

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 21 November 2018

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

Attendees

| Name | Borough / Organisation |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Cllr Peter Szanto | Elmbridge |
| Surinderpal Suri | Hounslow |
| John Coates | Richmond |
| Cllr Peter Taylor | Runnymede |
| Cllr Wendy Matthews | South Bucks |
| Cllr David Hilton | Windsor and Maidenhead |
| Rob Beere | AN3V |
| Tina Richardson | AN3V |
| Margaret Majumdar | EANAG |
| Rob Buick | Englefield Green |
| Paul Conway | Englefield Green |
| Tim Walker | Forest Hill Society |
| John Stewart | HACAN |
| Christine Taylor | HASRA |
| Armelle Thomas | HASRA |
| Malcolm Beer | LAANC |
| Graham Young | Richings Park Residents Association |
| Dr Roger Mason | Richmond Heathrow Campaign |
| Peter Willan | Richmond Heathrow Campaign |
| Stephen Clark | Teddington Action Group |
| David Gilbert | Teddington Action Group |
| Nicole Porter | Anderson Acoustics |
| Spencer Norton | British Airways |
| Ian Greene | DfT |
| Ian Jopson | NATS |
| John Henderson | Trax |
| Geoff Clark | Virgin Atlantic |
| Connor Daly | Heathrow |
| Lisa Forshew | Heathrow |
| Mike Glenn | Heathrow |
| Matt Gorman | Heathrow |
| Laura Jones | Heathrow |
| Cheryl Monk | Heathrow |
| Rick Norman | Heathrow |
| Xavier Oh | Heathrow |
| Peter Rafano | Heathrow |
| Richard West | Heathrow |

Apologies

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Stuart Lindsey | CAA |
| Nic Stevenson | CAA |
| Sarah Bishop | DfT |
| Stuart Price | NATS |
| Rosalie James | AN3V |
| Dr Maureen Korda | Plane Hell Action |
| Jane Dawes | 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.

2 Previous minutes and actions

- 2.1 MG went through the actions from the previous meeting. These are summarised below.
- 2.2 **Schedule a future learning session on the implementation of Performance Based Navigation (PBN) in the US (2.2):** MG advised that this has been added to the work plan for 2019 and would be arranged once an independent technical advisor has been appointed to the group.
- 2.3 **Respond to Stephen Clark's presentation (2.3):** MG reiterated that a learning session on PBN would be scheduled for next year. He expected this would be a topic that the independent technical advisor would look at and noted that Stephen Clark (SC) would be proposing an outline for such a study later in the meeting.
- 2.4 **Heathrow Community Engagement Board (HCEB) chair to attend HCNF working group (2.4):** MG advised that HCEB chair Rachel Cerfontyne attended the last working group meeting on 24 October. Following that she has drafted some proposals on how the HCEB and HCNF might work together and these have been circulated to the group.
- 2.5 **Develop a programme of activity for optimising departure procedures (2.5):** MG confirmed that this has been added to the 2019 work plan and will be covered in the working group.
- 2.6 **Consider TAG's proposed higher departure profile (2.6):** MG noted that Dave Gilbert (DG) had presented TAG's proposal for a higher departure profile to the working group. He advised that the next step was to assess the feasibility of the proposal and this would be followed up in the working group.
- 2.7 **Schedule a community presentation on night noise (4.4):** MG noted that this was not on today's agenda but noted that the topic would be welcomed as part of the community slot.
- 2.8 **Confirm Community Noise Group (CNG) representatives for community workshop (4.5):** MG confirmed that this was done.
- 2.9 **Investigate ground noise complaint (5.3):** MG advised that this had been investigated but there were no engine ground runs at that time. He added that Heathrow has been working with residents to trial an array of noise monitors around the airport to better understand the issue. Xavier Oh (XO) explained that monitors had been deployed on the Northern Perimeter Road and at Richings Park. By analysing noise data and comparing with engine test records it was possible to establish which events were caused by the airport. XO met with the Richings Park Residents Association earlier in the week to discuss the findings. Christine Taylor (CT) noted that it could sometimes sound as if an aircraft is about to take off but doesn't. Rob Buick (RBU) observed that one morning there had been a disturbance on the noise monitors and a corresponding aircraft on the airfield in the Flightradar24 tracking tool, but no aircraft could be seen landing or taking off in Webtrak. Rob Beere (RBe) pointed out that if the noise was not from the airport then it would be subject to environmental controls. MG advised that ground noise would be covered at the working group.

