

## Heathrow Community Noise Forum – 13 April 2015

### 2pm-5pm, Heathrow Academy - meeting notes

#### Attendees

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough</b>
Cllr Chris Turrell	Bracknell
Geoff Paxton	Bracknell
Margaret Majumdar	Ealing
Cllr Steve Bax	Elmbridge
Neil Luxton	Elmbridge
Ajit Bansal	Hounslow
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
Paul Conway	Englefield Green resident
Cllr Keith Bush	Surrey Heath
Conrad Sturt	Surrey Heath
Rosalie James	Aircraft 3 villages
Rob Beere	Aircraft 3 villages
Christine Taylor	Harmondsworth resident
John Stewart	HACAN
Kate Jennings	Department for Transport
Isobel Pastor	Department for Transport
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Ian Jopson	NATS
Dan Foster	NATS
Dave Curtis	NATS
Matt Gorman	Heathrow
Jane Dawes	Heathrow
Cheryl Monk	Heathrow
Richard Norman	Heathrow

#### Apologies

Cllr Amrit Mann	Hounslow
Cllr Ted Plenty	Slough
Cllr Pat Roberts	Runnymede
Kate Mann	Windsor resident
Dean Plumb	BA
Stuart Lindsey	CAA
Laura Jones	Heathrow

## 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 MG asked for views regarding the minutes of the first meeting, and whether they captured the themes/discussions accurately and in enough detail. There were a range of views. Natasha Fletcher wanted the discussions captured verbatim however it was generally agreed that the minutes that had been circulated were the right length/level of detail.
- 2.2 MG suggested that the meetings could be recorded for those wanting a record of the meeting and/or that a public gallery could be made available for people interested in attending the meeting, but who are not members. Members were comfortable with a public gallery and MG said that Heathrow would consider the logistics for providing this facility at future meetings  
**(Action: MG)**

## 3. Terms of Reference

- 3.1 The draft Terms of Reference had been circulated with the agenda. Cheryl Monk ran through the draft and then asked for comments.
- 3.2 Margaret Majumdar asked whether the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee (HACC) would be kept up to date on discussions at the HCNF. MG agreed that the committee would be provided with minutes from the meetings for information **(Action: MG)**.

### **Objectives/Aims:**

- 3.3 Natasha Fletcher said that the ToR should reflect that the forum's role to improve the complaints procedures for residents so that they can see that action has been taken – she gave some examples: will regulation/policy/noise monitoring be changed in light of this? Will people be given more direct links of communication with the CAA and NATS? Do complaints lead to direct fines?
- 3.4 Peter Willan said that the most important and challenging issue for the group will be future airspace changes however he said it should be acknowledged that this will lead to a polarisation of views amongst Forum members. He asked whether the forum was as expected to form a consensus on issues relating to this.
- 3.5 MG acknowledged this and said that where possible the group should work by consensus but recognising that this won't always be possible. He said that one of the roles of the HCNF is to seek stakeholder input on future airspace

designs but that any changes would be subject to public consultation and therefore the purpose of the group was not to agree on what went forward to consultation. However there will be other areas where consensus is easier to achieve for example agreeing the communications approach to airspace trials etc.

## **Principles**

- 3.6 Stephen Clark raised concerns on behalf of TAG that the ToR stated that members are expected to “Recognise Heathrow’s right to exist and operate within its current cap of 480,000 air traffic movements per year”.
- 3.7 MG explained that this is set out in the in ToR simply to reflect that the HCNF is dealing with issues associated with a two runway Heathrow and has not been set up to discuss operations in the event of airport expansion. He explained that 480,000 aircraft movements is the legal cap for flight movements at Heathrow and that the airport is not intending to reduce its operation.
- 3.8 Stephen Clark said Heathrow should acknowledge that while it has a right to operate, it is not authorised to make changes and that people have a right to a peaceful existence. It was agreed that this should be changed to “Recognise Heathrow’s *legal* right to exist...”

## **Membership & chairing of HCNF:**

- 3.9 Natasha Fletcher asked that the membership list should reflect the names of the community groups and area they represent and that they should not be grouped under borough names. Cheryl Monk explained that when the HCNF was set up, local councils had been invited to nominate a councillor and a community representative and that it reflected which borough the group sat under. It was agreed that where relevant, the name of the group would be noted in addition to the borough.
- 3.10 Cllr Bush said that each borough should be represented by a councillor and a properly constituted community group. Each representative should have a deputy who can attend if the representative is unable to.
- He explained that the minutes from meetings are lodged with Surrey Heath officers so that there is consistency across the council on this issue.
- 3.11 Rosalie James said that a variety of voices are required so that residents can raise concerns and get answers to questions which David Hilton agreed with.
- 3.12 It was generally felt that there ought to be more representation from London boroughs. MG explained we had invited London Councils and would follow up (**Action: MG**)

- 3.13 It was agreed that Heathrow should continue to provide chairmanship of the forum.
- 3.14 It was generally agreed that setting up relevant sub groups would be beneficial to expedite some of the work that needed to be done regarding data verification and analysis.

