

## Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 20 September 2017

### 1:00pm – 4:00pm Heathrow Academy – meeting notes

#### Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Cllr Conrad Sturt	Surrey Heath
John Coates	Richmond Council
Kathleen Croft	Stanwell Moor
Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Surrey Heath
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Ian Jopson	NATS
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
Graham Young	South Bucks
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Hannah Cook	Spelthorne Borough Council
Jayne Chace	Teddington Action Group
John Stewart	HACAN
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
Rosalie James	AN3V
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Andy Kershaw	British Airways
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
David Elvy	DfT
Dan Foster	NATS
Ian Jopson	NATS
Matt Burman	NATS
Robin Clarke	NATS
Sam Wright	NATS
Stuart Price	NATS
Amir Zar	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Mark Burgess	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Michael Glen	Heathrow
Pete Rafano	Heathrow
Richard Norman	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Zoltan Bazso	Heathrow

#### Apologies

Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Gerry Ceaser	LAANC
Sarah Bishop	DfT
Geoff Clark	Virgin Atlantic
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow

## 1 Welcome and apologies for absence

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

## 2 Previous minutes and actions

- 2.1 MGo went through the actions from the previous meeting. These are summarised below.
- 2.2 **Add a RAG (Red Amber Green) key to the work plan update:** This will be presented later in the meeting.
- 2.3 **Discuss Heathrow's noise insulation schemes at a future meeting:** This is not on the agenda today but will be considered for a future meeting.
- 2.4 **Provide a summary of late running flights:** This will be circulated to Forum members.
- 2.5 **Investigate an off-track departure for Peter Willan:** Completed after the last meeting.
- 2.6 **NATS to look into the heights of Luton flights for Rosalie James:** Completed.
- 2.7 **Darren Rhodes (DR) to look into sharing the Terms of Reference of his departure noise study for DfT:** DR will be presenting on this later in the meeting.
- 2.8 There were no further comments on the previous minutes and they were taken as read.

## 3 Introduction

- 3.1 MGo gave an update of the upcoming consultations and noted that both Heathrow and the Government are planning a number of consultations over the next few months and years. He was conscious that it is a complex picture and constantly evolving, so he sought to explain the current position. He informed the group that because the Government has confirmed that it will be holding an additional consultation on its draft Airports National Policy Statement (NPS) this Autumn, in order to avoid confusion, Heathrow has taken the decision to hold its consultations on expansion (DCO and airspace) and changes to Heathrow's current two runway operation early in the new year. He said he would provide a further update on timescales at the next meeting in November.

## 4 Operational efficiencies update

- 4.1 Mark Burgess (MBg) and Amir Zar (AZ) gave a presentation on two procedural changes to help improve the resilience of Heathrow's operation. The presentation is available [here](#). They explained that with Heathrow operating at 98% capacity, there is little headroom for recovery from issues that cause delays. The two changes to help with this are Enhanced Time Based Separation (eTBS) and the Re-categorisation of the ICAO Wake Turbulence Separation Minima (RECAT EU). Both of these involve safely reducing the separation between certain types of aircraft, helping to enable more rapid recovery from adverse conditions and reduce overall delays.

- 4.2 Robert Buick (RB) asked if this would help towards Heathrow's proposal to introduce an additional 25,000 flights per year before a third runway is built. MBg advised that this change was about improving the resilience of our existing capacity and that the additional 25,000 flights would be subject to a separate planning process and consultation. MGo drew attention to the notes in the presentation which explained that these options would not involve a change to Heathrow's current annual cap of 480,000 air traffic movements and would not change Heathrow's flight paths.
- 4.3 Stephen Clark (SC) asked if new technology would be required to introduce these changes. MBg explained that there would be no change in technology, just a change to what is done in the background by NATS air traffic controllers. SC asked what residents would notice on the ground apart from less late flights. Stuart Price (SP) advised that there would possibly be one additional landing per hour, improved punctuality, less flights moving into the evening period, and a reduction in airborne holding which should result in less aircraft landing on the departures runway (also known as TEAM, or Tactically Enhanced Arrivals Mode).
- 4.4 MM asked how these procedures would affect the order that aircraft are sequenced to depart. Matt Burman (MBm) advised that the departure order would not change, just the time between certain types of aircraft.

## 5 Departure noise update

- 5.1 MGo reminded the group that Heathrow has agreed to carry out a steeper departure study on one of the departure routes, with baseline data being gathered during 2017 prior to increasing the minimum climb rate in 2018. He observed that Heathrow is also keen to understand what is possible and what happens at other airports. Among the issues is whether steeper climbs automatically mean less noise or whether they just move the noise around, and if there is a trade off with fuel burn and emissions. He noted that DR will also be sharing details of a piece of work which should provide some useful independent evidence on this topic.
- 5.2 David Gilbert (DG) welcomed the opportunity for an open debate. He claimed that CAA data showed aircraft flying higher out of other airports. DR cautioned that this was taken from a tiny sample of data, observing that Teddington Action Group (TAG) had obtained the data using a Freedom of Information request rather than engaging with him. He was disappointed that TAG had drawn conclusions from documents that were only small samples and not a finished piece of work.
- 5.3 DR observed that noise on the ground that was the most important factor, not the climb rate, noting that the title of the study referred to departure noise. He gave a presentation on the Departure Noise Technical Working Group of ANMAC (Aircraft Noise Monitoring Advisory Committee) which provides technical advice to the Government on departure noise limits at the London designated airports. His presentation is available [here](#). He discussed the group's Terms of Reference and ran through the key areas covered. DG asked who was on ANMAC. DR explained that it was chaired by the DfT, the CAA advises, and Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted airports are represented. MGo added that there was also a technical adviser whose name could be provided. **ACTION MGo**

