

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 24 May 2017

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

Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Gerry Ceaser	LAANC
Graham Young	South Bucks
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 Buick	Englefield Green
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow Council
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Spencer Norton	BA
Darren Rhodes	CAA
David Elvy	DfT
Sarah Bishop	DfT
Faith Wilkinson	DfT
Dan Foster	NATS
Robin Clarke	NATS
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Mike Glen	Heathrow
Pete Rafano	Heathrow
Rachel Thomas	Heathrow
Richard Norman	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Zoltan Bazso	Heathrow

Apologies

Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Hannah Cook	Spelthorne Borough Council
Rosalie James	AN3V
Geoff Clark	Virgin Atlantic

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 went through the actions from the previous meeting. These are summarised below.
- 2.2 **Chase DfT for hard copies of the NPS documents:** These have now been sent out.
- 2.3 **Consider an evening learning session on upcoming World Health Organisation (WHO) guidance:** MG suggested looking at doing this once the guidance is out later this year.
- 2.4 **Discuss WHO night noise recommendations:** This should also be looked at in conjunction with the upcoming guidance.
- 2.5 **Consider showing Noise Preferential Routes (NPR) on Webtrak:** Pete Rafano (PR) has asked Bruel & Kjaer to investigate some options and provide costings. These costings are expected next month.
- 2.6 **Schedule an agenda item on climb rates:** This is on today's agenda.
- 2.7 **Follow-up questions for Darren Rhodes after last HCNF presentation:** Written responses have been provided and are included with the meeting notes.
- 2.8 **Respond to comments regarding NATS stance on multiple PBN route:** NATS have advised that they are not against multiple PBN routes but cautioned that there is no "one-size-fits-all" solution.
- 2.9 **Opportunities for community presentation slots:** This was originally proposed by Paul Conway (PC) and he will present his thoughts later in the meeting. The suggestion was discussed at last month's working groups and there was broad agreement to introduce this to the agenda as required.

3 Airspace consultation update

- 3.1 MG proposed that airspace consultation updates should be a standing item for future forums as it was essential members were kept up to date on this issue.
- 3.2 Rachel Thomas (RT) gave a presentation on the airspace change process. (The presentation can be found [here](#).) She provided a timetable for the Development Consent Order (DCO) application and Airspace Change Process (ACP). The ACP will take place in three stages covering design principles, design envelopes and flight path options. Later this year Heathrow will run a 12-week consultation on both the DCO and airspace.
- 3.3 Stephen Clark (SC) wanted to know at what stage the environmental impact assessment would be done. RT advised there would be various stages during the process. Jayne Chace (JC) asked what would happen if the consultation concluded that there should be no third runway. Cheryl Monk (CM) explained that the purpose of Heathrow's consultations was not to decide on a third runway but to consult on how it should be delivered. She explained that the Government's NPS, when designated, will establish the need for the expansion of Heathrow

- 3.4 RT explained that the introduction of Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA) and the review of the Compton departure route have been identified as priority projects for implementing prior to expansion and these will be consulted on later this year. CM reminded members that a presentation on IPA was given to the HCNF in November 2016. It has the potential to reduce the number of TEAM arrivals (Tactically Enhanced Arrivals Measures), i.e. when both runways are used simultaneously for arrivals to clear major backlogs of flights waiting to land. RT explained that the Compton easterly route is not flown as published in the Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) and the CAA have asked for it to be fixed. RT explained that there are longstanding issues with the Compton route on easterly operations which has led to NATS making procedural changes in 2014. The CAA has asked for the issues, on which the HCNF has been briefed on a number of occasions, to be fixed. This will require a new route to be introduced.
- 3.5 David Hilton (DH) observed that both IPA and the new Compton route would require the use of Performance Based Navigation (PBN) so residents would experience the effects of concentrated PBN routes before the new runway was constructed.
- 3.6 SC thought it would be useful to identify areas around the world where PBN has been successfully implemented, as he thought there was nowhere in the world that this was the case. MG advised that the US was further ahead but that the introduction of PBN there had been challenged by residents. He explained that Heathrow is keen to explore how to use PBN to deliver efficiency to the industry and also tackle noise issues, and said that Heathrow was the first airport to look at using multiple routes to do this. SC noted that Heathrow was entitled to be a profitable business but the onus should be on the DfT and CAA to look at the implications of PBN. Darren Rhodes (DR) observed that Amsterdam's Schiphol Airport has used PBN over communities and this is an example of where it operates today. In different countries it has been implemented in different ways with different degrees of consultation and success. SC noted there must be people living under those concentrated Schiphol routes and the implications of this for Heathrow should be looked at. He thought that PBN had led to legal cases in other countries and that is was described as an environmental disaster in Sydney. He observed that residents in Teddington had experienced PBN during the airspace trials in 2014 and felt the industry was in denial about its impact on populated areas, adding that those under concentrated routes should be entitled to have their house bought so they can move. MG advised that PBN was a global requirement and Heathrow was trying to find the most balanced way to introduce it.

