

Noise and Airspace Community Forum (NACF)

Minutes (8 February 2023, 13:00 – 16:00, Hounslow House)

Confirmed attendees

Name	Borough / Organisation
Andreas Lambrianou	Chair
Cllr Dr Wendy Matthews	Buckinghamshire Council
Barbara Perata-Smith *	CAA
John Burton	CAA
Baroness Liz Sugg	CISHA
Ian Greene	DfT
Margaret Majumdar	Ealing Aircraft Noise Action Group
Cllr Tony Popham	Elmbridge Borough Council
Robert Buick	Englefield Green Action Group
Paul Conway	Englefield Green Action Group
Paul Beckford	HACAN
Christine Taylor *	Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association
Armelle Thomas *	Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association
Becky Coffin	Heathrow
Rick Norman	Heathrow
Jenni Sykes	Heathrow
Michael Glen *	Heathrow
Lisa Forshew	Heathrow
Andy Knight	Heathrow
Richard West	Heathrow
Pierre Sohier	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
Paul Baker *	London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
Amanda Nicholls *	London Borough of Lewisham
Deborah Petty	Molesey Residents Association
Dave Matthews	NATS
Robin Clarke *	NATS
Bridget Bell	Plane Hell Action
Peter Willan *	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
Cllr David Hilton	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
Cllr Chris Howorth	Runnymede Borough Council
Sue Janota	Surrey County Council
Stephen Clark	Teddington Action Group
Dave Gilbert	Teddington Action Group
Carole Marr *	Windlesham Society

* *Attended online*

Apologies

Graham Young	Richings Park Residents Association
Spencer Norton	British Airways
Darren Rhodes	CAA
Rebecca Christie	DfT
Ian Jopson	NATS
Pete Glass	NATS

1 Welcome and Introduction

- 1.1 Andreas Lambrianou (AL) welcomed members to the meeting. He introduced Baroness Liz Sugg (LS), independent chair of the Council for the Independent Scrutiny of Heathrow Airport (CISHA), who was attending as an observer. LS explained that CISHA was the successor to the Heathrow Community Engagement Board (HCEB) and had been running for five to six months to help make engagement between stakeholders and the airport more effective. She noted that NACF sits under CISHA and that CISHA can support NACF to take forward issues raised in the forum.

2 Previous Minutes and Actions

- 2.1 AL advised that the draft minutes from the previous forum on 23 November had been circulated for comment. He noted that Carole Marr (CM) has requested an amendment to item 7.5 and Cllr John Martin (JM) had asked to be added to the attendance list, so both of these changes would be incorporated. No other changes were requested.
- 2.2 AL went through the actions from the previous meeting as detailed below.
- 2.3 **Provide map showing heights above sea level (2.1).** AL confirmed that a link to an online resource had been provided in the previous minutes. Bridget Bell (BB) replied that she would prefer a map and did not want to use an online resource. **ACTION RW**
- 2.4 **Latest figures for retrofitted A320 aircraft (2.9).** Rick Norman (RN) advised that Pierre Sohier (PS) had been contacting airlines for the latest data and would circulate an update. **ACTION PS**
- 2.5 **ANEEM update (2.10).** Michael Glen (MG) confirmed that ANEEM (a system to measure community noise exposure) had now been deployed.
- 2.6 **Changes to Terms of Reference (3.2/3.4).** AL advised that the forum's Terms of Reference had been updated and would be circulated after the meeting.
- 2.7 **Circulate Noise Action Plan (NAP) workshop dates (8.3).** AL confirmed that the dates were circulated to members in December.
- 2.8 **Data dashboard suggestions (9.3/10.5/10.6).** AL advised that MG would present on this later in the meeting.
- 2.9 **Provide number of flights during the shoulder period (10.3).** MG explained that there had been an average of 7.9 flights each night between 23:00 and 23:30 during 2022, similar to pre-Covid levels. The average nightly numbers for the last seven years were 8.5 (2016), 7.3 (2017), 8.6 (2018), 8.1 (2019), 1.5 (2020), 1.6 (2021) and 7.9 (2022). He reiterated that flights were not scheduled during this period.

