

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 22 November 2017

1:00pm – 4:00pm Compass Centre – meeting notes

Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Cllr Tony Popham	Elmbridge Borough Council
Surinderpal Suri	London Borough of Hounslow
John Coates	Richmond Council
Cllr Linda Gillham	Runnymede Borough Council
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Graham Young	South Bucks
Hannah Cook	Spelthorne Borough Council
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
John Stewart	HACAN
Gerry Ceaser	LAANC
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Andy Kershaw	British Airways
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Sarah Bishop	DfT
Rebecca Mitchell	DfT
Harri Howells	NATS
Dan Foster	NATS
Ian Jopson	NATS
John Henderson	Trax
Geoff Clark	Virgin Atlantic
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Pete Rafano	Heathrow
Richard Norman	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Apologies	
Cllr Carol Manduca	Runnymede Borough Council
Cllr Conrad Sturt	Surrey Heath
Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans	Surrey Heath
Kathleen Croft	Stanwell Moor Residents Association
Jayne Chace	Teddington Action Group
Robin Clarke	NATS
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Christine Taylor	HASRA

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 **Provide name of ANMAC technical adviser:** This has been done.
- 2.3 **There were two actions around Noise Abatement Departure Profiles (NADP):** Darren Rhodes (DR) has provided a written response which will be circulated with the meeting notes. David Gilbert (DG) added that Lmax contours should also be provided.
ACTION DR
- 2.4 **Take a deeper look at SoNA in the working groups:** This will be considered for next year due to diary availability.
- 2.5 **There were two actions around an Independent technical advisor** – to provide an initial response and to discuss at the working groups. This was done and is an agenda item at this meeting.
- 2.6 **Availability of ICAO PBN literature review:** Ian Jopson (IJ) advised that he now had the authority to release this. However, he proposed that a summary should be produced for circulation as the document is quite lengthy and currently only a draft. MG agreed that a summary sounded sensible and that Heathrow should aim to share this before the next meeting. **ACTION RN**
- 2.7 **Look at using Twitter to forecast the night runway and to provide reasons for end changes:** Cheryl Monk (CM) advised that the procedures were being put in place and should be implemented in December. This means that more information will be provided about which runway will be used at night and any disruption to operations, something that residents have been asking for.
- 2.8 There is one addendum to the previous meeting notes from 20 Sep 2017. Teddington Action Group (TAG) requested a change to the notes as they referred to PA Consulting instead of NLR (para 5.6). This has now been corrected online and is available [here](#).

3 Airspace update

- 3.1 Jane Dawes (JD) gave an update on both the modernisation of UK airspace in the South East of England programme known as 'Future Airspace Strategy Implementation (South) FASI-S, and also Heathrow's airspace consultation for the proposed expansion of Heathrow. The presentation is available [here](#). She explained that the UK's airspace is currently operating close to full capacity and needs to be modernised to meet the challenges of the 21st century and beyond. This will involve moving from ground based beacons to satellite technology known as Performance Based Navigation (PBN). This is planned for implementation in 2024.
- 3.2 JD recapped on Heathrow's expansion airspace consultation plans starting with the first consultation expected in the first quarter of 2018. This consultation will identify a set of key principles to help shape and underpin the design and structure of Heathrow's airspace. Feedback will be sought on these principles and the trade-offs that come with airspace design, such as the concentration or sharing of noise. These trade-offs will inform potential design options for shaping Heathrow's future airspace.

