

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 18 May 2016

1pm – 4pm 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 Conrad Sturt	Surrey Heath
Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Surrey Heath
Kathleen Croft	Stanwell Moor RA
David Sleight	Wokingham
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Chris Turrell	Bracknell Forest
Rosalie James	AN3V
John Stewart	HACAN
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Mark Simmons	CAA
Isobel Pastor	DfT
Rebecca Roberts-Hughes	DfT
Jonathon Counsell	IAG
Stephen Layton	Helios
Dan Foster	NATS
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Peter Rafano	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Zoltan Bazso	Heathrow

Apologies

Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Ian Jopson	NATS
Richard Norman	Heathrow
Dean Plumb	BA
Dave Curtis	NATS

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) circulated a document detailing the DfT definition of a heavily populated area (the definition can be found [here](#)). There was a discussion on the definition of “significantly” affected by noise in relation to the airspace change process (ACP). IP indicated that in the future this may be linked to health impacts.
- 2.3 **HCNF Membership:** MG stated that invitations were being extended to the London boroughs of Hammersmith & Fulham, Wandsworth and Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council (LAANC). HACAN East was also listed as a placeholder and John Stewart (JS) confirmed that he had spoken to groups in Hammersmith & Fulham who would be potentially willing to join the Forum. MG commented that this would help to expand the geographic spread of the Forum, however there was a risk that total numbers could become unmanageable and proposed that attendance should be limited to one council representative and one community representative from each area, with a deputy appointed if they cannot attend. DEFRA was proposed by Peter Willan as a member. IP advised that they lead on airspace issues but DEFRA will be considered.
- 2.4 **Approval of procedures:** Stephen Clark (SC) had previously requested a written statement setting out responsibilities for each organisation in relation to approving airspace procedures. Darren Rhodes (DR) said he will circulate this when it’s ready.
- ACTION DR**

3 Heathrow governance of noise

- 3.1 MG discussed the governance structure of noise as discussed in the previous Forum meeting (the slide can be found [here](#)). He reiterated that the HNF and HCNF have different roles and membership. The HNF is a smaller group that does not have the same breadth of local representation and is more focussed on strategic issues. MG explained there is no hierarchy with the groups and there are no plans to change or merge these groups. MG said he would circulate minutes from the HNF in this group.
- ACTION MG**
- 3.2 Peter Willan (PW) suggested it would be useful to have a central place on the Heathrow noise website for all minutes and papers from HACC, HCNF, HNF and EHO as well as notes from the working groups. **ACTION CM**
- 3.3 SC wanted to know who stands for communities during an Airspace Change Process (ACP) and what incentivisation or requirements are there for somebody to promote measures that can reduce noise under a proposed change. He suggested there was a strong case for an independent noise authority.
- 3.4 DR explained that an ACP fundamentally involves the community - the sponsor has to consult and engage with the communities as part of the process. The ACP review process checks whether there has been adequate community engagement and also takes the environment into account.
- 3.5 MG confirmed that there had been discussion about setting up an independent noise authority and the government is looking at that. One of the ideas that the Airports Commission put forward was for this authority to have a role as a statutory consultee in airspace design to consider noise issues.

- 3.6 PW and SC raised the issue that the ACP does not allow for an airspace change to be sponsored by residents or others solely for the purpose of reducing noise. DR stated there is nothing to stop this and IP said that this Forum was in effect doing this.

4 Respite study update

- 4.1 Nicole Porter (NP) gave an update on the respite study being led by Anderson Acoustics (the slides can be downloaded [here](#)). The research aims at better understanding the key aspects of an effective respite strategy for local communities that is consistent with efficient operations.
- 4.2 She provided a working definition of respite as being the scheduled relief from aircraft noise for a particular period of time. However this was by no means a final definition and research was needed in this area.
- 4.3 The respite study is being carried out by Anderson Acoustics, Systra and Arup Acoustics and is being overseen by a peer review group. Part of the research includes laboratory work which will be carried out at Arup's SoundLab which has the capability to provide a realistic representation of sound to further understand noise levels. MG extended an invitation to Forum members to visit SoundLab.
- 4.4 MG stressed that Heathrow had gone to great lengths to be transparent in this research, and as far as he was aware Heathrow is the only airport in the world doing this degree of research into respite.
- 4.5 SC wanted to know how the respite study might feed into the DfT research into attitudes towards noise and what the timescales were for the DfT work. DR responded that the research was about attitudes to current aircraft noise exposure and respite wasn't an objective of that study. IP added that the report was currently in peer review and was expected to be published this year.
- 4.6 PW wanted to know how respite would work for arrivals. Dan Foster (DF) suggested that future possibilities might include having a number of different routes coming to a point on the ILS which could be used on different days, however input was required from the respite study. PW considered that the location of the joining point was very important, and MG suggested that in future it would be possible to look at a closer joining point of possibly 4 or 5 miles.
- 4.7 DH wanted to know if there was a noise level or distance at which noise was not considered to be significant. NP said that this would be part of the study but until the basics were established it is not possible to say.
- 4.8 Kathleen Croft (KC) stated that respite is invaluable for those who live close to the airport. She asked if the respite study was only looking at arrivals, commenting that for her area, they are not such a big issue as departures. Other noise issues such as traffic noise need to also be taken into account. NP confirmed that departures were also included in the study as well as background noise from other sources because it is realised that people don't hear aircraft noise in isolation. The study would include field work as well as laboratory work. She was fully aware of the constraints of laboratory work but it allows the noise environment to be controlled.