- 2.10 **Respond to Armelle Thomas about night flights (6.2):** MG confirmed that a written response had been sent. Pete Rafano (PR) added that there had been no flights after 01:00 in the last three months.
- 2.11 **Request for an agenda item on health impacts (6.3):** MG explained that health impact assessments would be part of Heathrow's planning application for a third runway and more about this would be explained at the next HCNF meeting. **ACTION MG**
- 2.12 AT asked for section 6.3 of the previous meeting notes to be amended to reflect that she had read about statistics on respiratory diseases rather than claimed them. **ACTION RW**
- 2.13 **DfT to share PBN research with group (7.6):** MG confirmed that this was distributed to members.
- 2.14 **Respond to Peter Willan's presentation on airspace principles (7.10):** MG noted that a written response had been sent. After some debate it was decided that Heathrow should send such responses to all community members. PW advised that he had circulated the response as soon as he received it and that he would be commenting on it later in the meeting.
- 2.15 **Respond to Tim Walker's presentation on noise in SE London (8.2):** MG confirmed that a written response had been sent.
- 2.16 **DfT to respond to Mo Korda comments regarding a possible Planned and Permanent Redistribution (PPR) of air traffic (9.3):** MG advised that DfT had now sent this through and it would be forwarded on. Ian Greene (IG) added that the DfT would be asking the CAA to produce some track density maps to look at traffic patterns in SE London over the last few years.
- 2.17 **Respond to Dave Gilbert's questions about DCO Noise Assessment (10.1):** MG advised that this would be covered in the working group.

3 Consultation update

- 3.1 Lisa Forshew (LF) reminded members that from January to March 2019 Heathrow will be consulting on airspace design envelopes for an expanded Heathrow, which are the geographical areas within which potential future flight paths could be positioned. The consultation will also include future runway operations and airspace design envelopes for Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA).
- 3.2 PW asked for a consultation event to be held in Richmond upon Thames. Cheryl Monk (CM) noted his request and advised that Heathrow had proposed a number of venues and was currently going through the responses.
- 3.3 John Stewart (JS) observed that members had already been asked for their views on IPA. LF explained that recent engagement had covered IPA design principles while the January 2019 consultation would look at IPA design envelopes. She advised that the IPA design principles would be submitted to CAA on 3 December for gateway assessment at the end of December. IPA design envelopes would then be consulted on in January 2019.
- 3.4 JS asked if the design envelopes for an expanded Heathrow would also be part of the January consultation and LF confirmed that they would. JS asked what sort of geographical area these design envelopes would cover. MG advised that it was a large area because CAA guidance requires us to cover areas that may be overflowed by flights up to 7,000ft. JS felt it should be explained to people that those outside the design envelope could also experience some noise.

- 3.5 JS asked how far out the consultation would extend. LF explained that there would be a combination of leaflets and advertising within the 7,000ft area and the main consultation events would be in the 4,000ft area in the same way as the January 2018 consultation. Margaret Majumdar (MM) observed that residents in areas such as Greenford had not responded to the last consultation because they were unaware they could be affected. She asked how Heathrow would encourage such areas to engage. RN advised that the design envelopes would identify areas that could be affected and LF added that 2.2 million leaflets would be sent out. MM felt that previous leaflets had not adequately encouraged people who are currently overflowed to engage in the process and asked if copies would be available in libraries. LF confirmed that paper copies would be available in a number of locations and the leaflets would make it clear that new areas will be affected so people should engage even if they are not currently overflowed.
- 3.6 MG noted during the conversation that there was a confusion between the terms “design envelope” and “noise envelope”. RN explained that a noise envelope was a framework of measures aimed at reducing the noise impact of an airport, whereas a design envelope was the broad geographical area where a flight path (or paths) could be positioned. MG suggested that the group should refer to the noise envelope as a noise framework to avoid confusion.

