

**Noise and Airspace Community Forum (NACF)**

Minutes (23 November 2022, 13:00 – 16:00, Hyatt Place Hotel)

**Confirmed attendees**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Borough / Organisation</b>
Andreas Lambrianou	Chair
Cllr Chris Turrell *	Bracknell Forest Council
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Cllr Dr Wendy Matthews	Buckinghamshire Council
John Burton	CAA
Darren Rhodes *	CAA
Abigail Grenfell	CAA
Maggie Pollard	CAA
Rebecca Christie	DfT
Ian Greene	DfT
Margaret Majumdar	Ealing Aircraft Noise Action Group
Robert Buick	Englefield Green Action Group
Nigel Davies	Englefield Green Action Group
Paul Conway	Englefield Green Action Group
Tim Walker *	Forest Hill Society
Paul Beckford *	HACAN
Christine Taylor *	Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association
Armelle Thomas	Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association
Becky Coffin	Heathrow
Lisa Forshew	Heathrow
Michael Glen	Heathrow
Andy Knight *	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Jenni Sykes	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Natalie Wallis	Heathrow
Pierre Sohier	Heathrow
Sophie Land	Heathrow
Sarah Jane Pickthorne	Heathrow
Michael Thornton *	Heathrow Strategic Planning Group
Colin Stanbury *	Local Authorities Aircraft Noise Council
Cllr John Martin	London Borough of Ealing
Surinderpal Suri *	London Borough of Ealing
Ajit Bansal *	London Borough of Hounslow
Amanda Nicholls *	London Borough of Lewisham
Deborah Petty	Molesey Residents Association
Robin Clarke *	NATS
Bridget Bell *	Plane Hell Action
Peter Willan *	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Cllr Chris Howorth	Runnymede Borough Council
Cllr David Hilton	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
Stephen Clark *	Teddington Action Group
Dave Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Carole Marr *	Windlesham Society

\* *Attended online*

## Apologies

Ben Lippitt  
Ian Jopson  
Graham Young  
Tina Richardson

CAA  
NATS  
Richings Park Residents Association  
Windlesham Society

## 1 Welcome and Introduction

1.1 Andreas Lambrianou (AL) welcomed members to the meeting.

## 2 Previous Minutes and Actions

2.1 AL advised that the previous draft minutes had been circulated for approval. He acknowledged that comments had been received from Dave Gilbert (DG) which would be incorporated, and that unless there were any other comments the minutes would be marked as final. Bridget Bell (BB) referred to her comment (para. 5.3) that measuring heights above sea level did not take account of those living on higher ground. AL agreed to share a map of the area surrounding Heathrow showing heights above sea level.

- *The online resource [www.bing.com/maps](http://www.bing.com/maps) provides access to UK Ordnance Survey maps. Simply select 'Ordnance Survey' in the top right-hand corner and then zoom in to see topographical contour lines.*

2.2 AL went through the actions from the previous meeting as detailed below.

2.3 **Chair to provide email address (1.1).** AL confirmed that this had been circulated to members.

2.4 **Various actions relating to the data dashboard (1.7/4.5/5.2).** AL advised that Mike Glen (MG) would present on this later in the meeting.

2.5 **DfT to share ANEG presentation (2.4).** AL confirmed that this had been circulated to members.

2.6 **The use of working groups and other methods to pick up on community issues (2.12).** AL advised that this would be incorporated as an ongoing commitment.

2.7 **Detail the issue of data below 51dB for DfT (2.13).** AL advised that he was setting up a meeting with the relevant parties.

2.8 **Summarise points raised about SoNA (3.4).** AL confirmed that this had been done.

2.9 **Provide latest A320 retrofit data (4.1).** Rick Norman (RN) has started on this and will provide an update at a future meeting. **ACTION RN**

2.10 **ANEEM deployment update (4.3).** To be provided at a future meeting. **ACTION MG**

## 3 Terms of Reference

3.1 AL went through his proposed draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the forum which were circulated in advance of the meeting. He proposed that the forum should return to

meeting in person every two months, alternating between Heathrow venues and community locations. He also proposed producing an annual report, setting out the forum's objectives and activities during the course of the year, and providing a forward view on future events.

