

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 5 June 2019

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

Attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Cllr Peter Szanto	Elmbridge
John Coates	Richmond
Cllr Chris Howorth	Runnymede
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor and Maidenhead
Margaret Majumdar	EANAG
Rob Buick	Englefield Green
Paul Conway	Englefield Green
John Stewart	HACAN
Christine Taylor	HASRA
Armelle Thomas	HASRA
Mo Korda	Plane Hell Action Group
Kathleen Croft	Spelthorne resident
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Tina Richardson	The Windlesham Society
Nicole Porter	Anderson Acoustics
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Ian Greene	DfT
Gary Marshall	DfT
Howard Simmons	ICCAN
Rupert Basham	ICCAN
Kjeld Vinkx	To70
Connor Daly	Heathrow
Gordon Ferguson	Heathrow
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Richard Greer	Heathrow
Lucy Hodgson	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Richard Norman	Heathrow
Xavier Oh	Heathrow
Sue Thomas	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow

Apologies

Darl Sweetland	Buckinghamshire County Council
Surinderpal Suri	Hounslow
Cllr Linda Burke	London Borough of Ealing
Graham Young	Richings Park
Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Tim Walker	Forest Hill Society
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
David Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Geoff Clark	Virgin Atlantic
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Sarah Bishop	DfT
Robin Clarke	NATS
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Laura Jones	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. He informed the group that Surrey County Council would be joining the forum as well as new representatives for London Borough of Ealing, Surrey Heath Borough Council, Runnymede Borough Council and Spelthorne Borough Council. Another new member was Kjeld Vinkx from To70 who has been appointed as the independent technical advisor to the group.

2 Previous meeting notes and actions

- 2.1 MG went through the actions from the previous meeting as described below.
- 2.2 **Further develop the Issues Tracker (2.6)**. This will be circulated with the notes from this meeting. **ACTION RW**
- 2.3 **Confirm position on early growth in writing to Armelle Thomas (2.11)**. Confirmation was sent in writing.
- 2.4 **Community to select preferred candidate for independent advisor role (4.2)**. Kjeld Vinkx from To70 had been appointed and is present at the meeting.
- 2.5 **Investigate examples of arrival heights over Lightwater (7.1)**. NATS have looked into these and a response has been sent to Rob Beere.
- 2.6 **Formally invite ICCAN to join HCNF (8.2)**. This has been done and representatives from ICCAN are present at the meeting.
- 2.7 **Peter Willan (PW) to provide his data around the ATM cap (9.4)**. PW has sent his apologies for today's meeting and has not provided this data yet. **ACTION PW**
- 2.8 **Describe DCO/PEIR process (10.1)**. This is on today's agenda.
- 2.9 **Provide more information about the Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG) (10.4)**. This was covered at the last working group and will also be covered today.
- 2.10 MG advised that the meeting notes from 20 March 2019 have been amended as requested by Stephen Clark (SC) to emphasize certain points from his presentation. The updated notes are available online [here](#) or can be emailed on request.
- 2.11 MG sought to clarify comments from the previous meeting regarding contributions from groups with more than one member. He reminded members that when the HCNF was formed in 2015 he had asked groups to put forward one spokesperson per group. He advised that it was his wish for everyone to contribute to the discussions but was aware that this was not always easy within the three-hour timeframe and so asked for everyone's cooperation in this. CT responded that she had been excluded at the last meeting. MG apologised and stressed that it had not been his intention to silence her.

3 Community slot

- 3.1 MG handed over the meeting to Paul Conway (PC) to chair the community slot. PC welcomed the forum's newly appointed independent technical advisor Kjeld Vinkx (KV) from Dutch aviation consultancy To70. He hoped that KV's advice would result in community group members being able to make concise recommendations to Heathrow which could be acted upon. KV introduced himself and felt that, based on discussions with community members last week, his experience as an advisor to airports such as Schiphol Airport would help in this role. PC noted that various members had sent questions to put to KV and these would all be addressed. He advised that some members had met with KV last week and that the briefing note given to KV would be circulate in due course. **ACTION PC**
- 3.2 PC asked presenters to observe the schedule to allow time for questions, noting that he had been criticised in the past for not allowing members the opportunity to speak. He noted that he did not have email addresses for all community members and agreed to MG's suggestion that Heathrow should circulate his email address to members, so they can contact him. **ACTION RW**