4 Future runway operations

- 4.1 Richard Norman (RN) gave a presentation discussing runway operations for an expanded Heathrow. His presentation is available [here](#).
- 4.2 RN reminded members that Heathrow’s committed goal is to expand Heathrow whilst affecting fewer people with noise than 2013, through a combination of factors such as quieter planes, quieter airport design, quieter operations and an extended ban on scheduled night flights. He advised that January’s consultation will include aspects of how Heathrow operates its future runways such as directional preference, runway alternation and night flights.
- 4.3 SC said it was impossible to believe that Heathrow could achieve its committed goal of affecting fewer people and asked what metrics would be used to measure this. RN advised that a range of metrics would be used. SC asked if levels would be reduced to meet the latest WHO guidelines. RN responded that there was a lot of relevant information in the WHO guidelines which would be considered. SC felt that where WHO guidelines were not taken on board this should be made clear and the reasons should be given.
- 4.4 DG asked if the goal to affect fewer people related to all future years or just by 2050, noting that the Airports National Policy Statement (NPS) had stated that a third runway would impact more people for several years. RN advised that the noise envelope (noise framework) would set limits on impacts which the future design and operation of the airspace must stay within. DG pointed out that some people would be newly overflowed. RN agreed but said other areas would see improvements and reiterated that a range of factors from airspace design to aircraft technology would contribute to noise reduction.

- 4.5 PW asked if the results of the January 2019 consultation would go into the Development Consent Order (DCO). RN explained that the runway operations elements of the January 2019 consultation would help inform the statutory consultation in June 2019. PW asked if the consultation responses would be fed into the CAA as part of the airspace change process. RN advised that the airspace design envelopes for expansion and IPA feed into the CAA's airspace change process. PW thought it would be useful to have a more detailed explanation about how the processes fit together. MG agreed that there was a degree of complexity due to being subject to two regimes and suggested covering this at a future meeting. **ACTION JD**
- 4.6 With regards to night flights, Peter Szanto (PS) asked if Heathrow's restricted recovery period from 23:30 to 01:00 shown in the presentation would become shorter with a third runway. RN explained that the issue of tighter restrictions from 23:30 to 06:00 was one of the questions Heathrow would be consulting on, noting that the number of flights in this period has been reducing and the recently launched Quiet Night Charter should reduce these further.
- 4.7 Rob Beere (RBe) complained that he had been woken in the morning by a flight from South Africa contrary to his understanding that early morning arrivals were transatlantic flights. MG explained that the pattern of early morning arrivals had not changed for several years, with on average around 16 long haul arrivals each morning from 04:30.

5 Steeper departure trial interim report update

- 5.1 John Henderson (JH) gave an update on the steeper departure trial that is currently in operation on one of Heathrow's easterly departure routes known as the Detling route. The presentation is available [here](#).
- 5.2 JH explained that during the trial the minimum climb gradient on the 09R Detling departure route has been raised from 4% to 5% between 1,000ft and 4,000ft for 12 months. He advised that the number of aircraft maintaining a 5% climb rate has improved as a result of the trial. Results show a very slight reduction in the average noise level beneath the flight path with some small average increases observed to the sides.
- 5.3 JH advised that the climb gradient for this trial is measured differently to airports such as Paris Charles de Gaulle (CDG), where the gradient is measured from the end of the runway while Heathrow's is measured from 1,000ft at a distance of 6.5km from 'start of roll'. He observed that if measured in the same way, aircraft using Heathrow's Detling climb gradient would be at a height equivalent to an 8.83% climb gradient. DG and SC disputed this and pointed out that Paris CDG had a 5.5% minimum requirement for aircraft flying away from the city but a steeper 6.5% requirement for aircraft flying over the city. MG observed again that if measured in the same way, Heathrow's Detling procedure was higher than both of these procedures. He added that it was unclear if Paris CDG measured climb performance whereas Heathrow had introduced a new system to closely monitor this in January 2017.
- 5.4 JH observed that it was possible some aircraft were failing to meet the trial SID altitude restrictions because some crews were not being alerted to the failure until the aircraft was more than 250ft below the restriction. RBe asked if the procedure could be raised by 250ft to allow for this. JH explained that it was quite a complex issue but raising the altitude restrictions by a further 250ft could penalise those aircraft that were already achieving the climb gradient requirement.