- 4.9 Conrad Sturt (CS) asked how sensitivity to noise is being considered. NP responded that they were investigating the role of that.
- 4.10 Paul Conway (PC) wanted to know if the Cranford agreement was going to continue. MG said that it would not, but in order for the northern runway to be used for easterly departures new access taxiways are required which need planning permission. A planning enquiry took place last year and we are currently awaiting formal government approval.
- 4.11 PC also asked whether residents under westerly departure routes currently notice any benefit from runway alternation. KC confirmed that a huge benefit was noticed in Stanwell Moor and that residents wouldn't be able to stand the noise without respite.
- 4.12 SC asked whether averages and events will be looked at. NP responded that everything was on the table. MG concluded that Forum members would be kept updated as the work goes forward.

5 Voluntary quiet night charter

- 5.1 Stephen Layton (SL) gave a presentation on the voluntary quiet night charter being considered by Working Group 3. This can be found [here](#).
- 5.2 Heathrow has initiated an activity to agree a voluntary charter with airlines to improve the night noise environment. This would seek collectively with the airlines to reduce the level of late running departures, provide a greater number of nights without late running departures and reduce the likelihood of late running flights deep into the night. It would also seek through discussion with local communities to agree adapted operating practices in the night to reduce and/or share the impact of noise.
- 5.3 The agreement would be voluntary and therefore focuses on pragmatic items. MG cited the success of a previous voluntary agreement to ban flights scheduled between 4:30am-6am from landing before 4:30am.
- 5.4 John Stewart (JS) felt that this was a good initiative, but stressed that in order for it to work it needs to be equitable.
- 5.5 DH wanted to know what would deliver the most benefit for residents. SL thought this would be that a cut-off time for late running departures. DH asked if this was within Heathrow's gift, to which MG responded that it wasn't because night flight policy is set by government.
- 5.6 DH asked whether scheduled flights which are delayed are allowed to depart. MG confirmed that they could as long as there is sufficient quota, and JD added that it has to be a compliant aircraft type. It's normally only for passenger relief so cargo planes typically don't use the allocation. Heathrow makes sure that the allocation is used equitably and does refuse permission for some late departures.
- 5.7 PW wanted to know if this discussion would feed into the review of night flight restrictions and if a voluntary code could be part of the next regime. IP confirmed that all information put forward would be considered.

- 5.8 PW suggested it would be helpful to know the QC distribution at night and the routes used. JD said this would be fed into Working Group 3. PW asked if there were any QC8 planes still operating. PR confirmed that there were none during the night. JD added that QC4 was a 747 on departure. Jonathon Counsell (JCou) added that BA has started retiring 747s in the last 3 or 4 years and they should be absent from the fleet by mid-2025 at the latest. These are being replaced by quieter aircraft including A380s and 787s. He supported this work and stated that the airline does not like to operate late runners.
- 5.9 There was a discussion about how much quieter A380s were than 747s. NP said this was being looked into.
- 5.10 John Coates (JCoa) wanted to understand Heathrow's commitment on night flights in the event of a third runway. MG explained that the Airports Commission (AC) had proposed 6.5 hours without night flights between 23:30 and 06:00, and that Heathrow was proposing 23:00 to 05:30. This would benefit the community because the AC proposals would potentially result in more flights up to 23:30. This was likely to be the first significant change to night flights in many years.

6 Working group updates

- 6.1 JD and NP gave an update on the working group (WG) progress.
- 6.2 JCoa wanted to know which communities were represented on the Compton WG. Englefield Green, Ascot and Ashford were mentioned. MG concluded that broader consultation would be needed when routes were being considered.
- 6.3 DH requested that the policy learning from the WG's (excluding Compton) could be captured and fed into WG4, and asked whether WG4 would feed into the upcoming DfT consultation. MG stated that where consensus can be found it should feed into the consultation.
- 6.4 PW articulated a desire to share the benefits in noise across the community as aircraft get quieter in the long term.
- 6.5 RJ wanted to know when the Strawberry Hill House monitor report would be published. NP advised that this would happen as soon as the report format was agreed in WG1. It is proposed that this should be a PowerPoint presentation as opposed to a wordy report, with a summary dashboard, key messages, a verification statement, glossary, distribution of tracks and noise details including event duration. DH asked if noise would be modelled. NP said it would be measured but that WG1 was discussing how modelled data could be included.

7 AOB

- 7.1 Mark Simmons (MS) gave a quick reminder that the closing date for the CAA consultation on airspace change is on 15 June.
- 7.2 SC wanted an update on the departure profile study. JD advised that the work is on the way but not complete yet, as responses were required from the other airports. MG confirmed that a progress update would be circulated in due course **ACTION JD**

7.3 DH asked if all of the previous WG meeting notes had been circulated. CM responded that the WG5 and WG2 notes were in the process of being written up and would be published on the Heathrow noise website soon.

Date of the next meeting

Wednesday 6 July 2016, 1pm - 4pm, Heathrow Academy