- 3.2 Margaret Majumdar (MM) asked for the meeting notes to be referred to as minutes.  
**ACTION AL**
- 3.3 Deborah Petty (DP) queried the proposal that the Chair could remove membership of an organisation or community group that failed to attend on more than one occasion in the year. AL explained that he was keen to encourage active membership but acknowledged that there would be some flexibility.
- 3.4 Rob Buick (RB) queried the proposal that groups could only nominate one member to attend forum meetings, noting that two people were sometimes needed due to the workload involved. Cllr Chris Howorth (CH) added that it may sometimes be useful for council representatives to have an officer present. AL agreed to amend the ToR to confirm that up to two members would be invited at the discretion of the Chair but if meeting sizes become unwieldy it may be necessary to reduce the number.
- 3.5 Peter Willan (PW) asked if industry and Government representatives from NATS, DfT, CAA and the airlines were considered as observers or participants. AL confirmed that they were members of the forum. PW asked if the scope of the forum included the potential expansion of Heathrow. AL confirmed that the forum should consider the noise impacts of any Heathrow operations. PW highlighted that the forum had no mandate to make decisions. AL confirmed that the forum could not make decisions on behalf of other organisations but sought to find a consensus view where possible and reflect that into those decision-making processes. PW asked if topics such as carbon and air quality could also be raised at the forum. AL acknowledged that there were interdependencies but noted that there was a separate group which looked at air quality, so those issues should be raised with that forum. He added that all of the forum chairs met regularly under the CISHA umbrella, so he would want to liaise with them on those topics.
- 3.6 Armelle Thomas (AT) agreed that the minutes should be shared with members of the represented community groups but stressed that they needed to be accurate and approved by members before they are distributed. AL noted that part of his role was to ensure that the minutes were an accurate reflection of the meeting and that comments could be directed to him.
- 3.7 Michael Thornton (MT) asked (via Teams Chat) if meetings held in community locations would still be accessible online. AK confirmed that this would be the case where possible, although it would depend on the facilities and capability of the chosen venue.

## 4 Resumption of Funding for Independent Expert Advice

- 4.1 AL announced that Heathrow had agreed to provide funding for the Chair to procure independent expert advice as he saw fit. Becky Coffin (BC) added that Heathrow was still making a loss but confirmed that funding would be resumed from 1 January 2024, subject to a revised process whereby the Chair would be responsible for allocating the funding to the right projects. Paul Conway (PC) called for the advice to be provided exclusively to community members, but AL clarified that the scope of work would be agreed with all forum members. AL and BC added that the scope of work should be agreed before deciding who should be appointed to do the work.

## 5 Benchmarking Heathrow's Noise Position

- 5.1 DG gave a presentation on benchmarking Heathrow's noise position to set its Noise Action Plan (NAP) in context and see how Heathrow performs against other airports. He outlined some metrics that could potentially be used in the proposed data dashboard. He stated that community groups ultimately want to see annoyance from noise reduced, so metrics that describe annoyance should be used and they should also feed into the next NAP. He made a number of proposals such as using the latest UK and European data to understand Heathrow's performance, looking at the 2019 population impact in London, using 2019 data in the DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) to understand the financial impact, providing baseline single mode event contours and N-above contours, using independent consultants and improving the understanding of annoyance from noise. The presentation was circulated prior to the meeting.
- 5.2 Spencer Norton (SN) suggested that 2017 should be used as a benchmark instead of 2013/14. He also proposed waiting for 2022 data because the fleet mix has changed so much post-Covid and 2019 is no longer representative of today's operations.
- 5.3 Darren Rhodes (DR) advised (via Teams Chat) that 2011, 2016 and 2021 were the Environmental Noise Directive (END) assessment years.
- 5.4 RN advised that benchmarking had featured in Heathrow's NAP several times. He pointed out that London was nine times bigger than Frankfurt with 2.4 million people affected by road noise and 1.6m during the night-time. He was keen to find common space to support or resource research. He noted that single mode and N-above contours were included in Heathrow's annual noise contours, but they could not be used for direct comparison as they were not produced for other airports. He cited a 2022 report which he had co-authored in an independent capacity entitled 'Study on Airport Noise Reduction' for further reading. The report can be downloaded [here](#).
- 5.5 IG stated that DfT would look at metrics as part of the new Aviation Noise Attitude Survey (ANAS), replacing the 2014 Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA), and would consult on any changes. DG claimed that SoNA was flawed with numbers that were dumbed down. He stated that Government policy was therefore wrong and that DfT did not understand the impact of change. He concluded that Airspace Modernisation should not be allowed to proceed on that basis. IG advised that research was always evolving, and every study had opportunities for improvement, including those produced by WHO. He explained that it had always been the intention to repeat the SoNA study, and the lessons learned would be put into place by the CAA for the next study. However, he stressed that current UK policy was based on the current study. RB asked when ANAS would take place. IG explained that the study was planned for 2023 with results expected in 2024.
- 5.6 PW felt that a wholly different approach was needed, as he could think of six major studies over the last thirty years, but they were always put off by another study.

