

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 30 January 2019

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

Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Darl Sweetland	Buckinghamshire County Council
Luisa Sullivan	Buckinghamshire County Council
Cllr Peter Szanto	Elmbridge
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow
John Coates	Richmond
Cllr Conrad Sturt	Surrey Heath
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
Rob Beere	AN3V
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
Tim Walker	Forest Hill Society
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Armelle Thomas	HASRA
Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Kathleen Croft	Spelthorne resident
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Andy Kershaw	British Airways
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Sarah Bishop	DfT
Tim May	DfT
Gary Marshall	DfT
James Trow	Noise Consultants Ltd
Connor Daly	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Lisa Forshev	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow

Apologies

Geoff Clark	Virgin Atlantic
Dr Maureen Korda	Plane Hell Action
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Stuart Price	NATS
John Stewart	HACAN

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 **Explain more about health impact assessments at next meeting (2.11):** MG advised that how this fits into the timeline will be explained later in the meeting.
- 2.3 **Amendment to previous meeting notes (2.12):** MG confirmed that the notes have been amended and are available to download [here](#).
- 2.4 **Explain consultation timeline and ACP/DCO process (4.5):** MG noted that this is on today's agenda.
- 2.5 **Respond to presentation by Teddington Action Group (TAG) on Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA) (10.2):** MG confirmed that a response was sent out last month and copied to forum members.
- 2.6 **Respond to Peter Willan's presentation (11.2):** MG noted that a response had been sent out and copied to members.
- 2.7 **Circulate presentations in advance where possible (12.2):** MG confirmed that all materials were circulated in advance, with the first presentations going out on 28 January and the last ones on the morning of the meeting.

3 Community slot

- 3.1 MG handed the meeting over to Paul Conway (PC) to chair the community slot. MG noted that some of the material had only arrived earlier in the day, so Heathrow would be in listening mode. He noted that some large issues were going to be covered and suggested some of them may be better dealt with through the working group. He advised he would discuss this further with PC after the meeting. **ACTION MG**
- 3.2 PC asked presenters to stay within their timeframe and apologised to members who had been unable to put their points across at the last meeting. He also apologised to Rob Beere (RBe) that the issue of aircraft heights over Lightwater was not on today's agenda. He acknowledged that Heathrow had asked for this to be included and hoped RBe would accept it being covered at the next meeting. **ACTION RW**

4 Community slot: SoNA vs WHO

- 4.1 David Gilbert (DG) gave a presentation looking at the CAA's Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA) and the latest World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines on behalf of the Community Noise Group (CNG). The presentation is available [here](#).
- 4.2 The presentation raised a number of questions aimed at the DfT. Sarah Bishop (SB) noted that this was the first time she had seen the presentation, but she would be happy to respond in writing or have a separate meeting to discuss further. DG asked for a separate meeting at the DfT. **ACTION SB**

- 4.3 Tim May (TM) assured DG that the DfT was looking at the WHO report and how it will apply in a UK context. He advised that they would not take everything at face value, noting that there were some caveats and there had been some criticism about the methodology from academics. He observed that the WHO report advises that locally derived results should be used when considering policy, so when looking at studies from other parts of the world it was important to look at their context. He also noted that some of the WHO data was based on older research than DfT was using today. He explained that the DfT has an inter-governmental group on costs and benefits of noise which examines evidence and they will look at the WHO report to consider whether webTAG needs to be changed as a result. DG asked if this meeting could be observed. TM responded that he wouldn't normally expect internal government meetings to be observed but he would be happy to ask the question. **ACTION TM**
- 4.4 In reference to using a LOAEL (lowest observed adverse effect level) of 51dB LAeq, TM advised that the LOAEL used is based on the SoNA study. He explained that it was national policy for all airspace changes across the UK, not just for Heathrow. He added that the DfT was not saying there were no effects below that level but cautioned that the accuracy drops when measuring noise exposure below 51dB.

