGI) gave a presentation covering the findings from the SID Climb Gradient Study (the presentation can be found [here](#)). The study was carried out to understand how departure procedures at Heathrow compare with those at other international airports. The work will help to inform further studies to look at steeper climb gradients in more detail and to identify the best practice for airports with similar traffic types and load factors.
- 5.2 RN confirmed that a departure profile study will be carried out on the easterly DET /DVR route to establish the different climb profiles of different aircraft types, airlines and the impacts of deploying either of the two noise abatement procedures – NAPD1 or NAPD2. As part of this noise monitoring will be undertaken. MG stated that robust data was required to establish the impacts of steeper departures.
- 5.3 SC said that Heathrow affects a larger population than other airports so it should operate the quietest procedures available. He thought that the 4,000ft end point of the NPR should be reconsidered and questioned whether a minimum climb gradient of 4% was the right requirement.
- 5.4 DR pointed out that the minimum climb gradient was just that and that many aircraft were flying considerably more than that. He also said that increased departure altitudes may not necessarily be quieter. The impact of these also needs to be considered in terms of carbon and air quality.
- 5.5 DH was concerned that if aircraft are getting heavier and taking longer to climb then they are causing more noise nuisance over a wider area, and wondered if aircraft were flying lower than necessary, possibly to save money.
- 5.6 RRH said there had to be a balance between those people living further out and those closer to the airport. DH wanted to know why the same aircraft could be at 6,000ft over Sunninghill one day and 2,500ft the next. RN explained this was the reason for the departure profile study, so that if changes are made then the consequences at different points on the route are understood.
- 5.7 PW wanted to know if there was a policy for continuous climb and who sets the procedures. DR explained the legal requirement is for airlines to use one of two noise abatement procedures – known as NADP1 and NADP2. These are approved by the CAA with regard to safety only. IP added that the two procedures, which result in either noise closer in or noise further out, are set by ICAO.
- 5.8 SC requested a written statement on what procedures are approved by which organisations. **ACTION DR**

## 6 Working Group Action Plan

- 6.1 RN reported back on progress from the five HCNF Working Groups. A copy of the plan is available [here](#).
- 6.2 DH requested that the minutes from the Working Group meetings should be available to everyone at the HCNF. MG agreed that these should be circulated to all in future.  
**ACTION MG**
- 6.3 It was generally agreed that there was lots of work being undertaken through the action plan, however members expressed a desire that the action plan would lead to a positive change in noise. DH said some 'quick wins' were necessary to maintain people's enthusiasm. MG agreed that where things can be done quickly they should be.
- 6.4 PW wanted to know when the Government would consult on night flight. IP could not confirm the exact date.
- 6.5 PW also stated that the Cranford planning enquiry decision could affect a new area. MG said a response from the Planning Inspector was due soon, however the required changes to taxiways would need to be planned and unlikely to be built before 2017.
- 6.6 PW expressed concern that a decision on a third runway this summer could considerably impact the work in the action plan. MG responded that the HCNF is focussed on a two runway airport. The consultation process for a third runway would take several years, so the work in this action plan would carry on regardless.
- 6.7 RN concluded that Heathrow's goal is to have one document that details all the actions Heathrow and its industry partners are taking to reduce noise impacts – currently this is spread over the Blueprint for Noise Reduction, the Noise Action Plan and HCNF plan.

## 7 AOB

- 7.1 No other business was raised.

## Date of the next meeting

Wednesday 18 May 2016, 1pm - 4pm, Heathrow Academy