

## Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 22 March 2017

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

#### Attendees

| <b>Name</b>                 | <b>Borough / Organisation</b> |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cllr Chris Turrell          | Bracknell Forest              |
| Cllr Conrad Sturt           | Surrey Heath Council          |
| Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans | Surrey Heath Council          |
| Cllr Wendy Matthews         | South Bucks Council           |
| Christine Taylor            | HASRA                         |
| Gerry Ceaser                | LAANC                         |
| Graham Young                | South Bucks                   |
| Hannah Cook                 | Spelthorne Borough Council    |
| Jayne Chace                 | Teddington Action Group       |
| John Coates                 | Richmond Council              |
| John Stewart                | HACAN                         |
| Kathleen Croft              | Stanwell Moor                 |
| Margaret Majumdar           | EANAG                         |
| Paul Conway                 | Englefield Green              |
| Peter Willan                | Richmond Heathrow Campaign    |
| Rob Beere                   | AN3V                          |
| Rob Buick                   | Englefield Green              |
| Rosalie James               | AN3V                          |
| Stephen Clark               | Teddington Action Group       |
| Steve Bax                   | Elmbridge                     |
| Surinderpal Suri            | Hounslow Council              |
| Nicole Porter               | Anderson Acoustics            |
| Spencer Norton              | BA                            |
| Darren Rhodes               | CAA                           |
| Sarah Bishop                | DfT                           |
| Dan Foster                  | NATS                          |
| Robin Clarke                | NATS                          |
| Geoff Clark                 | Virgin Atlantic               |
| Jane Dawes                  | Heathrow                      |
| Laura Jones                 | Heathrow                      |
| Matt Gorman                 | Heathrow                      |
| Mike Glen                   | Heathrow                      |
| Peter Leeming               | Heathrow                      |
| Rachel Thomas               | Heathrow                      |
| Richard Norman              | Heathrow                      |
| Richard West                | Heathrow                      |
| Xavier Oh                   | Heathrow                      |
| Zoltan Bazso                | Heathrow                      |

#### Apologies

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Cllr David Hilton | Windsor and Maidenhead |
| Isobel Pastor     | DfT                    |
| Ian Jopson        | NATS                   |
| Cheryl Monk       | Heathrow               |
| Derek Provan      | 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 Matt Gorman (MG) noted that the actions from the previous meeting had been completed. Margaret Majumdar (MM) observed that the DfT had not yet sent out hard copies of the NPS documents. Sarah Bishop (SB) agreed to chase this. **ACTION SB**
- 2.2 MM asked if the NPS would be discussed at today's Forum. MG felt it would be better to focus on UK Airspace Policy today.
- 2.3 Surinderpal Suri (SS) asked who had been involved in the Community Information Report template. Richard Norman (RN) advised it had been developed and agreed through the Forum's working groups and would be reviewed in a year or two once a few reports have been issued. Nicole Porter (NP) added that a number of reports are currently in progress. Stephen Clark (SC) noted that Teddington Action Group (TAG) are meeting with Heathrow next week for further discussions on this.

## 3 DfT UK Airspace Policy

- 3.1 Sarah Bishop (SB) gave a presentation on UK Airspace Policy. The presentation can be found [here](#) and covered issues raised by the HCNF around metrics, altitude based priorities and the three tiers of airspace change. MG thought it was an impressive consultation document that marked a significant foundation.
- 3.2 MM felt there was a difficulty expressing noise levels using annual averages because easterly operations only occur for 30% of the time. She asked if another metric could be used to reflect this. SB noted this was a good point and advised that one of the roles of an Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) would be to look at metrics going forward. Richard Norman (RN) added that Heathrow already produces easterly only metrics in the new Community Information Reports and is planning to introduce these to the noise action plan contours.
- 3.3 John Coates (JC) referred to the CAA document CAP1498 "Definition of overflight" and asked for more information. Darren Rhodes (DR) summarised the proposal to use an inverted 'cone' to count overflights rather than only counting aircraft that are directly overhead. He explained that the CAA was currently looking at how to implement this into the change process which will need to look at altitude and angle of elevation thresholds. He added that the wider the cone, the more flights are captured. JC asked if the contours demonstrate westerly preference. DR responded that the contours were for an average summer day so that would reflect the fact that westerly preference is applied today.
- 3.4 Stephen Clark (SC) asked when the Transport Select Committee would discuss the two consultations. SB advised that the committee will feed into Government before decisions on the NPS and airspace policy are made. SC expressed concern at the timescales but MG observed that was for Parliament to decide. SC suggested the DfT could use Strawberry Hill as a case study for Tier 3 changes. He asked what would happen if future WHO guidance changed the goalposts. SB advised that if there were significant changes then DfT would look at that. SC also asked what sanctions and incentives would be in place to ensure the system works fairly. SB advised that the Government would have powers and the CAA was expected to have a role, it would not be left entirely to airports. However, airports know what works at a local level.