5 Community slot: Airspace design principles - minimising significant adverse impacts from noise

- 5.1 Stephen Clark (SC) and David Hilton (DH) gave a presentation calling for the CAA's decision to approve Heathrow's Gateway 1 Airspace Change Application to be reviewed, Heathrow's design envelopes to be revised, the webTAG model to be updated and independent health and wellbeing research to be commissioned. The presentation is available [here](#).
- 5.2 DH stressed that the community groups were trying to bring balance to Heathrow's ambitions without having teeth or technical support. MG responded that it was in Heathrow's interest to listen to the community response in relation to airspace change. He acknowledged that communities have a critical role to play and noted that the appointment of an independent advisor would help with technical expertise. He added that a commissioner had now been appointed to lead the newly established Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) and suggested he could be invited to the forum to talk about how he sees his role. **ACTION RW**
- 5.3 DH referred to respite research carried out by Anderson Acoustics, claiming there was no tangible outcome from the work and asking DfT if they would commission research to look at the lateral separation required to provide respite. Nicole Porter (NP) of Anderson Acoustics advised that she had presented the key findings from the second phase of the respite research, noting that a full report would be published in due course, supplemented with more detailed noise analysis. SB added that the DfT's airspace and noise engagement group would be meeting soon and she would be happy to put this forward to them as possible research. **ACTION SB**
- 5.4 Robert Buick (RBu) asked Heathrow to remember the reaction to the 2014 airspace trials when considering airspace change going forward. PC added that the concentrated flight paths used in the trials had led to public outcry, protests and meetings. He stressed that the thought of waiting for an allotted four hours of concentration in the future was abhorrent and the DfT must listen to the communities on this issue.

- 5.5 MG acknowledged this was helpful feedback which got to the heart of the issue. He recalled that in 2011, well before the trials, Heathrow had submitted a joint response along with British Airways, NATS and HACAN to the Government's consultation on a sustainable framework for UK aviation on the potential challenges of concentration and the need to provide respite. He noted that the 2014 trials, while badly implemented, were born from a good intent to trial the technology. He explained that Performance Based Navigation (PBN) is being introduced around the world and Heathrow is required to introduce it too. He acknowledged that a pure form of concentration was not the right answer and Heathrow was looking for the best possible way to use the technology, such as having a number of different routes to provide respite. He stressed that this was why Heathrow was engaging so much on this topic.
- 5.6 Surinderpal Suri (SS) proposed introducing a template to capture key questions and show how they have been answered. MG thought this was a good idea and suggested calling it an issues/questions log or tracker. However, he noted that while it was incumbent on Heathrow to provide answers, a distinction should be drawn between a question not being answered and an answer being provided but not being liked. Peter Willan (PW) observed that he had been through the old meeting notes and appreciated the work that had been done, noting that action points were well captured and in most cases covered by the next meeting. However, he noted the process could get less transparent when topics became older or were transferred to the working group, so an issues tracker would help with that. **ACTION RW**

6 Community slot: Unanswered Questions for Heathrow, CAA and Government

- 6.1 CNG members presented questions to the forum on the topics of PBN, respite and a local noise objective. These are available to download [here](#). MG noted that Heathrow had received these questions a few days ago so a written response was currently being drafted and would be sent out shortly. **ACTION JD**
- 6.2 SC noted that the question on PBN had mostly been covered but a formal response would be welcomed. Jane Dawes (JD) observed that PBN had not been particularly well undertaken in the US, citing San Francisco where a lack of awareness had been a major factor and even the airport had not known it was being implemented. She contrasted this with Heathrow's approach of regular engagement with communities including consultation events and HCNF meetings. She added that US residents were now starting to recognise some of the benefits of PBN and some community groups were now asking airport operators to equip aircraft for PBN to provide more accurate and predictable procedures.
- 6.3 MG noted that Heathrow had already answered the question around the proposed local noise objective and its position was not going to change, adding that this was a good example of the difference between an unanswered question and not liking the answer. PW did not accept Heathrow's rejection of the proposed local noise objective, but Lisa Forshew (LF) pointed out that the proposal would effectively maximise the impact for newly affected people and this went against the positive feedback Heathrow had received about minimising the number of people newly overflowed.