- 2.10 **Future agenda item on night flights (10.7).** AL advised that this had been added to the forum's annual work plan which would be covered later in the meeting.
- 2.11 **Provide number of properties that Heathrow has insulated (11.1).** RN advised that approximately 10,750 properties had been treated under Heathrow's noise insulation schemes. Surinderpal Suri (SS) posed a number of questions and RN offered to meet with him to discuss the issues he raised. **ACTION RN**
- 2.12 Robert Buick (RB) asked which contours were used for scheme eligibility. RN explained that they were 69 dB for the Day Noise Scheme, 90 SEL for the Night Noise Scheme and 69 dB for the Quieter Homes Scheme. He added that Heathrow would be announcing new noise insulation schemes in the coming weeks and hoped to provide an outline at the next meeting. **ACTION RN**
- 2.13 **Community noise monitors (11.3).** AL advised that this would be covered later in the meeting.
- 2.14 Armelle Thomas (AT) asked for an update on item 5.2. **ACTION RW**

3 Annual Work Plan

- 3.1 AL put forward a draft work plan for 2023 and advised that items would be scheduled in advance to facilitate an effective discussion on the day. Margaret Majumdar (MM) asked if presentations proposed by community members would be additional to those on the work plan. AL confirmed that there would be space for community members to propose topics and wanted members to jointly agree which topics would be covered as deep dive items. He added that having an annual work plan should mean that papers could be circulated in plenty of time.
- 3.2 BB asked how much time would be allotted to each item. AL explained that it would vary depending on the item. RB noted that the Noise Abatement Departure Profile (NADP) study was scheduled for 24 May and asked if the results would be ready. RN hoped so and said he was following up with Darren Rhodes (DR). **ACTION RN**
- 3.3 Paul Conway (PC) asked Heathrow to reconsider the offer of an independent advisor to the chair, stating that it was only fair for community groups to have their own advisor and to choose who that should be. He alleged that Heathrow donated hundreds of thousands of pounds to political parties and that the £25,000 offered for an independent advisor was derisory. AL responded that the budget was allocated to the chair, adding that it was important to find the best expert and that he would take advice from both community and industry representatives to ensure that whoever was chosen had credibility with all members. Becky Coffin (BC) confirmed that the chair should make the decision. She reminded members that the funding would be reviewed but Heathrow was not currently a profit-making business. She stressed that Heathrow does not make donations to any political parties. *(Note: all political donations are registered on the [Electoral Commission website](#).)*

4 Issues Surrounding SoNA

- 4.1 Dave Gilbert (DG) gave a presentation recapping his previous criticism of the CAA's Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA 2014). He proposed that an independent advisor should carry out a review and report back to the forum. The presentation was circulated prior to the meeting.

- 4.2 AL responded that he would be happy to consider a literature review as part the workload of the independent advisor. He reminded members that SoNA was being superseded by the new Aviation Noise Attitudes Survey (ANAS) which would pick up on some of the issues raised.
- 4.3 Ian Greene (IG) confirmed that the DfT had commissioned ANAS and that DG had been involved in some of the discussions around the development of the study. He advised that the study would take on some of the learning points of the SoNA review carried out by the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN). The survey is due to be undertaken this summer with a report expected in 2024.
- 4.4 IG responded to various points made in the presentation. He advised that SoNA was only about annoyance and was not used in the monetisation of other health impacts (slide 1). In reference to a recent meeting between HACAN, DfT and Defra (slides 3 and 4), he advised that the similarity between the SoNA and Miedema curves had not been used to defend SoNA. He cautioned that DG was doing the CAA a disservice by suggesting there was a conflict of interest between the Environmental Research and Consultancy Department (ERCD), which does excellent independent work, and other areas of the CAA which are there to support the aviation industry. He noted that he had stated at the last meeting that every study had opportunities for improvement, not that SoNA required improvement (slide 6). He also suggested that the age of studies was not relevant to the discussion, noting that while Miedema was 40 years old, most of the WHO studies were 20 years old while SoNA 2014 was a more recent study.
- 4.5 AL asked how members could influence ANAS. IG explained that the study was already established following engagement from CAA and ICCAN, so at this point in time there was no way to further influence the study as it was almost at the point of being launched. John Burton (JB) added that the CAA would continue to engage throughout the design and delivery phase and would share the findings with the NACF and other groups when the report is published.
- 4.6 DG asked if CAA would come back and explain what they plan to do with the survey. JB explained that it was not an open public document in order to mitigate bias in line with ISO standard recommendations. He noted that community groups had been engaged in the design principles and the points raised by ICCAN had been considered.
- 4.7 RB questioned the independence of the CAA, claiming that the ANASE study (Attitudes to Noise from Aviation Sources in England) had come about because of consistent bias by CAA, suggesting that the CAA's remit was not to be independent, it was to get more aircraft in the sky.
- 4.8 AL opened the floor for questions. PW commented that there had been at least six major studies in the last 40 years that had only served to kick the can further down the road. He noted that ANASE had not been used for targets to reduce noise as originally stated by the Secretary of State and questioned how ANAS would be used. Deborah Petty (DP) asked about the overall scope of the survey design. Stephen Clark (SC) proposed that ANAS should be peer reviewed and asked how it would be factored into Airspace Modernisation or the expansion of airports. SS noted that there were other impacts to consider such as Local Authority targets and the risk of developments being substandard. PB asked if there were any plans to update DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) annoyance values.