- 5.4 DR advised that a whole chapter of the report will look at departure climb gradients. The group has data from airports including Paris, Amsterdam and Sydney, and a benchmarking study will be undertaken against Heathrow. He discussed the two Noise Abatement Departure Procedures (NADP1 and NADP2), advising that a difference in aircraft speeds could result in a situation where the peak noise from one procedure is lower but the noise event is longer. He explained that aircraft departing from Heathrow predominantly use NADP2, noting that at Gatwick around 70% of departures use NADP2. The study will look at using entirely NADP1 all the way to using entirely NADP2. He suggested that the best solution may not be the same for all aircraft types.
- 5.5 MGo asked about the timescale for completing the study. DR observed that a draft report was originally planned for the end of the year, but the first quarter of 2018 looks more possible. He added that he may share aspects of the work with the Forum and working groups as it progresses.
- 5.6 Stephen Clark (SC) noted that TAG had received a response to an earlier dossier but would like a response to their dossier on other airports. DG asked if TAG could circulate the dossier, noting that Heathrow's permission was required to circulate content from NLR. MGo thought it should be fine to share this with other community members at the Forum as long as the report is already in the public domain.
- 5.7 SC thought that ICAO recommended the use of NADP1 over densely populated areas. DR said this was not his recollection so SC asked him to check and respond. DR added that NADP1 was designed to reduce noise close to the airport while NADP2 reduces noise further out. **ACTION DR**
- 5.8 SC said he was sceptical of the CAA's output and described its Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA) as a whitewash. He did not consider annual average noise to be the right basis to look at impacts, noting that his area sometimes has severe impact late at night which does not show up in annual average contours. David Hilton (DH) added that metrics such as N65 and N70 should be considered and DR confirmed these were in the study's scope. Margaret Majumdar (MM) felt that average metrics were also inadequate for Ealing as it is only affected by noise for 30% of the time. She added that Ealing was under two departure routes and felt it was unreasonable that the area was outside Heathrow's noise insulation schemes. MGo acknowledged the limitations of some of the metrics used and noted that Heathrow was already using a range of supplementary metrics. Rick Norman (RN) added that Heathrow was now charged with producing annual noise contours and was looking at bringing in contours for easterly and westerly days. SC gave credit to Heathrow and Anderson Acoustics for using additional metrics in the new Community Information Reports. DG asked if DR could provide  $L_{Amax}$  contours comparing NADP1 and NADP2. **ACTION DR**
- 5.9 MGo advised that Heathrow is looking to scope a departure climb study through the Forum in a similar way to the PA Consulting study. However, DR's report will be looked at first as the other route would not be any quicker. He noted TAG's concerns around independence but did not agree and felt it would provide a robust piece of evidence. SC suggested that an independent peer review would add more credibility. MGo said this would be discussed but in the meantime the work would be looked at through the working groups. RN and MGo suggested that the working groups could also take a deeper look at SoNA. **ACTION RN**

## 6 Webtrak weather data

- 6.1 Pete Rafano (PR) gave a presentation about a new rainfall layer for Webtrak, a map-based tool that provides information about aircraft as they take off or land at Heathrow. The presentation is available [here](#). The new rainfall layer allows users to understand how weather events such as thunderstorms can cause aircraft to be positioned in places where they are usually not, known as 'off track'. This is intended to bring greater transparency to the community as to why aircraft might sometimes be in unusual places.