- 3.5 Rosalie James (RJ) expressed concern that the ICCAN would not be independent. SB noted that no decisions had been taken yet. She added that the purpose of setting up such a body was to improve trust, so if the proposal was not effective in this it would be looked at again. RJ asked who would make decisions about the balance between noise and carbon between 4,000 to 7,000ft. SB advised this was for the CAA as the independent regulator of airspace. Rob Beere (RBe) said he understood that the CAA wanted to limit ICCAN powers. SB responded that the Secretary of State would make the decision about powers and not the CAA. MG added that the CAA was only one voice in the debate.
- 3.6 With regards to the DfT's NPS consultation, Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans (RJE) expressed her dissatisfaction that there was no consultation event in Surrey Heath.
- 3.7 Peter Willan (PW) suggested that WebTAG, a toolkit for assessing transport schemes, was not fit for purpose. SB noted his opinion and advised that WebTAG was kept under review.
- 3.8 Wendy Matthews (WM) asked if the cost benefit analysis would include monetisation of the health impacts of overflight. SB confirmed that it would. WM asked what it meant for noise management to be carried out at a local level. SB suggested that Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) would be decided at a local level and agreed through the local planning process.

## 4 Working group updates

- 4.1 Rick Norman (RN) gave an update of progress in the Forum's two working groups. The action plan for 2017 can be found [here](#). He recapped that the first working groups of this year had laid out the plan going forward.
- 4.2 RN noted that Working Group 1 had discussed finding joint responses to the DfT consultation on Airspace Policy on areas where there was common ground, acknowledging there would be some areas where members would disagree. The group will look to identify a few members who would be interested in drafting this and presenting it back to HCNF members. He advised that the environmental directive action planning process was coming up, so the group will look to identify content for that action plan. RN was keen that the action plan was consolidated so there would only be one action plan to work from. The group will also consider organising an evening learning session to look at upcoming WHO guidance. **ACTION RN**
- 4.3 With regard to the research on respite, RN hoped the group would have a document by Easter which could be brought to the Forum to consider the next steps. He observed that the noise monitoring plans were moving forward and that Webtrak was being enhanced to 3D so the group would explore the opportunities of this. RN also announced that Fly Quiet was being relaunched to include emissions and would now be called Fly Quiet and Clean. This will be presented at the next group meeting. RN also noted that a new tool had been developed to monitor the 4% minimum climb rate (as set out in the AIP).
- 4.4 RBe suggested that NATS had reservations about introducing multiple PBN routes and SC asked if Heathrow would report back on this. MG thought this sounded inconsistent with the message Heathrow was getting from NATS but confirmed the question would be noted. **ACTION MG**

## 5 Aircraft vectoring below 4,000ft

- 5.1 Mike Glen (MGI) gave a presentation on aircraft vectoring below 4,000ft. The presentation can be found [here](#). The presentation looked at a NATS investigation into breaches of the Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) associated with Heathrow Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs). The report found that the numbers of breaches were comparatively small. A large number of breaches on the westerly Detling route were potentially due to speed control of newer, more aerodynamic aircraft types, and on the westerly Midhurst route for wide body aircraft. It was therefore possible that the problem could be solved by speed intervention.
- 5.2 Jayne Chace (JC) asked if slowing down aircraft would make them lower and louder. MGI advised this would not necessarily be the case and noted the speed reduction would only be small at around 10-15 knots. He added that these were only early days and all factors would be considered.
- 5.3 RJ asked if the NPR's could be shown on Webtrak and MGI thought this could be considered. **ACTION MGI**
- 5.4 RBe asked why the track keeping statistics quoted in the study excluded the easterly Compton route. Jane Dawes (JD) advised that this had been covered in the group before and Laura Jones (LJ) added that track keeping for individual routes was published on Heathrow's noise website [here](#).
- 5.5 Paul Conway (PC) asked at what altitude noise impact was considered to be insignificant. RN advised that this was subjective, noting that Forum members represented areas overflown at different altitudes. The reason for looking at so many different metrics was to consider this. DR observed that Heathrow occasionally receives complaints from places some distance away from the airport such as the Lake District where aircraft are at 30,000ft. So for some it's about annoyance and intrusion and for others it's about hearing an aircraft.
- 5.6 Peter Willan (PW) observed that the study showed around 2% of aircraft breached the NPR and asked what the target figure was. MGI explained that the purpose of the report was to investigate the reasons for breaches below 4,000ft and not to set a target, but thought that speed intervention should improve this figure. PW also asked when Heathrow was introducing PBN. MG explained that the timescale for airspace change was not fully defined yet but JD said that this is likely to be around 2023-24.
- 5.7 Rob Buick (RBU) asked if track keeping could be addressed by adjusting the position of the NPRs. JD advised that it was the procedure that should be adjusted and not the NPRs, noting that some of the newer aircraft types perform differently to the older ones.