## 6 Issues Arising out of Airspace Modernisation Workshops

- 6.1 Stephen Clark (SC) and Deborah Petty (DP) gave a presentation highlighting community concerns relating to Heathrow's Airspace Modernisation (AM) workshops from July and November. The presentation covered a broad range of topics and asserted that future flight path options should not be devised or appraised until an acceptable evidence base is available. The presentation was circulated prior to the meeting.
- 6.2 Jenni Sykes (JS) noted that she recognised all of the remarks in the presentation from

prior email correspondence. She advised that a response had been sent out before the meeting and could be circulated to members if that would be helpful. She asked for all further feedback to be submitted by email so that it can be formally documented under the CAP1616 Airspace Change Process, noting that feedback was appreciated but it needed to be effectively recorded in one place.

- 6.3 JS pointed out that Heathrow had not yet assessed the comprehensive list of options, so comments about the assessment method were for the future. She also corrected the assertion that Heathrow had modelled 650,000 theoretical flight paths, noting that these were notional tracks used to collect data to develop the long list of options only. DG asked how Heathrow would evaluate change. JS explained that Heathrow had not yet started that evaluation but would advise on the proposed methodology as the work progresses.
- 6.4 SC stated that Heathrow should be held accountable for the impact of its AM programme and should not defer to DfT, CAA and ACOG policy, procedures and protocols. Rebecca Christie (RC) responded that AM has a complex structure with a number of people delivering. As co-sponsors, the DfT and CAA have responsibility for strategy and the regulatory process respectively. There are also a number of relevant policies on decarbonisation, Net Zero, noise and planning across government, so there will be points that Heathrow will look to Government and CAA to answer. She explained that AM is much larger than just Heathrow, that there is a framework in which Heathrow has to operate and ACOG has responsibility for that, with multiple users of airspace that have to come together. She explained that if AM was not to proceed because of policy that might change later then there would never be any infrastructure projects, so governments have to move ahead based on current policy. She noted that the AM programme is underway now but there is no end date, so it will be an evolution and how the world looks in 20 or 30 years could be quite different. She added that communities are aware of the benefits of AM and that ACOG will be engaging with communities to further explain what AM can deliver.
- 6.5 PW said he could not see the benefits of AM and that modernising airspace just because it has not been updated for fifty years was not a good enough reason. AL reminded him to provide feedback through the formal channels.

## **7 Airspace Modernisation Update**

- 7.1 Natalie Wallis (NW) gave an update on the AM timeline, explaining that Heathrow was currently at Stage 2A in the CAP1616 Airspace Change Process. She advised that a comprehensive list of flight path options and concepts had been developed to meet the Design Principles set out at Stage 1, and that engagement workshops had now been completed with community and industry stakeholders. She added that the deadline for feedback on the approach to Stage 2A was 5pm on Friday 9th December. The presentation was circulated prior to the meeting.
- 7.2 DP expressed concern about the next stage of option assessment and wanted to be more involved in the process. NW explained that additional engagement sessions had been scheduled above and beyond the requirements of CAP1616 for that reason.
- 7.3 DG asked how communities could provide feedback without knowing the noise impact. JS explained that noise assessments would take place at Stage 2B of the CAP1616 process.
- 7.4 AT appreciated Heathrow going beyond the CAP1616 process but said this should be expected because the impact of Heathrow was so large as a result of it being located in

the wrong place.

- 7.5 Carole Marr (CM) expressed concern that Design Principle 7 (“seek to avoid overflying the same communities with multiple routes”) has only received “initial consideration” at this stage. She queried how Heathrow can satisfy the principle of avoiding overflying communities with both arrivals and departures when a significant number of the design options for arrivals and departures for certain areas are in the same airspace. Lisa Forshew (LF) assured CM that Heathrow would be looking to keep arrivals and departures separate where possible.
- 7.6 PW asked if flight paths were being analysed based on single flights or projected traffic numbers. LF explained that at this stage of options development they used metrics looking at single flights. Traffic forecasts will be included when options are assessed.