7 Airspace and Future Operations Consultation

- 7.1 JD and Xavier Oh (XO) gave members an overview of Heathrow's current Airspace and Future Operations Consultation which runs for eight weeks from 8 January until 4 March 2019. The presentation is available [here](#). The consultation is seeking views on: Heathrow's future runway operations; airspace change for an expanded Heathrow; and airspace change to make better use of Heathrow's existing two runways. JD explained that the purpose of the consultation is to take feedback on the proposals and she urged people to attend an event and engage in the consultation material.
- 7.2 JD explained that the consultation presents 'design envelopes' which are the geographic areas within which future flight paths could be positioned. She advised that the design envelopes did not necessarily mean that flight paths would be positioned over the whole area. She explained that new arrival routes for Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA) would only be used until the third runway and the airspace associated with it was implemented. She advised that Heathrow was looking to introduce IPA in the context of the airport's current cap of 480,000 Air Traffic Movements (ATMs) per year. She added that Heathrow was not currently applying for any additional movements, but any future application for a further 25,000 ATMs would be consulted on and applied for through the Development Consent Order (DCO) process.
- 7.3 JD also mentioned the Compton departure route on easterly operations, noting that Heathrow would like to make changes to address the issues with the easterly Compton route by considering the options for a new departure route. This will require Heathrow to go through the CAA's airspace change process and to start this process Heathrow will be engaging this year with an aim to implement a new departure procedure in 2022.
- 7.4 MM asked if IPA would continue in perpetuity with 480,000 ATMs if the third runway was not approved. JD explained that it would continue until any further applications were made.
- 7.5 Tim Walker (TW) advised that there was an appetite for residents to attend consultation events locally but there were not enough events. Cheryl Monk (CM) advised that Heathrow had tried to select consultation events in as wide an area as possible over the designated consultation zone. She added that Heathrow was also offering agile pop-up events including a Q&A event with the MP for Lewisham.
- 7.6 DG asked why no data was presented for the number of flights above 60dB in the design envelopes for expansion. JD explained that Heathrow had used 65dB as a measure for daytime operations. More detail on night time operations will be presented once more is known about runway arrangements.
- 7.7 DG also asked if Heathrow had looked at managing demand before 07:00 by pushing flights back before 07:00. JD advised that IPA would allow Heathrow to better manage demand between 06:00 and 07:00 by enabling slightly additional capacity in that hour within the existing 480,000 ATM cap, so it would allow Heathrow to consider moving flights from before 06:00 or those in the late evening into that hour.
- 7.8 SC presumed the possible additional 25,000 ATMs would be subject to economic appraisal and asked why they were not included in the application for the National Policy Statement (NPS). SB advised that it had not been included in the NPS so they had not done the analysis, adding that it was up to Heathrow to propose the additional movements and associated mitigations.

- 7.9 RBe stated that WHO guidelines recommended a 10-hour ban on night flights and this was not being followed by Heathrow. TM advised that these were only guidelines and did not take account of the cost of implementing such a proposal. He was not aware of any airport in the world that had a 10-hour night flight ban and said the DfT felt that 6.5 hours was an appropriate balance.
- 7.10 Graham Young (GY) asked for clarification on whether the proposed 6.5-hour night flight ban would mean there would be no aircraft moving during that period. SB responded that the removal of night quota was one of the options. GY asked for clarification that this would mean no landings during the night flight ban period unless there was an emergency. SB confirmed that would be the policy if night quota was removed. MG added that Heathrow was currently consulting on how the 6.5-hour scheduled night flights ban would operate.
- 7.11 Luisa Sullivan (LS) observed that the proposals to make better use of Heathrow's existing two runways would result in more ground noise and asked if this was being addressed. JD confirmed that a full environmental assessment would be required for IPA and this would consider ground noise.
- 7.12 Peter Szanto (SZ) advised that there was concern in Elmbridge that IPA potentially exposes residents to new arrivals noise and this was made worse by the fact that it would be in the morning and on westerly operations. He asked whether the new routes would be over a very narrow set of houses or spread out within the design envelope so that the same people are not affected all morning. JD advised that PBN was highly accurate and aircraft do keep to the waypoints when using those procedures. She explained that the opportunity exists to look at multiple approaches and this will be considered as part of the design process.
- 7.13 Armelle Thomas (AT) did not trust Heathrow's comments around the additional 25,000 ATMs because at a recent meeting John Holland-Kaye (JHK) had not been prepared to say there was currently no plan for this. CM advised this was not what JHK had said. MG reiterated that Heathrow was currently consulting on IPA for Heathrow's existing two runways and this could potentially be used for some additional movements. AT asked about health impacts and MG advised that, as mentioned at previous meetings, Heathrow was required to carry out health assessments as part of the planning application. He added that Heathrow was aware of the potential adverse effects of noise and was taking this seriously. AT asked why A3 maps showing design envelopes had not been available at a recent Local Focus Forum (LFF) meeting. CM advised that maps had been available, but most people prefer to view them online. She added that the maps were also available at the consultation events and at today's meeting for anyone who would like copies.