4 Follow up to Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA)

- 4.1 Stephen Clark (SC) gave a presentation entitled "The impact of airspace change on noise sensitivity and how static SoNA results compare to other International Noise Studies". The presentation is available to download [here](#).
- 4.2 The presentation compared SoNA with World Health Organisation (WHO) guidance and additional studies. SC stressed that change increases noise sensitivity and questioned whether the Government had included change impacts in its development of airspace policy by only using SoNA. A number of questions were posed in the presentation and SC suggested that a working party should be held to look at this. MG agreed to a further meeting and confirmed that Heathrow would provide a written response. **ACTION RW**
- 4.3 SC asked who out of DEFRA, DfT, Public Health England, Heathrow or the CAA had a duty of care for protecting the public. Richard Norman (RN) acknowledged that each of the organisations has some responsibility around the impacts on the local community. MG added that Heathrow has a duty of care for the impact of its operations, responding to a policy framework that is set by Government. Ian Greene (IG) agreed that everyone has a duty of care, observing that regulation was a complicated landscape so not it was not possible for just one body to have that duty of care. In response to other questions posed in the presentation, IG observed that SC has asked these questions of the DfT before and was aware the DfT is not able to discuss these issues while there are still proceedings going on relating to the judicial review. He added that work was ongoing at DEFRA to review the WHO guidelines, but noted that DfT has a clear current policy in place as stated in the Aviation Policy Framework and it would work to that policy until such a time as that should change.

- 4.4 David Hilton (DH) observed that Heathrow was supposed to work with communities and local government to determine how airspace change should take place up to 7,000ft, but felt this was an unbalanced approach as the communities lack the necessary resources. He added that CAA was only interested in the CAP1616 process and not the outcome, so the regulator does not regulate. MG disagreed that it was all about the process from Heathrow's perspective. He noted that governments around the world has mandated the introduction of Performance Based Navigation (PBN) and that while this could lead to pure concentration of flight paths which may be easiest for the industry, Heathrow was looking for the best way to use the technology to introduce different routes to provide breaks from aircraft noise.
- 4.5 IG added that the new airspace change process CAP1616 puts greater emphasis on community engagement, explaining that there have been some proposals which were rejected around the lack of adequate consultation and engagement, so there has been an increase in scrutiny on engagement with communities. SC replied that consultation and engagement did not solve the problem.

5 Follow up on Performance Based Navigation (PBN)

- 5.1 Stephen Clark (SC) gave a presentation entitled "PBN – unanswered questions and unresolved challenges". The presentation is available to download [here](#).
- 5.2 Issues raised in the presentation included: The social impact of PBN trials in the UK and what evidence there was that PBN could be acceptable around Heathrow; ICAO's unpublished research on PBN and whether a report by Anderson Acoustics on the 2014 PBN trials had been considered; the introduction of PBN at Toronto Pearson airport and whether airspace capacity limitations would limit respite at Heathrow; and which organisation would be accountable if Heathrow's expansion and airspace change proposals caused substantial adverse physical and mental health damage to large numbers of people.
- 5.3 SC stressed that there was a complete lack of understanding of how extremely concentrated PBN routes can be implemented over densely populated areas around Heathrow on an acceptable basis. He asked how meaningful or valued respite could be achieved in practical terms within the congested airspace around Heathrow with the number of flights proposed, how public consultation on concentrated PBN routes could begin, who would be accountable for adverse physical and mental health damage, and how Heathrow could proceed with the Development Consent Order (DCO) until such questions are answered.
- 5.4 MG reiterated that Heathrow was not blindly going forward with concentrated flight paths. He advised that the airport had learned from the previous PBN trials and was looking at how it can deliver for both the industry and the community. He advised that Heathrow had to respond to the legal requirement to modernise airspace. He noted that like many other airports around world, Heathrow was close to an urban area, so it was looking for the best way to use PBN to provide a solution. He added that Heathrow was undertaking research into respite and how far apart routes should be. He suggested that in the interest of time he would not follow up on this anymore, but he was concerned that SC had the perception that Heathrow was cruising ahead regardless to introduce PBN whereas this was not the case.