- 3.3 David Hilton (DH) highlighted a statement in the presentation which stated that modelling carried out by both the Airports Commission (AC) and CAA has shown that it is possible to significantly reduce the number of people affected by noise while increasing the number of flights at Heathrow. MG observed this was published by the AC a couple of years ago but noted that it was based on average noise contours and he acknowledged that average noise contours were not the last word on the matter. Rob Buick (RB) thought the AC evidence was totally flawed but MG argued that it was still factually accurate based on the indicative flight paths used. JD understood the concerns, but explained that it was a complex process to get through an airspace change process which should address those concerns. Peter Willan (PW) also felt the AC analysis was flawed in its 'do-minimum' and 'do-something' work and was concerned that the NPS referred to those studies.
- 3.4 RB suggested that if Heathrow expansion does not take place then there would be no need for airspace modernisation. JD explained that airspace modernisation across the UK was mandated regardless of Heathrow expansion because the growth was still forecasted for other airports and it was necessary to move away from ground based navigation. RB asked what would happen in the event of a satellite outage. JD advised that Heathrow was working with NATS to ensure a solution is in place but that safety was always to priority
- 3.5 Stephen Clark (SC) asked when the consultations would take place. MG advised that the first consultation would take place in the first part of next year and further updates will be given at future meetings.

4 DfT Airspace Policy and Air Navigation Guidance

- 4.1 Sarah Bishop (SB) and Rebecca Mitchell (RM) from DfT gave a presentation on the new Airspace Policy and Air Navigation Guidance that was published in October. The presentation is available [here](#).
- 4.2 SB and RM discussed the main findings from the DfT consultation which ran from 2 February to 25 May 2017, noting that communities particularly welcomed the proposals on noise metrics, options analysis and creating a new independent noise body (ICCAN) which will be set up in Spring 2018. The industry was also supportive of the proposals and felt that they would support airspace modernisation. They explained that the DfT have also made some revisions to the proposed policies following feedback from the consultation.
- 4.3 SB also gave a brief update on the NPS and advised that there had been a large response to the first NPS consultation and encouraged people to look at the materials for the second NPS consultation which closes on 19 December 2017.
- 4.4 Margaret Majumdar (MM) asked how the ICCAN chair would be appointed and be seen as independent. SB advised this was being worked on and suggested one option might be to have one industry representative and one community representative, although this was yet to be decided. She acknowledged that the DfT was very keen to do this in the right way. David Hilton (DH) noted that ICCAN would be established as an advisory Non-Departmental Public Body of DfT and asked what this meant. SB explained that ICCAN would be part of the DfT for pay and ration purposes, but it would have full independence in terms of setting its work programme. It would only be accountable to the Secretary of State in terms of meeting its Terms of Reference.
- 4.5 RB asked how carbon dioxide emissions would fit within this strategy. SB said the DfT recognised the need for an updated domestic carbon policy and would be taking this forward.

- 4.6 PW suggested that future consultations should not have separate chapters for environmental and economic topics. SB advised that she expected it would be structured in that way.
- 4.7 PW observed that the DfT forecast was based on the number of Heathrow flights increasing sharply as soon as the third runway is opened whereas Heathrow has said it would introduce additional flights gradually. SB confirmed this point had been raised many times and although the DfT is aware of the proposal for phasing the scheme the runway being fully available on day one was the best planning assumption available at the time.
- 4.8 David Gilbert (DG) noted that the presentation stated that mitigating noise was the environmental priority from 4000ft to 7000ft and asked about altitudes below that. SB explained that noise was already a priority below 4000ft.