8 Airspace Change and Development Consent Processes

- 8.1 James Trow (JT) explained why there were two approval processes and how they work together. The presentation is available [here](#). He explained that the Development Consent Order (DCO) is the approval for the construction of the third runway and all the related ground infrastructure. The process requirements for this are described in the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS). The Airspace Change Process (ACP) is the approval for the design and operation of new or changing flight paths and any changes to airspace boundaries. The process requirements for this are described in the CAA's airspace change process guidance (CAP1616).
- 8.2 RBu asked if the DCO takes rail infrastructure into account. JT advised that any change which affects rail infrastructure will have to be assessed.

- 8.3 Peter Willan asked what ATM cap Heathrow was designing for. MG advised that the latest NPS sets out a requirement for at least 260,000 additional ATMs. He added that Heathrow was also testing some scenarios above this number, but any expansion would have to meet the tests in the NPS such as affecting fewer people by noise than were affected in 2013. SB explained that the DfT does not want airspace to be a constraining factor and NATS had been asked to make maximum assumptions for airspace modernisation work. She added that the DfT assessment was based on 740,000 ATMs but would not be surprised if they had modelled for higher numbers. PW asked SB to check this and let him know. **ACTION SB**

9 Aviation 2050 and Airspace Modernisation Strategy

- 9.1 SB gave a presentation on the future of UK aviation. The presentation is available to download [here](#). She advised that the DfT had published a green paper at the end of 2018 which is currently out for consultation and sets out the Department's position on the key issues through to 2050. Its aim is to achieve a safe, secure and sustainable aviation sector that meets the needs of consumers and a global, outward-looking Britain.
- 9.2 SB mentioned various air quality policy proposals including improving the monitoring of air pollution. RBu felt there was confusion over whether pollution disperses above 1,000ft or 1,000m and thought there should be monitors all along the flight paths. SB advised that a white paper would be published later this year which will confirm the DfT's policy. She added that while there was a lot of data on Heathrow there was not enough data nationally. MG added that Heathrow should consider an overview of air quality at a working group, noting that there is a huge amount of data on air quality at Heathrow and much of this has been public for many years. **ACTION RN**
- 9.3 Christine Taylor (CT) felt that housebuilding was occurring in inappropriate places close to airports, such as offices in Harlington being converted into accommodation with no outdoor space for children. SB acknowledged that local authorities have challenging housebuilding targets and advised that the DfT was working with them. AT wanted to know where houses would be built for those being forced to leave their homes in Harmondsworth. She also asked why the chair of ICCAN was not present at today's meeting and suggested that ICCAN was neither independent or credible. SB advised that ICCAN was set up to be totally independent, that it currently had no statutory powers but this would be reviewed in two years. She added that it's Head Commissioner Rob Light (RL) was very keen to engage with communities. MG was astounded that anyone could claim ICCAN was not independent and said there was no basis for this. He suggested that RL should be given a chance to establish the commission.
- 9.4 SB mentioned that the noise policy proposals included an expectation that there will be enforceable noise caps as a condition on any airport expansion, aiming to balance noise and growth and provide certainty. SS asked how these proposals would work alongside the DCO. SB explained that DfT was looking to establish the principle of noise caps as a strategy, noting that Heathrow was probably the first airport where it could be tested how to establish that.

10 AOB

- 10.1 MG noted that time had run out and proposed that AOB items be taken offline. He asked members to consider whether future meetings should be longer. **ACTION ALL**

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 20th March 2019 (1:00pm - 4:00pm), Heathrow Academy.