- 5.5 JH cited an example of three A380 flights to Dubai, noting that one of the flights took off earlier on the runway and climbed steeper, resulting in a noise reduction of up to 8-10dB on the ground. SC asked if this was down to airline choice. JH advised that the three flights were by different airlines but the performance varied from day to day. SC felt that if all flights could go higher it would bring massive reductions in noise and a massive win for the airport and communities. IJ was curious to know if the higher aircraft was flying slower than the others, noting that this could have contributed to the increased height but at the expense of the noise lasting for longer. He explained that there could be a trade-off between reducing the maximum noise level and increasing the length of the noise event. SC thought that reducing the maximum noise level should be the most important factor when noise levels were over 65dB. MG added that the difference in height may also have been due to a difference in load factor.
- 5.6 RBe asked about the climb gradient for aircraft above 4,000ft. Spencer Norton (SN) advised that aircraft will start levelling off as they approach 6,000ft to avoid triggering the Traffic Collision Avoidance System (TCAS).
- 5.7 JH advised that the steeper departure trial will continue until the end of the year with a final report due in March 2019.

6 Working group update

- 6.1 RN gave an update from the last HCNF working group meeting on 24 October. The working group meeting notes are available [here](#).
- 6.2 RN advised that XO had been working on the procurement process for appointing an independent technical advisor, with possible candidates including Dutch consultants NLR and Ruud Ummels from To70 who fulfils a similar role at Gatwick Airport.
- 6.3 RN observed that during most of 2018 working groups 1 and 2 had been combined into a single meeting. This had been met with broad approval by members, so the decision has been made to continue with just one working group in 2019, with the meeting extended to three hours to allow sufficient time. Margaret Majumdar (MM) observed that the forum had started with five working groups, so reducing this to a single group was rather like abolishing the working groups and having a forum every month. RN responded that when there had been two working groups there was often an uneven split in the agenda and some members had wanted to attend both meetings but could not find the time. He added that it was always the intention to keep this under review and the consensus was that a single working group was preferred. MM suggested that in the event of meeting dates being rescheduled school holidays should be avoided.

7 Community Presentation: Independent technical advisor update

- 7.1 Cllr David Hilton (DH) gave an update on the process of appointing an independent technical advisor to the group. His presentation is available [here](#).
- 7.2 There was a discussion about whether local councillors at the HCNF were speaking on behalf of their councils or presenting their own views. After some debate it was broadly agreed that when a council has a particular policy on a particular issue, the councillor represents the council on that issue. However, when a council does not have a policy on an issue, the councillor represents what they consider to be the views of their local community.

8 Community Presentation: Proposed initial research topic: WHO noise guidance implications

- 8.1 DG proposed that the group's future independent technical advisor should conduct research to compare World Health Organisation (WHO) noise guidance with the Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA) and WebTAG impacts. The presentation is available [here](#).
- 8.2 DG advised that SoNA categorises a noise level of 54dB as "highly annoyed" whereas WHO uses 45dB Lden. He noted that while SoNA was based on one study sample of around 2,000 people, WHO guidance was based on 12 studies covering around 17,000 people. He also suggested that DfT was not consistent with WHO on Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Levels (LOAEL). Ian Greene (IG) explained that the Government's LOAEL was set by SoNA. He observed that WHO does not include the SoNA findings in its analysis and pointed out that WHO guidance specifically mentions looking at cultural differences and local context. He explained that DfT would be looking at WHO guidance in the context of WebTAG so he advised delaying DG's proposed research on this until the DfT work was complete.