## 8 Noise Action Plan 2024-2028 Development Plan

- 8.1 Pierre Sohier (PS) gave an overview of Heathrow’s timeline for the next Noise Action Plan (NAP) to cover the period 2024-2028. He proposed holding three working groups between January and April 2023 to develop the draft NAP prior to public consultation in June. The presentation was circulated prior to the meeting.
- 8.2 Community groups asked for early understanding on how the plan will be developed and which metrics will be used, with a focus on the issues that really impact on communities, not just the minimum requirements set by Defra. DP asked if communities could contact Heathrow with ideas and PS confirmed that they could.
- 8.3 AL requested that the proposed dates for the working groups be circulated as part of the forward timetable. **ACTION PS**

## 9 Data Dashboard

- 9.1 Mike Glen (MG) presented a dashboard showing operational data for October 2022 across a range of metrics. The presentation was circulated prior to the meeting. He presented the standard Key Performance Indicator (KPI) chart of 21 metrics. He pointed out that the RAG status for each metric was green apart from those for 1,000ft infringements which increased due to higher traffic levels, and CCO compliance which dropped due to increased interaction between arrivals and departures as a result of increased traffic. He proposed a concept for a future dashboard that focussed on nine key metrics and asked members for feedback.
- 9.2 BB asked why the final two KPIs were not assigned a colour. MG explained that there was no RAG status for Night Quota. BB suggested showing the number of flights before 06:00. MG advised that this was included on the proposed dashboard.
- 9.3 Paul Beckford (PB) asked if the dashboard could also show 2019 data. **ACTION MG**
- 9.4 RB asked if aircraft are fined for 1,000ft infringements. MG responded that fines were only issued for breaching noise limits. RB added that showing track keeping across all runways masked the issue of the easterly CPT route. MG explained that Heathrow looked at data for each runway, advising that the dashboard was designed to provide a snapshot but that he was happy to provide a deeper dive into specific topics as needed.



## 10 Night Flights

- 10.1 MG presented charts showing the number of late runners in 2022 to date. He gave a comprehensive description of the criteria for allowing dispensations and how challenging summer conditions had contributed to many of these over that period. He noted that despite the challenges, Heathrow remained within and below its quota allowances. He advised that one of Heathrow's targets for 2023 was to increase the number of nights without late runners. The presentation was circulated prior to the meeting.
- 10.2 AL asked MG to confirm the process for dispensing a flight. MG advised that the dispensation is applied by Heathrow and reported to DfT for scrutiny within 24 hours.
- 10.3 AT advised that Heathrow was only supposed to operate in the shoulder period (23:00 to 23:30) in exceptional circumstances. She noted that there appeared to be a rush from 23:15 to 23:30 almost every night for late flights to depart before 23:30 and this should be stopped. MG responded that no flights are scheduled after 23:00 and offered to provide data showing the number of flights during the shoulder period. **ACTION MG**
- 10.4 CH asked if the disparity between 23:00 and 23:30 was due to the difference between the time that aircraft push back from the stand and the time they take off. RN explained that the times in question were wheels up/down times.
- 10.5 MM pointed out that late runners during easterly operations were a key issue for Ealing residents, stressing that it was totally unacceptable that there had been three departures after 01:00 in February and a further four in June. She recalled that Heathrow used to provide a table showing the details of every late running flight and asked if that could be reinstated. **ACTION MG**
- 10.6 PB added that the reasons for dispensations should also be published. AL asked for information about night flights, number of nights free of night flights and the number of dispensations to be included on the dashboard if possible. **ACTION MG**
- 10.7 AL also requested that a more in-depth discussion of night flights form part of the agenda for a future meeting. **ACTION MG/RN**

## 11 AOB

- 11.1 Surinderpal Suri (SS) pointed out that regulatory standards for development were being infringed in terms of noise levels, noting that British Standard BS8233 limits the noise levels inside bedrooms to 45dB, which means that external façade noise levels should not exceed 60dB. He warned that standards needed to be realigned to avoid housing stock becoming sub-standard. He asked how many properties Heathrow had insulated over the last five years. **ACTION RN**
- 11.2 Wendy Matthews (WM) asked for it to be noted that communities which are not directly overflown can also suffer from noise annoyance.
- 11.3 AL informed members that he had requested Heathrow provide him with discretion to place four of Heathrow's community noise monitors at locations to be decided by him in discussion with NACF members. **ACTION MG/RN**

11.4 CH asked if the noise monitor in Virginia Water could remain for an extended time period as it would not have measured much noise during the pandemic. AL stated that Heathrow were yet to agree to this request and that the process for allocating any noise monitors would involve discussion with forum members.

### **Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 8 February 2023 (1:00pm – 4:00pm)