## 6 CAA's Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA)

- 6.1 Darren Rhodes (DR) gave a presentation on the Survey of Noise Attitudes 2014 (SoNA 2014) commissioned by the UK Government. The presentation can be found [here](#) and the SoNA report can be found [here](#). The purpose of the survey was to obtain new evidence on attitudes to aviation noise, review how annoyance is measured and provide baseline results for future surveys. MG proposed that any questions that could not be answered during the meeting could be compiled for the next meeting. **ACTION MG**
- 6.2 SC asked how the study took easterly and westerly modes into account. DR advised that the report looked at separate modes and this was a key point in some of the conclusions.

- 6.3 John Stewart (JS) thought it was worth pointing out that there was a high correlation between the volume of complaints and a lack of respite, both close and far from Heathrow, and observed that continuous noise affects people more. DR confirmed that respite was one of the issues to take away from this, and RBe observed there was no respite from arrivals during easterly operations over his area.
- 6.4 JS noted that HACAN receive fewer complaints from areas of higher noise and thought that might be because of higher levels of noise insulation. Robert Buick (RBU) asked how social grade influenced annoyance. DR explained that the survey found that people of a higher social status were more likely to be annoyed by noise, showing that non-acoustical factors can be significant.
- 6.5 MM reiterated earlier comments about  $L_{Aeq}$  not being a suitable metric for those affected by easterly operations, noting that Ealing sometimes get up to 20 aircraft in one hour. She also doubted the methodology of asking residents during October to February about noise from the summer as they may have forgotten how annoyed they were. Kathleen Croft (KC) expressed agreement with this.
- 6.6 PW asked if the findings of the study fed into the WHO work. DR advised that WHO had gathered evidence before this study was published.
- 6.7 Surinderpal Suri (SS) asked whether annoyance was correlated with the number of events and whether it would increase with airport expansion. DR advised that annoyance was not correlated with the number of events but with noise level. He added that expansion will result in new flight paths so an individual will not necessarily be affected by more flights.
- 6.8 RBe asked for clarification on whether noise caused medical effects. DR noted that the study showed that health ratings were associated with annoyance and not noise exposure.
- 6.9 SC wondered why the report had been commissioned by DfT instead of DEFRA. DR advised that DEFRA had also been involved. SC felt that the draft Airports National Policy Statement (NPS) used evidence based on metrics that did not match social attitudes and asked how that impacted on WebTAG.

## 7 Aircraft climb performance

- 7.1 DR and Spencer Norton (SN) gave a presentation on aircraft climb performance which was originally presented at Working Group 2 on 16 February. The presentation can be found [here](#) and discusses the reasons for variation in climb performance such as aircraft type, load and atmospheric conditions.
- 7.2 MG noted that Heathrow was currently developing a steeper departure trial on the Detling 09R route and installing monitors to verify the noise impacts on the ground at different points along the route. Rachel Thomas (RT) added that this involved raising the minimum climb gradient for noise abatement purposes published in the AIP from 4% to 5%. Jane Dawes explained that this would require aircraft to maintain a minimum climb gradient for noise abatement purposes of not less than 5% from 1,000ft.