9 Community Presentation: Proposed initial research topic: PBN, concentration and respite

- 9.1 SC proposed research into Performance Based Navigation (PBN), advising that it would inform other essential related work to be undertaken in redesigning London's future airspace, such as respite. His presentation is available [here](#).
- 9.2 MG confirmed that Heathrow was keen to develop its understanding on PBN, noting that pure concentration with no respite would not be a desirable outcome. He pointed out that a process had been agreed for initiating research topics for the technical advisor and DH confirmed there was a flow chart for this process.
- 9.3 DH pointed out that Ascot residents had hated PBN when it was trialled in 2014 and recalled the Government had stated that the highest risk for PBN was that communities would not accept it. MG agreed that the trials had shown the strength of feeling around PBN. However, they had also helped to inform how PBN could be used in the future to provide respite from flights overhead, and that it was always Heathrow's intention to do so.
- 9.4 RBe thought Heathrow had denied PBN was used in 2014. MG disagreed and reiterated that Heathrow was very clear that the trial did use PBN and that it had just been an early trial of it. He explained that PBN was being introduced around the world and Heathrow was leading the world in looking at this issue as an airport. He observed that PBN would not be introduced until 2025 so this was a multi-year programme and Heathrow was looking at this and working with local communities as early as possible and was one of the main reasons why the HCNF was set up.

10 Community Presentation: Design principles and IPA engagement

- 10.1 SC presented a summary of the key points made in TAG's response to Heathrow's design principles and IPA discussion document. The presentation is available [here](#).

- 10.2 He advised that the response was endorsed by seven HCNF community representatives and he requested a response from Heathrow before the next HCNF meeting. JH advised that Heathrow would be hosting a dedicated session on 13 December to go through Heathrow's feedback to the responses. LF noted that TAG's response appeared to contain a few areas of misunderstanding and confirmed that Heathrow would respond in writing. **ACTION LF/JH**
- 10.3 IJ disagreed with comments suggesting that PBN had been universally objected to across the world. He advised that over the last three to four years he had been researching PBN for ICAO along with over 50 international experts. A lot had been learned from the PBN trials and there were examples where PBN had worked very well. He added that the concept of PBN-based alternation routes was new and as far as he was aware these had never been used or trialled anywhere else in the world.
- 10.4 PS asked if IJ could provide more information about the ICAO research group. IJ advised that he was unable to disclose anything as he had been required to sign a confidentiality agreement to be part of ICAO. He added that a full report of the work including a literature review would go to the Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP) steering group next in February 2019 and he had recommended that the information should be made available, noting that it was interesting research that underlined a lot of the discussions held at the HCNF.
- 10.5 NP addressed the subject of respite research, recapping that she had previously presented highlights of research so far and that further work has been proposed. She advised that this would not be completed before the January 2019 consultation as it was intended to include feedback from the consultation in the work.

11 Community Presentation: Airspace design principles - Stage 1 Gateway application

- 11.1 PW presented his views on Heathrow's airspace design principles and the CAA's regulatory process for changes to airspace design CAP1616. His presentation is available [here](#).
- 11.2 PW acknowledged that his presentation was really aimed at the CAA and was disappointed that they were not represented at the meeting. MG observed that Heathrow had already corresponded with PW on this topic but would respond to any points that had not previously been raised.

12 AOB

- 12.1 PC thanked community members for their presentations. He advised that limiting the community slot to one or two topics would be better in future. He also reminded other community members that the slot provided an opportunity for everyone to have their say, not just those who spoke today.
- 12.2 MG advised that Heathrow would aim to circulate presentations before the meeting where possible including an update on where Heathrow was in the consultation process. **ACTION RW**

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 30th January 2019 (1:00pm - 4:00pm).

Please note: This meeting will take place at the Compass Centre.