4 Community presentation slot overview

- 4.1 Following a proposal by Paul Conway (PC) at the last HCNF that there should be a slot for community groups & stakeholders at the Forum, PC presented his thoughts on this. He proposed this slot should be available as and when groups had something to present. He suggested slots should be 30 minutes long followed by 15 minutes for a Q&A session. He suggested that communities should work together. He hoped that groups would be able to employ an independent expert where necessary and asked if Heathrow would consider funding this. MG said he was happy in principle to discuss the idea. However, he noted that previous independent experts had been collectively agreed by the group and cautioned against creating a 'them and us' situation. PC thought there was a degree of mistrust which could be overcome by doing this. He proposed that community representatives should meet before the next Forum to work together on content. SB observed that the creation of an Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) would provide an independent expert at the forum. MG noted that this would be a significant addition to the group but is some time off.

- 4.2 John Stewart (JS) thought it would also be interesting for particular groups to make presentations about the issues in their own community. SC felt that there was enough common ground between communities to make it worthwhile for community representatives to work together on content. JS felt that both approaches would work. For example, community groups close to Heathrow may want to discuss ground noise but other groups wouldn't know enough about that.
- 4.3 Christine Taylor (CT) observed that she and Kathleen Croft (KC) were from some of the communities most affected by both ground and air noise and was frustrated that the Forum was often dominated by issues affecting those further away from the airport. She felt that complaints about ground noise hadn't been properly investigated by Heathrow.
- 4.4 Rick Norman (RN) advised that Heathrow's action plan includes plans to deliver a strategy around ground noise including monitoring. CT felt it was not appropriate to carry out night time engine testing close to a populated area and suggested that such tests should be part of a ban on night flights. MG agreed that the forum was for all communities around Heathrow and advised that her complaints about ground noise would be looked into. **ACTION RW**
- 4.5 Peter Willan (PW) added that he felt the forum was often dominated by departures and there had been much less discussion about arrivals.

5 Climb gradients

- 5.1 Mike Glen (MGI) and Pete Rafano (PR) gave a presentation about climb gradients. The presentation can be found [here](#).
- 5.2 MGI summarised the findings from a previous study of published climb gradients at 42 international airports, noting that those with steeper climb gradients had restrictions associated with them and were not cited as being for environmental reasons.
- 5.3 An update on the steeper departure trial was given. This will see the minimum noise climb gradient on the easterly Detling route increased from 4% to 5% in 2018. A rate of 5% was chosen as the 'best fit' for all aircraft types, weights and conditions, with the aim of tackling the lowest and largest aircraft types. The study will look for any potential unintended consequences such as the effect on noise levels and emissions. MG added that monitoring had shown a decrease in the average height of the lowest departures at specific distances so Heathrow was conducting this trial to increase climb gradients and monitor noise levels to measure the effect.
- 5.4 Stephen Clark (SC) observed that most flights were already achieving 5% so increasing the minimum rate to 5% was not enough. MG said he was cautious of making changes that could have unintended consequences, especially after lessons learned from the 2014 trials. SC also requested a response to a Teddington Action Group (TAG) dossier. **ACTION MG**
- 5.5 PR discussed Heathrow's new Climb Gradient Tool (CGT) which was recently introduced to more accurately monitor departures against the minimum climb gradient of 4%. Following work with BA on their A380 performance, the airline has now revised the departure profile. This has seen an improvement of approximately 98% of these aircraft now achieving the 4% climb gradient. As a result of this, BA's A380 aircraft are now around 400ft higher once they reach the equivalent distance of Twickenham. Margaret Majumdar (MM) asked if a chart showing Ealing could be provided. **ACTION PR**