5 Independent technical advisor update

- 5.1 Following discussions at the HCNF working groups about appointing an independent technical advisor to work with the HCNF, Rick Norman (RN) presented some initial thoughts on what the role might be and who might fill the position. His presentation is available [here](#). RN proposed that a broad scope should be agreed through the working groups before looking at the finer detail. He advised that a broad set of skills would be required so the role might be suitable for a single person.
- 5.2 SC advised that the community groups had originally planned to present proposed Terms of Reference for a PBN study and protocols on how an independent consultant might work between the community groups and Heathrow. However, he felt that the revised draft NPS gives serious cause for concern that the research could be a wasted effort. He noted that the NPS would have primacy over noise planning issues and wondered if there was any point having a joint discussion on PBN when it looked as though some decisions had already been made. He asked if the analysis was only based on concentrated flight paths and wanted to know what research had been carried out on previous implementation of concentrated flight paths in urban areas. He also wanted to know if the analysis of numbers affected would limit potential flight path scenarios such as respite even if this increased the number of people within the 54dB contour, and whether new metrics would be used when considering flight path options.
- 5.3 SB advised that the text in the revised draft NPS should not be seen as the Government having a policy on concentration. She explained that full options analysis would have to take place, noting that options for respite seemed likely for any Heathrow changes. She added that a suitable range of metrics would be used and noted that it would not be the NPS that decides the number of people affected. The average noise metric had been updated from 57dB to 54dB as it was felt that if an average metric was to be used this was the most important one.
- 5.4 SC explained that using average noise metrics would not properly reflect any increase in flights on the Detling route even if aircraft got quieter. MM added that any increase in flights over Ealing would be unbearable. SC also expressed concern about concentration of flight paths and the possibility of creating 'noise canyons'. MG noted his concerns and appreciated that what might work in a rural area might not work in an urban area.
- 5.5 Tony Popham (TP) advised that Elmbridge Council supported dispersal within the corridor and wanted this to be supported by their MP Dominic Raab. Linda Gillham (LG) echoed TP's comments and noted that Runnymede Council also favours dispersal.

- 5.6 DH said the Appraisal of Sustainability stated that 92,000 people would be newly affected. He felt the figure was misleading and suggested that ranges should be used. SB advised that there were many other figures in the report and the DFT's approach is normally to use ranges.
- 5.7 DH was very supportive of the idea of appointing a technical advisor. JS added that he was reassured by comments from SB and MG. He was confident it was possible to move forward on these issues and suggested it would be good to look at PBN first. JS and MM both agreed that it would be important to have the same individual coming to all the meetings. MM added that the adviser should have experience of working with all stakeholders on all sides of an issue. SC thought that all the topics proposed by RN were worth looking at.
- 5.8 SC mentioned the approach taken by Gatwick Airport and RN offered to contact the names that Heathrow had put forward to see if they could attend one of the working groups including To70 to see if they could articulate the process used at Gatwick.
ACTION RN
- 5.9 RN proposed continuing discussions at the next working group meetings in December. However, some members thought this was too soon and wanted the community groups to meet first to discuss this further. MG asked the community groups to report back to RN on this. MG wanted to reiterate and make the group aware that Heathrow was not holding this up and was keen to keep it moving but respected the wishes of members to have some more time to take this forward.

6 Comp-Air demonstration

- 6.1 Harri Howells (HH) gave a demonstration of a tool called Comp-Air. The presentation is available [here](#). Comp-Air allows users to design new flight routes and see what the effect of changes to the design of the route would make to elements such as population overflown or noise footprint. HH explained that this will be looked at in more detail at HCNF working group 7th December.
- 6.2 RB asked if the tool was web-based. HH advised that it was not web-based yet but NATS was looking at the possibility of rolling this out.
- 6.3 DG asked if it was possible to model the effects of increased flight numbers or quieter aircraft. HH observed that a number of add-ons had been proposed but explained that if too many parameters were introduced it would be difficult to see what was affecting what. DG asked if Comp-Air was based on modelled data. HH confirmed that it was based on the ANCON model. DG expressed concerns over the accuracy of ANCON, for example for A320's, and asked if there was any progress on improving the model. DR confirmed work was in progress. However, he observed that Comp-Air was a tool for comparison and HH confirmed it was good for comparison purposes. SC asked if it was possible to superimpose routes. HH responded that it only looked at single routes, noting that adding multiple routes to the tool would confuse matters.

7 AOB

- 7.1 MG observed that this was originally intended to be a community slot, but this would now be used for questions.