- 7.3 RBU asked how many aircraft this would affect. JD advised that this data was not currently available and Heathrow was only required to check compliance with the 4% rule. Up until now, the only way Heathrow could measure the climb rate of aircraft was to put a gate at end of an NPR to see whether aircraft reached 4,000ft. Based on this, if aircraft had reached 4,000ft by the end of the NPR they would be deemed as compliant with the 4% rule. This approach had been agreed with DfT and CAA and identified an aircraft as achieving the noise abatement climb gradient if it passed through a specific point at fixed distance and altitude from the runway at 4,000ft. However, a new tool has now been developed to monitor the climb rate more throughout the climb. This was added to the system at the start of the year and data should be available in a couple of months once a sizable data set has been collected.
- 7.4 RN added that the tool only monitors 4% and noted that other work was being done as part of the Detling 09R study to look at actual climb profiles. Rachel Thomas (RT) advised that a presentation on this had been given at Working Group 2 (available [here](#)) and the slides showed the difference between climb rate and AIP requirement. RJ asked what airlines would do if some A380s could not achieve 5%. JD responded that the trial was a result of work done in response to with the HCNF and 5% was chosen to ensure that the impact of any unintended consequences could be kept to a minimum until they were further understood. The first phase is a baseline study and the second phase will look at the impact of 5%. The longer term aspiration is to find the optimum procedure for Heathrow based on what airlines can do and what would give the maximum benefit. This would not be known until the end of the study.
- 7.5 Both SC and JC felt that 5% was unambitious and SC observed that Paris Charles de Gaulle airport has a published minimum climb rate of 6%. JD responded that the 5% study would help to understand the impact on airlines and cautioned that trialling a larger step change could have unintended consequences. MG added that many aircraft already climb steeper than this and noted that one of the unintended consequences could be that a good improvement in one community might make things worse in another. He advised that the published procedure at Paris Charles de Gaulle airport did not necessarily relate to actual climb rates achieved. MGI added that many airports do not monitor compliance with procedures. MG suggested this could be considered for a possible future agenda item. **ACTION MG**

## 8 Remit of HCNF going forward – open discussion

- 8.1 Matt Gorman opened up the meeting for a discussion about the scope of the Forum going forward. The Forum's current Terms of Reference were circulated to members before the meeting and can be found [here](#).
- 8.2 MG recounted that after the Government had announced support for expansion at Heathrow the question had been asked about whether the HCNF should include discussions about a three runway airport. From Heathrow's point of view, the principals of airspace design would apply to both a two runway airport and three runway airport. He noted that only one community group around the table had disagreed that the HCNF should consider expansion as part of the Terms of Reference. He proposed that expansion should be included but asked for any feedback to be provided before the next meeting.
- 8.3 PW asked if Heathrow was continuing to model a two runway airport and JD gave examples of work on arrivals efficiencies and the Compton route. RN added that Heathrow also needed to forecast two runway outputs over the next five years as part of the noise action planning process.

- 8.4 RJ advised that she had raised the issue because she thought it should be subject to a vote. She felt the Forum should only look at a two runway airport but would go with the majority.
- 8.5 Paul Conway (PC) suggested there should be an opportunity of a presentation slot for communities at the Forum if good notice is given. He added that the HCNF had been very enlightening and the opportunities for questions and answers were good but often limited by time. MG thought that on face value this sounded reasonable but it would be useful to define the objective of those slots. He suggested this should be picked up in the working groups. **ACTION RN**
- 8.6 MG asked for any comments on the Terms of Reference (including whether the Forum should cover issues relating to a three runway Heathrow) to be fed back over the next few weeks. He noted they were relatively long so there could be an opportunity to edit them.

## 9 AOB

- 9.1 SS noted that WHO recommended a night noise level of 40dB ( $L_{night}$ ). SB suggested this should be picked up at a future meeting. **ACTION SB**
- 9.2 SS also noted that there was a relatively low uptake of Heathrow's night noise insulation scheme. MG advised that Heathrow had put out detailed proposals for how noise insulation would be improved under third runway proposals.
- 9.3 RBe asked how more flights could be added to the London area if it was already running at capacity. SB responded that the DfT was working with NATS to look at the current airspace constraints regardless of a third runway at Heathrow. She added that it would become full at some point if airspace is not redesigned. RBe asked why Martin Rolfe from NATS had said it was already full. Dan Foster (DF) responded that airspace was full at certain times of day, such as 06:30 to 08:30, and added that NATS was looking at different ways of managing aircraft in the London area to add capacity and resilience. RBU noted that Heathrow already had 480,000 ATMs and wondered why more capacity was currently needed beyond the proposed 25,000 additional movements. DF reiterated this was also for more resilience.

## Date of next meeting

Wednesday 24th May 2017, 1pm-4pm, Heathrow Academy.