6 Noise relief

- 6.1 John Stewart (JS) and Mo Korda (MK) presented four proposals which aimed to improve the noise climate for communities under Heathrow's flight paths in advance of future airspace changes. Their presentation is available to download [here](#).
- 6.2 They put forward proposals to stagger the joining point for arrivals, increase variation in departure routes, promote fairer night flight arrival distribution, and reduce simultaneous overflight by arrivals to London City Airport (LCY) and Heathrow. JS asked members to email their views on these issues so that he could take the ideas forward. **ACTION ALL**
- 6.3 JS acknowledged that the proposal to increase variation in departure routes would constitute an airspace change so they would need to talk to CAA further about this. MG observed that Heathrow had trialled the idea of flying on both sides of the departure routes in 2014. JS advised that he would be talking to Heathrow, NATS and CAA to find a short-term solution on night flight distribution.
- 6.4 Regarding some areas of London being affected by double overflight when LCY is on easterly operations and Heathrow is on westerly operations, JS advised that overflight by LCY arrivals had become worse since LCY had concentrated its flight paths in 2016. He understood that LCY would be required to redesign its flight paths to fit in with other airspace changes in the South East by 2024/5 but would like to see if anything could be done in the meantime to reduce double overflight. DH stressed that removing westerly preference at Heathrow was not an option until the required taxiways are in place to allow Heathrow to introduce full runway alternation on easterly operations. He felt that it should be the job of the regulator to look into the issue of areas being overflown by arrivals from both airports.
- 6.5 RN welcomed the report and the recognition in the presentation that any changes have consequences and the proposals would result in moving noise to different areas. JS acknowledged that the proposals could result in other parts of London having more aircraft noise. He noted that HACAN used to receive complaints from areas such as Islington and Camden but was not receiving so many of these now. He understood that the proposal changes could cause a resurgence of complaints from these areas, so some sort of consultation would be required.

7 Industry slot

- 7.1 MG chaired the second half of the meeting which was primarily focussed on Heathrow's upcoming Airport Expansion Consultation.

8 Airport Expansion Consultation

- 8.1 Cheryl Monk (CM) gave a brief overview of the upcoming Airport Expansion Consultation. The presentation is available to download [here](#). She advised that the consultation will run for 12 weeks from 18 June to 13 September and would cover four main areas: Heathrow's expansion scheme, managing and mitigating impacts, future operations and assessment of impacts. She added that there would be over 40 exhibition events during July and August.
- 8.2 Presentations on environmentally managed growth, the Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG), early growth and future runway operations were given as detailed below. These were originally presented at the HCNF working group on 25 April and the slides are available to download [here](#).

- 8.3 **Environmentally Managed Growth:** George Davies (GD) outlined Heathrow's proposal to implement a system of environmentally managed growth, where capacity is released according to a number of legally binding, strict environmental limits.
- 8.4 Margaret Majumdar (MM) asked if this would mean the night noise quota would no longer be a dedicated number. RN advised that the night noise quota system would remain, and he would cover this later.
- 8.5 Peter Szanto was in favour of the proposal and asked if it would apply to any increased movements resulting from Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA). GD confirmed that it would apply.
- 8.6 With regard to the NPS requirement that the impact of aircraft noise should be limited and where possible reduced compared to the 2013 baseline, SC asked how the 2013 baseline would be defined and what metrics would be used. GD acknowledged that setting the right metrics was very important and noted that the noise envelope design process would include a review of the metrics.
- 8.7 Robert Buick (RB) asked if limits on the release of capacity would only apply over and above an additional 260,000 flights. GD advised that Heathrow would have to perform within environmental limits, so these would apply from the first additional flight over and above the 480,000 flights operating today. RB asked if Heathrow would match the regime at Schiphol airport. GD advised that Schiphol has different factors such as its geography, so Heathrow would need to apply a regime that was suitable for Heathrow. He noted that Schiphol was a good example along with many other airports that Heathrow could build upon.
- 8.8 Armelle Thomas (AT) asked what the baseline was for the reduction in staff car trips and whether that applied just to Heathrow staff or to all 76,000 workers at the airport. He advised that he was happy to pick this up but noted that the HCNF was fundamentally a noise forum. He confirmed that the reduction applied to all workers and noted that the baseline was covered in the document.
- 8.9 **Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG):** Sue Thomas (ST) advised that Heathrow needs a framework of limits and controls to manage noise in the future and this was known as a noise envelope. She explained that this is also a requirement of the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) and will form part of the system Heathrow is proposing for environmentally managed growth. She added that the NEDG had been set up with an independent chair and had held four meetings so far.
- 8.10 RB felt that the NEDG needed someone additional from the community side beyond the two community representatives from the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (HSPG). ST advised that membership would be reviewed later in the year. MG added that HACAN attends the meeting at the nomination of the HCEB. Chris Howorth (CH) asked if Runnymede Borough Council had been invited to join. ST explained that Runnymede was a member of the HSPG, so it had a voice through that channel. She added that Hillingdon Council had been invited separately as they were not on the HSPG. SC felt that Local Authority members were not the same as community members. MG responded that they were the elected representatives of communities but acknowledged they were different from community groups. Tina Richardson (TR) asked if Surrey Heath was represented on the HSPG. CM said she would check. **ACTION CM**