## 7 Working group updates

- 7.1 Rick Norman (RN), Mike Glenn (MGI), Zoltan Bazso (ZB) and Xavier Oh (XO) gave updates on the work currently ongoing in the Forum's two working groups.
- 7.2 **Work plan status:** RN provided a RAG (Red Amber Green) status update on the current work plan as requested in the previous actions. The presentation is available [here](#). He noted that the amber items in Working Group 1 were due to World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines not being out when expected. He observed that the A320 retrofit arrival study in Working Group 2 was shown in red because the noise monitors were currently being used for the steeper departure trial, so the study will probably have to wait until next year. He added that the voluntary quiet night charter may also push into 2018. This will be looked at in the next Working Group 2 meeting in October.
- 7.3 **Slightly steeper approach trial:** MGI gave an update on the trial to increase the angle of the glide slope of landing aircraft from 3° to 3.2°. The presentation is available [here](#). Following the end of the trial next month, Heathrow will seek to make the 3.2° approach permanent. As part of this Heathrow is extending the trial for a further 12 months with the aim of providing a seamless transition from the trial to a permanent procedure. DG asked if Heathrow would consider 3.5° in the future. MGI advised that some aircraft types can only fly up to 3.15° or 3.25° due to flaps and instrumentation. London City airport uses steeper approaches but the airport has a different aircraft mix and Airbus A380s could not land there. Stewart Lindsey (SL) noted that ICAO currently only allows steeper approaches for reasons of obstacle avoidance, so a change of policy is required to allow this to happen. DR added that Frankfurt airport uses steeper approaches but this was not a permanent procedure.
- 7.4 **Fly Quiet and Clean:** ZB gave an update on Heathrow's Fly Quiet and Clean programme, which encourages airlines to use quieter and cleaner aircraft and fly them in the quietest way. The presentation is available [here](#). He noted that one operator's Boeing 777 fleet had improved its CDA (Continuous Descent Approach) compliance from 24% to 80%, while another operator's track keeping had improved from 92% to 98%. He informed the group that the 2017 Q2 results should be published next week. MGo commented that he hadn't realised the degree of pickup this programme would get, noting that there had been a lot of media coverage and work by the airlines to improve their performance, which was the end goal of the programme. DH thought it was good that this was being used to improve performance, but observed that AvGen thought the methodology was flawed. RN advised that Heathrow had responded directly to AvGen. He stated that he was comfortable with the programme, noting that it was achieving its purpose and bringing improvement. DG wondered if some of the metrics would encourage the use of larger aircraft. RN advised that Heathrow was aiming to use metrics that were fair across the whole fleet, with ZB adding that a balanced approach was required for those metrics and he thought it was a fair balance.

- 7.5 **Noise Action Plan 2019 – 2023 development update:** XO gave an update on progress of the development of a new Noise Action Plan (NAP) for the period 2019 - 2023. The presentation is available [here](#). SC asked if the 2016 noise mapping was available yet. RN advised that it should be available in the next few weeks, adding that it would be a larger report than usual and would include supplementary metrics. MGo noted that this was a good example of discussions at the Forum being taken on board.

## 8 Community presentation – Opportunities and scope of PBN

- 8.1 MGo observed that HCNF member Paul Conway (PC) had asked for the opportunity for communities to give presentations at the Forum. The following presentation by Robert Buick (RB) and Stephen Clark (SC) was the first of these and would look at the opportunities and scope of Performance Based Navigation (PBN). The presentation is available [here](#). RB and SC noted that PBN potentially had very significant implications for communities around Heathrow and proposed that independent research should be commissioned to understand what was possible through PBN and the potential side effects.
- 8.2 MGo offered some initial thoughts, welcoming the presentation and noting it was a constructive contribution. He thought that Heathrow should look at how any ongoing work may answer some of the questions posed and where there may be gaps. SC called for an independent assessment. MGo observed that the Government was planning an independent commission on noise which would look at existing research and carry out this sort of study, but acknowledged that this was not an immediate solution. RN added that Heathrow's respite research would answer some of the questions posed. However, he understood the request for independent advice and suggested this should be discussed at the working groups to develop the scope and look at who should do the work. **ACTION RN**
- 8.3 John Stewart suggested it would be useful for Heathrow to provide an initial response before the next working groups. **ACTION MGo**
- 8.4 Stuart Price (SP) advised that data from Gatwick had already been published in the document CAP1385. Nicole Porter (NP) added that the respite working group had looked at 18 implementations of PBN in the US. RB cited problems that the FAA had experienced in Baltimore and Phoenix, noting that lessons should be learned to avoid the same situation at Heathrow. MGo said this was music to his ears, noting that Heathrow had given the same examples in the past and observing that it was a huge challenge.
- 8.5 Ian Jopson (IJ) thought this approach should be welcomed. He acknowledged that implementation of PBN was not without its problems, noting that although there were some good examples there were probably more bad ones. He advised that ICAO had more than 50 experts around the world working on this, so there was a body of information that could inform this study, although unfortunately it was strictly in confidence until it was complete. NP asked if the literature review could be released early and IJ agreed to find out. **ACTION IJ**

## 9 AOB

- 9.1 RB asked when the Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA) sleep report would be available. DR advised that it was still under discussion with peer reviewers so he was not able to provide an indicative timeline at the moment.

- 9.2 DG recalled that there had been a good presentation on the reasons for an end change at the last meeting. However, he felt that that some members of the community often thought the airport used easterly operations when the wind was lower than 5 knots, and asked if it was possible to build more confidence in the decision. MGo advised that producing real-time updates might be a large task as it is quite a dynamic situation, noting that this was why the presentation had provided an overview of the reasons rather than offering a case by case justification. MBg suggested that Heathrow should take this away and discuss it further. MGo observed that a resident had asked if the Twitter account could be used to provide an indication of which runway was likely to be used during the night. He added that Heathrow's operations team was at the airport 24 hours a day so it would make sense to look at what they could do. **ACTION MBg**

### **Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 22nd November 2017, 1pm-4pm, Heathrow Academy.