- 5.6 Darren Rhodes (DR) informed the group that he has been commissioned by DfT to look at departure noise in totality. He reminded the group that making departures higher would not necessarily make them quieter because of changes to thrust or speed, so it was a complex issue. He hoped to incorporate the effects of Heathrow's departure trial in his work. John Stewart (JS) asked is this was a national piece of work or just around Heathrow. DR advised it was generic but would clearly be focussed towards heavier aircraft because of noise. Rob Buick (RB) asked when the night noise study would be published. DR responded that the night noise SoNA was currently in progress and he was in discussions with the peer reviewers.

6 Respite research

- 6.1 Nicole Porter (NP) gave a progress update on the research currently underway to develop Heathrow's knowledge of respite. She advised that an information pack was being developed and the Respite Working Group (RWG) would be reconvened to consider priorities and make recommendations based on the research.
- 6.2 Peter Willan (PW) noted that the consequence of respite was that two or more flight paths would be required. JC asked why the study only looked the hours of 07:00 to 23:00. RN advised that this was just the first stage of the work.
- 6.3 JS felt that it was an excellent piece of work. He advised that the findings should be released with caveats as the context was important. It was agreed that the presentation would not be published yet, but would be circulated to the group. MG asked members not to use the document until there was a framework around it.

7 Airspace policy consultation statement of common ground

- 7.1 RN updated the group on the preparation of a joint submission to the Government's UK Airspace Policy consultation. The submission was developed in conjunction with some of the Forum members and will be submitted as a response from those members who choose to put their name to it, rather than from the HCNF as a whole. JS added that the submission would be additional to the individual responses of members and it only covered areas where common ground had been found.
- 7.2 David Hilton (DH) said he had attended the meeting where this response had been prepared and he commended the open discussion at the meeting. He noted that the HCNF sometimes felt more confrontational in comparison because of the "industry vs community" layout. He recalled a previous workshop on Compton route design principals which has also worked well, although that had split the community from the industry and he felt it would have been better to mix the groups up for better dialogue between the parties.

8 Development proposal for Noise Action Plan 2019-2023

- 8.1 RN advised the group of the requirement to develop a Noise Action Plan for 2019-2023. (The presentation can be found [here](#)). Heathrow's current NAP runs until 2018. He explained that this work would be taken to the working groups to find consensus on the content for a draft NAP. This would go to public consultation in 2018 before submission to DEFRA for approval and adoption. Next month's working groups will look at quieter planes and quieter procedures.

9 AOB

- 9.1 MGI informed the group that phase two of the Slightly Steeper Approach starts tomorrow and will run until October. This will see some aircraft landing at 3.2° instead of 3.0°. He noted that more information will be available on the noise website [here](#). Cheryl Monk (CM) added that this was a repeat of the previous trial to gather data during warm months.
- 9.2 NP advised that the latest Community Information Reports for monitors located at Strawberry Hill House and NPL had not been published yet as there were some final points to resolve with TAG. Reports for other areas have now been prepared and will be discussed with local community groups.
- 9.3 MM observed that Heathrow's consultation later this year would take place before Parliament had decided on whether to approve a third runway. She asked if Heathrow was already writing the consultation documents. MG confirmed that the airport was developing its thinking on this. He pointed out that this was additional to the statutory consultations but felt it was valuable to do. He concluded that it was a complex picture but Heathrow would try to make the process as clear as possible.

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 19th July 2017, 1pm-4pm, Heathrow Academy.