#### 4. Procedural changes to Compton Route

- 4.1 Following the announcement by Heathrow in March regarding changes made by NATS to the Compton route, Dave Curtis provided an explanation for the changes and set out the impacts of doing this. Since the change was made in June 2014 he said that approx. 20 aircraft a day are now within the more concentrated band of departures using the Compton route. He also explained that as a result of the changes, aircraft can now get to a higher altitude quicker and that NATS estimate there has been an increase of 10% in the use of continuous climb by aircraft using this route.
- 4.2 Dave Curtis confirmed that NATS had not made any other procedural changes to arrivals or departures that would have an impact on the ground. He explained that controllers are tactically managing aircraft and there will be daily variations based on factors on the day.
- 4.3 Natasha Fletcher asked why NATS weren't aware of the changes when asked by Heathrow whether any changes had been made. Dave Curtis explained that the change was to upper airspace which was looked after by Terminal Control at Swanwick, rather than NATS personnel based at the Heathrow tower.
- 4.4 MG stated that airports aren't involved in changes to upper airspace however this had demonstrated that NATS need to keep Heathrow informed of changes where there may be discernable changes for people living around Heathrow. There was now a process in place to ensure this happened.
- 4.5 Conrad Sturt asked whether noise contours could be produced showing the effect of this change. Darren Rhodes confirmed that this would be a substantial piece of work but could be carried out. **(Action: DR to check feasibility and timescales)**
- 4.6 Stephen Clark raised the issue of airline climb procedures. He brought to the attention of the group an article that appeared in Flight Global magazine from 2010 stating that Singapore Airlines had been cleared to operate a 'more efficient' Airbus A380 departure procedure at Heathrow that keep the aircraft lower on departure. Darren Rhodes said that there were a number of factors that were considered by airlines and it was a trade-off between noise level, fuel usage and engine wear. Stephen Clark was interested to know how the decision on ascent rates by airlines was arrived at. MG agreed that it would be useful to discuss this with BA at a future CNF meeting.

## 5. Data verification and analysis

- 5.1 Rick Norman ran through a presentation previously circulated to members setting out potential options for verifying Heathrow's tracking systems.
- 5.2 It was requested if Webtrak data could go back further than 90 days. Cheryl Monk explained the same system is used at other international airports and 90 days is the standard period used. However she confirmed that 12 months of data will shortly be available on the system.
- 5.3 It was agreed that the verification exercise should be carried out by an independent third party but that should not be the CAA.
- 5.4 It was suggested that the any analysis undertaken needed to consider the situation before and after the trials and considers issues including the concentration of patterns within the NPR, altitude of aircraft, usage of routes.
- 5.5 It was agreed the analysis should initially focus on those areas that were most impacted by the airspace trials last year i.e Englefield Green, Ascot, Windlesham/Lightwater, Bracknell and Teddington.
- 5.6 There was a discussion regarding noise contours. Some members do not feel that the annual government noise contours accurately reflect people's experience of noise since they were based on average noise levels. David Hilton said that noise contours were important since they were the basis for government policy.
- 5.7 Natasha Fletcher was interested to understand where the noise monitors were located that measured departure noise limits – and how the fining system worked. MG said that we could provide this information for the next meeting. **(Action: MG)**
- 5.8 Paul Conlan asked if because of the reaction to the trials and the lack of trust about current flight paths, whether daily density plots could be provided showing the percentage of flights using each route. MG agreed this was a positive suggestion and we would follow up **(Action MG)**
- 5.9 It was agreed that a sub group would be established to consider the verification of the systems and to scope the analysis to be carried out. MG asked that members let Cheryl Monk know if they were interested in being part of this group. **(Action: ALL)**

## 6. Dates for future meetings

- 6.1 MG asked for views regarding frequency of meetings. It was agreed that there were many issues to discuss and at this stage every 6 weeks was useful but that we would keep that under review. MG agreed that we would diarise dates for future meetings and inform members asap **(Action: CM)**

## 7. AOB

7.1 Rosalie James asked why Heathrow still shows NPRs on maps since so many aircraft leave the routes well before the end of them. She showed 2 maps – one from before the trials and one that was presented at the HCNF meeting in March 2015 and asked NATS to explain the differences. It was Rosalie's view that more aircraft are being vectored at 4,000ft and heading towards Bagshot/Lightwater.

7.2 There was some discussion about this but Ian Jopson concluded that unless he knew the dates from these maps, it was difficult to explain any variation because there are a number of factors that affect the decision to vector aircraft. He said it would be better to build a picture of whether there had been changes over time, which would be brought out by the data analysis.

7.3 He said he would find out the dates of the maps and provide an explanation to Rosalie **(Action: IJ)**

7.4 Peter Willan made a request that the impact of arrivals is also considered at future meetings, since the focus had been on departures up to now. MG agreed.

7.5 Christine Taylor stated that there was a great deal of frustration amongst residents in her community who may not understand the technical explanations provided by the airport but are experiencing more noise over them. She asked if it was worthwhile reporting planes that disturbed them. Cheryl Monk confirmed that they should let the community relations team know and the flights could be investigated.

Matt Gorman thanked everyone for attending.

### KEY DATES

**Date of next full meeting: 18 May 2015 – 1-4pm, Compass Centre, Heathrow**

**Date of sub group meeting – 11 May 2015, 3-4.30pm Compass Centre**

**Airport familiarisation visits arranged for 30 April and 15 May 2015**