

Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 18 May 2015

1pm-4pm, Heathrow Compass Centre - meeting notes

Attendees

Name	Borough
Geoff Paxton	Bracknell
Margaret Majumdar	Ealing
Cllr Steve Bax	Elmbridge
Cllr Wendy Matthews	South Bucks
Graham Young	South Bucks
John Coates	Richmond
Peter Willan	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Natasha Fletcher	Teddington Action Group
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Kathleen Croft	Stanwell Moor Residents Assn
Cllr David Hilton	Windsor & Maidenhead
Kate Mann	Ascot resident
Paul Conway	Englefield Green resident
Cllr Marisa Heath	Runnymede
Conrad Sturt	Surrey Heath
Rosalie James	Aircraft 3 villages
Christine Taylor	Harmondsworth resident
John Stewart	HACAN
Tim May	Department for Transport
Patrick Leahy	Department for Transport
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Ian Jopson	NATS
Dan Foster	NATS
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Richard Norman	Heathrow
Laura Jones	Heathrow

Apologies

Cllr Chris Turrell	Bracknell
Dave Curtis	NATS
Neil Luxton	Elmbridge
Ajit Bansal	Hounslow
Cllr Amrit Mann	Hounslow
Dean Plumb	BA

1. Welcome and apologies for absence:

1.1 Matt Gorman (MG) welcomed members and noted apologies for absence (above)

2. Previous minutes and actions:

2.1 **London representation:** Matt Gorman went through the minutes and actions from the last meeting. The issue of representation by more London Boroughs was discussed. MG raised the difficulty of inviting every London Borough and it was agreed the GLA would be invited to attend and that membership is kept under review. John Stewart and Peter Willian agreed and suggested to involve more groups when necessary.

2.2 **Route contours:** Darren Rhodes said he would scope out the work required to produce noise contours to reflect the impact of changes to the Compton route. He flagged that there would be a cost involved in carrying out the work. **(ACTION: DR)**

2.3 **Communications:** Cheryl Monk explained that Heathrow was continually looking for ways to communicate better and improve the way we explain complex issues around Heathrow's operations, for example through animations, interactive graphics etc. She said Heathrow would set up a workshop and invite members to provide their feedback and suggest improvements to communications and complaint response.

2.4 **Dates of future meetings:** CM confirmed she will send dates of the next meetings for the remainder of the year. (Dates below)

3. Terms of Reference:

3.1 MG asked if there were any further comments on the revised Terms of Reference that had been circulated to the group.

3.2 Margaret Majumdar asked if the HACC could be made aware of CNF meetings. MG agreed that the minutes of the meetings would be sent to the HACC secretary for distribution. MM also suggested that the CNF members should receive the HACC minutes. CM explained these were available on-line (www.lhr-acc.org.uk)

3.3 MG confirmed that not attending two consecutive meetings would mean members may be replaced. MG confirmed that either a member or deputy could attend.

4. Update – verification & analysis sub group:

4.1 Rick Norman gave an update on the first meeting of the verification sub group meeting held on 11th May. It has been agreed at a previous CNF that verification of Heathrow's noise and track keeping systems was required to build trust in the data provided by the airport to residents.

4.2 RN explained that a Dutch company (NLR) had been put forward as a potential contender for carrying this work out and who had experience in this field. Members had been asked to come back to the next meeting with their own suggestions and thoughts regarding

NLR. Members also had a fuller explanation of Heathrow's Noise and Track Keeping systems (NTK).

4.3 Stephen Clark stated that any analysis must also consider the impact of noise on the ground.

4.4 Ian Jopson said it would be useful to define what is meant by change. He said there are variances to daily flight patterns due to the impact of traffic and weather patterns – the analysis needed to determine absolute changes rather than daily fluctuations.

4.5 Natasha Fletcher asked how long the process would take. RN said the scope for the verification will be presented at the next full meeting of the CNF and if agreed, the work would begin immediately but was likely to take a few months.

4.6 David Hilton stated that he believes there have been systematic changes to airspace that cumulatively have resulted in changes on the ground. He was interested to know if NATS were able to look back and compare flight patterns now, with 5-10 years ago. Ian Jopson confirmed they do.

4.7 Matt Gorman said Heathrow are keen to understand if there have been any systematic changes. He explained that since the changes to the Compton route, Heathrow had reviewed over 100 TOIs (Temporary Operating Instructions) for the last 18 months and apart from the Ockham stack trial, could not find evidence of procedural changes that would have any discernable impact on the ground. Cllr Hilton said it was encouraging as he thought that no one was looking at them.

4.8 Rosalie James suggested that TOIs were reviewed dating back more than 18 months as there had been numerous trials over the last 5 years e.g. Operational Freedoms.

4.9 Discussions reverted back to the verification exercise. Paul Conway thought that joint funding of this would ensure impartiality. There was some discussion about whether local authorities would agree to fund this.

4.10 Rosalie James asked about SESAR – and if it had been in place since 2006. Ian Jopson explained that SESAR is about researching new operational procedures and improving operational efficiencies and that if change is deployed it will be subject to an airspace change proposal.

4.11 There was some discussion about what changes require CAA approval and what was exempt from this. There was a general feeling that there was a need for residents and stakeholders to better understand what the difference was between a procedural change and a supplementary change, and when CAP 725 applies that triggers a public consultation. Stuart Lindsay said he was happy to do a presentation on this as it is a complicated area.

(ACTION: SL)

4.12 Peter Willan raised changes that Heathrow were already making and that were detailed in the APPG (All-Party Parliamentary Group) on Heathrow. MG explained that these related to on-going changes and improvements to the noise climate, for example, trialling steeper approaches and increasing the number of arrivals using CDA. MG explained that this forum was specifically looking at changes to airspace and flight patterns. MG said Heathrow could run this at a future meeting.