- 8.11 ST stressed that the NEDG needed to be a relatively small group to be effective, otherwise it would be hard to make any progress. MG added that the HSPG was an independent group of Local Authority representatives and agreed that it would not be practical to have 15 Local Authority members around the table, so the HSPG had identified two representatives for the NEDG.
- 8.12 TR asked for a copy of the NEDG's Phase 1 Final Report. MG suggested circulating it to all members. **ACTION RW**
- 8.13 **Early growth:** Lucy Hodgson (LH) gave an overview of Heathrow's emerging proposals to introduce additional Air Transport Movements (ATMs) in advance of the third runway. She advised that Heathrow would set out its emerging proposals for early growth at the statutory consultation before proposals are finalised for the DCO application.
- 8.14 DH asked if the project had government backing. IG advised that any such application would go through the DCO process and would be considered by the Secretary of State. He advised that DfT was supportive of the ANPS which had come through parliament but had not made a statement about early growth.
- 8.15 SC stated that the introduction of IPA could mean some areas would be affected by both arrivals and departures on different days which was contrary to the principle of not overflying communities with multiple routes. MG advised that there would be a detailed session on IPA for community groups tomorrow.
- 8.16 PS felt there had not been adequate consultation on IPA as there had been no option for residents to say if they were in favour or not. He noted that while there were mixed feelings about Heathrow expansion in Elmbridge there was almost universal opposition to IPA and this could undermine support for the third runway.
- 8.17 **Future runway operations:** RN recapped that Heathrow had sought views on directional preference, runway alternation and night flights at its Airspace and Future Operations Consultation from January to March 2019.
- 8.18 RN noted that Heathrow was looking at how to combine the runway alternation patterns and night restrictions to focus on optimising the respite provision in the evening and night periods. He explained that there was an aim to avoid instances where late evening flights are followed by early morning flights over the same communities. Kathleen Croft (KC) was grateful to hear this was being considered.
- 8.19 AT asked where and when focus groups had been carried out, who had attended them and who had run them. RN advised that they had been held at a number of locations around the airport and were facilitated by consultants called Stonehaven. CM added that there would be a full report, so this could be sent to AT once it has been published. **ACTION RW**

9 Noise assessment

- 9.1 Richard Greer (RG) gave a presentation on the Development Consent Order (DCO) process and the airspace change process and how they fit together. He explained that the final airspace design would not be known until after the DCO would be granted. This is explicitly built into the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) that states that the assessment of aircraft noise for a DCO would be based on indicative airspace design. So, in order to assess the environmental effects of flight paths for the DCO a range of indicative 'test case' airspace designs had been developed. The presentation is available [here](#). The airspace change process is subject to separate decision making, by the CAA, following consultation and environmental impact assessment of the airspace proposals.
- 9.2 MK asked for more details about the test cases. RG explained that each test case has been developed to show the range of potential effects, looking at design principles such as maximising respite and limiting the number of people overflown. He added that full details would be published in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) consultation document.

10 Working group update

- 10.1 MG advised that the working group update would not be covered at today's meeting due to a lack of time. Meeting notes and presentations from the working group are available to download [here](#).

11 Slightly Steeper Approaches – Airspace Change Proposal

- 11.1 Gordon Ferguson (GF) advised members that following successful trials to increase the angle of descent on the final approach into Heathrow from 3.0° to 3.2°, the airport was now preparing to submit an Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) for the permanent adoption of the slightly steeper approaches. He advised that Heathrow was now seeking input on its design principles by 21st June which would be used to inform the final set of prioritised design principles for submission to the CAA. The presentation can be downloaded [here](#).
- 11.2 GF advised that since the second trial in 2017 the CAA had allowed Heathrow to keep the slightly steeper approaches operational for a temporary period while they prepare and submit an ACP for their permanent adoption. He advised that for operational reasons these slightly steeper approaches are used by fewer than 2% of Heathrow's arrivals which fly RNAV (Area Navigation) approaches. He explained that RNAV is a method of navigation without the need for navigational aids or beacons. The remainder flew the standard 3.0° approaches using the Instrument Landing System (ILS). MG added that slightly steeper approaches will remain optional for aircraft until airspace has been modernised. MM asked how the slightly steeper approaches would mesh with IPA. GF explained that both were RNAV approaches.

12 AOB

- 12.1 MG announced that following feedback from the community, the @HeathrowNoise Twitter service has now been updated to provide information about which runway will be used overnight.
- 12.2 MG also announced that Cheryl Monk would be moving to a new role as Head of Communications for the Airspace Change Organising Group on a two-year secondment, so this would be her last HCNF. Members responded that she would be greatly missed.

Date of next meeting

Wednesday 24th July 2019 (1:00pm - 4:00pm), Heathrow Academy.