- 7.2 PW repeated a question from previous meetings regarding the potential increase in noise energy due to the weight of the fleet at Heathrow. RN responded that the noise assessment each year takes account of that, so any significant change would come through in the results. DR added that the fleet also changes in terms of technology and aircraft in the fleet being changed, so it would be wrong to focus on weight alone. PW felt that increasing the number of passengers on an aircraft from 160 to 200 could have a huge impact. DR explained that, as mentioned before, fuel load was far more significant than passenger weight.
- 7.3 DG asked if the 2016 noise contours had been published. RN advised that they should be out in the next couple of weeks, explaining that work at the CAA had been delayed due to the collapse of Monarch Airlines. MG added that he would raise this with CAA formally as it is nearly the end of 2017 and it has taken a long time. **ACTION MG**
- 7.4 MM asked how the HCNF would engage with the Community Engagement Board (CEB) which is currently being set up. Cheryl Monk (CM) provided some background on the CEB, explaining that setting up the CEB was a recommendation of the Airports Commission and was included in the draft NPS. Heathrow has been talking with the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HACC) about building on the strength of that committee and morphing it into the CEB. She noted that the current HACC chair would be standing down and she hoped a new chair would be recruited early next year. She advised that the new chair would have a role in how the CEB and HCNF work together. JS added that the CEB would be similar to the HACC but with more powers, oversight and responsibility.
- 7.5 Gerry Ceaser (GC) adding that a considerable amount of work had been done by the HACC on this. Broad principles have been established on how the CEB should work and discussions were in progress about sub committees that could sit beneath this, including potentially the HCNF.
- 7.6 RB asked for an update on when the SoNA night time report would be available. DR explained that timescales had slipped while he team had worked on the Monarch Airlines repatriation. He noted that it was high on his list but could not commit to a timetable.

8 Working Group updates

- 8.1 **Steeper departure trial:** John Henderson (JH) gave an update on the steeper departure trial on one of Heathrow's departure routes. The presentation is available online [here](#).
- 8.2 He advised that local communities had asked Heathrow to raise the departure climb gradient so an operational trial was being carried out to understand the impact of making such a change. He advised that from 4 January 2018 all easterly departures on the Detling route will be issued with the steeper route for the duration of the trial which will run for 12 months. The trial increases the gradient required between 1000ft and 4000ft from 4% to 5%. JH stressed that during the trial aircraft will fly a gradient of at least 5%, noting that many aircraft are already much higher than this.
- 8.3 John Coates (JC) asked if all of the noise monitors being used for the trial were within the 3km departure route swathe. RN explained that the point of the monitors was to compare levels at different locations, not just to measure noise overhead.
- 8.4 DG asked how aircraft would achieve the higher gradient. Spencer Norton (SN) explained that it would be coded into the aircraft's flight management computer, adding that the ability for an aircraft to make that constraint would depend on its weight.

- 8.5 SC asked how the data would be presented. MG advised that a range of metrics would be used depending on what members would like to see. NP added that this could include changes in Lmax or different times of day depending on the questions being asked.
- 8.6 **Webtrak NPR overlay:** Pete Rafano (PR) gave a demonstration of a new feature in WebTrak which will show Heathrow's Noise Preferential Routes(NPRs) and will provide details of aircraft that fly outside the NPRs below 4,000ft. He advised that violations would be displayed within 20 minutes of occurring. The presentation was well received and the tool is planned for launch in the first quarter of 2018.
- 8.7 **Noise Action Plan progress:** RN gave an update on work to prepare a new Noise Action Plan (NAP) for Heathrow for the period 2019-2023. The presentation is available here. He advised that work would continue through the working groups in December before a new draft NAP goes to public consultation next year.
- 8.8 DG observed that expansion proposals included a 3.5° glide slope and displaced thresholds, and asked if these were included in the NAP. MG advised that the new NAP was only for the period 2019-2023, explaining that what DG had described would be part of the consultation for a third runway.
- 8.9 DG asked if displaced thresholds could be introduced now. RN explained that a lot of reconfiguration would be required to make that possible. MG confirmed that it would require significant redesign of the airport at a very significant cost, so this was being combined with expansion proposals. DG suggested this could be done as a do-nothing scenario. MG said he understood DG's point, but noted that Heathrow was assuming it was working towards a third runway. RN added that the NAP included slightly steeper approaches, however the 3.5° glide slope was a 2050 assumption so it would not be included within the NAP for 2019-2023.

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 24th January 2018, 1pm-4pm, [Heathrow Academy / Compass Centre TBC](#).