5. NATS familiarisation – feedback:

5.1 Two familiarisation sessions for Forum members had been arranged since the last meeting of the Forum. These were held at the Heathrow control tower and hosted by NATS. Cheryl Monk asked for feedback from the visit which had been well attended.

5.2 Members generally found the visits informative and useful, although some thought they could be cut down in length.

5.3 Natasha Fletcher said she would like copies of the slides used at the session and direct contact with NATS so it's not just Heathrow answering all the questions. Ian Jopson said NATS are currently working on a procedure for how to respond directly to residents and that they are working on a FAQ and are in the process of putting an email together to respond directly to enquiries.

5.4 David Hilton said it left some questions unanswered in particular to what extent aircraft are required to follow the SID. Stewart Lindsay explained that the NPR is the area around the SID and is 1.5km wide either side of the SID. He also explained that aircraft have to stay within the NPR up to 4000ft, at which point ATC are free to vector aircraft from the NPR even if the SID goes further. He went on to explain that aircraft are free to be tactically vectored and can be anywhere as long as they are within air traffic rules and within controlled airspace.

5.5 Rosalie James asked who oversees airline procedures and said she had written to the CEO of BA to ask if they've made any changes.

6. Noise fines:

6.1 Jane Dawes ran through a presentation explaining the rules regarding Heathrow's departure noise limits. She also talked about the fixed noise monitors and noise monitoring carried out by Heathrow using mobile monitors.

6.2 The departure noise limits are set by Government and measured at fixed locations around Heathrow. JD explained that the level of noise fines was reviewed in 2014 and as a result, Heathrow significantly increased the level of fines. This money raised from these is distributed through the Heathrow Community Fund for local projects. The presentation contains more details and is available on the website www.heathrow.com/hcnf.

6.3 John Stewart asked if there was noise measuring further out and wanted to know if aircraft meeting requirements close to the airport are still meeting them further out. It was confirmed that they are monitored at 6.5km although mobile monitors do extend further out and are used by both Heathrow and the CAA. Darren Rhodes also confirmed that noise continuously decreases as aircraft fly further away from the airport.

6.4 David Hilton stated that Heathrow had placed a mobile monitor in Ascot during the trials. A report for this is currently in production and is expected to be published within 3 months.

6.5 Kate Mann asked how often the mobile monitors are moved and if there is a list of all the monitors. Jane Dawes said they are normally in place for 6 months and Heathrow produces a report following each period. These can be found here:

<http://www.heathrowairport.com/noise/facts,-stats-and-reports/reports/communiity-noise-reports>

6.6 Darren Rhodes said the CAA report CAP 1149 can be found on the CAA website which provides a summary of the fixed and mobile monitors between 2007 and 2013 which were used to validate ANCON - the UK civil aircraft noise contour model.

<http://www.caa.co.uk/application.aspx?catid=33&pagetype=65&appid=11&mode=detail&id=6101>

6.7 Natasha Fletcher asked if Heathrow publishes the details of which planes are fined. Matt Gorman confirmed we don't but said he will look into the feasibility of this. **(ACTION: MG)**.

7. Noise monitoring & modelling:

7.1 Darren Rhodes gave a presentation to explain how the Government's annual average noise contours are produced.

7.2 Natasha Fletcher asked why Teddington was not in the Government contours. Darren Rhodes explained that the contours are set around government policy, but said regardless of this they fully accept that people will still be annoyed by noise beyond the contours.

7.3 Matt Gorman said that the 57dB contour is just one metric to measure noise, however this is what Government has historically used.

7.4 Nicole Porter from Anderson Acoustics then went through a presentation on noise modelling (available at www.heathrow.com/hcnf). This was a technical presentation and explained the following: the model (N65) used by Anderson Acoustics (AA) is based on actual tracks; AA verifies their model against measured data; AA look at what they have modelled against what has been measured and there is very close agreement between both data sets. She explained that although monitors can't be put in every location, what is modelled matches very closely to what is monitored. She said that through this model AA are trying to reflect what is actually happening and to move away from whether you live inside or outside a line (contour).

7.5 Nicole Porter went on to describe the "N65" model. The N65 metric measures the number of noise events over 65 decibels over a specified amount of time and so reflects actual noise experienced by residents. She explained that before the trials noise modelling had been built into the process, however this was used to predict the noise impacts based on standard noise metrics including changes to the 57dB Leq noise contour.

7.6 She explained however that in light of the strong community reaction to the trials, an enhanced set of metrics involving N65 had been developed that details the changes to noise over a specified period broken down by postcode. The modelling is backed up with data from noise monitors. She explained this gives a better picture of the impacts for people on the ground and will be used for assessing the impact of future trials.

7.7 Peter Willan asked if there was modelling being done for respite periods. Nicole Porter said there wasn't.

7.8 John Stewart commented that he found Nicole Porter's presentation really interesting and that they have asked the Davies Commission to do this type of modelling.

8. AOB:

8.1 Geoff Paxton asked if Heathrow was aware of an email that stated they had disregarded some complaints before the trial. Laura Jones said they weren't. Natasha Fletcher asked why it took an FOI from Zac Goldsmith for Heathrow to provide the number of complaints. LJ explained that Heathrow provided the information to Zac Goldsmith after he had emailed the Heathrow Chief Executive asking for the information. She explained that this was not because of an FOI which Heathrow is not subject to. LJ also confirmed that Heathrow records all complaints made and the only complaints that were disregarded were those made about aircraft events that hadn't yet taken place.

Dates of future meetings

- Wed 8th July at 2pm-5pm – venue to be confirmed
- Mon 14th September 1.30pm-4.30pm – venue to be confirmed
- Thurs 5th November 2pm-5pm – venue to be confirmed.