- 4.9 IG explained that ANAS would update understanding and help to build the evidence base further. He advised that the survey was being undertaken by external experts who are well versed in surveys and agreed that it should be peer reviewed before anything was taken forward from it. He explained that noise annoyance was looked at through the Defra-led Interdepartmental Group on Costs and Benefits Noise subject group (IGCB(N)). He noted that the work had been delayed but was now progressing, and the IGCB(N) would be looking to make recommendations across government on the costs and benefits of noise, and whether the WHO, SoNA or any other curve should be used.
- 4.10 With regard to Airspace Modernisation, IG explained that the main purpose of setting a Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) was to allow a baseline for options analysis for different routes within the airspace change process, so the baseline would be the same whichever curve was used. He added that any changes to TAG values would update that. With regard to developments, IG explained that the Aviation 2050 green paper in 2018 had consulted on guidance for new developments, and the DfT was working closely with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) to provide better guidance for Local Authorities.

5 Airspace Modernisation

- 5.1 SC gave a presentation raising a number of issues with Airspace Modernisation and the Airspace Change Process following Heathrow's airspace engagement workshops. The presentation was circulated prior to the meeting.
- 5.2 AL reiterated comments from the previous forum that all feedback on this topic should be submitted through the dedicated channels so that it can be formally documented under the CAP1616 Airspace Change Process. Jennifer Sykes (JS) agreed and noted that most of the issues had already been discussed at the airspace engagement workshops.
- 5.3 JS clarified a number of points in the presentation. She explained that Heathrow's quoted comments on PBN were made in response to a consultation by International Air Transport Association (IATA) regarding EU legislation for the deployment of Performance Based Navigation (PBN) by 2019, with Heathrow's message being that it was important for Heathrow to have time to understand the impact of PBN before it was deployed. She explained that CAP1616 required Heathrow to develop a Comprehensive List of Options (CLOO) and noted that not all of them would be taken forward to the final proposals, which will need to comply with Air Navigation Guidance (ANG). She reminded SC that public consultation would take place at Stage 3 of the process. BB pointed out that there was no need to gather evidence of arrivals using PBN as South-East London had experienced this since mid-2016, with data available at Heathrow's noise monitor in Camberwell which was installed in February 2018.
- 5.4 Lisa Forshew (LF) gave a presentation explaining the CAP1616 Options Appraisal process and setting out the timeline for Stage 2 of the ACP, noting that Heathrow plans to share work undertaken on the Design Principle Evaluation (DPE) at the next phase of workshops in March.

- 5.5 Members raised a number of questions. SC asked how many options would be taken into the Initial Options Appraisal (IOA). LF explained that the process allowed options to be discontinued following the DPE but that it was likely that all options would be kept and assessed at the IOA. SC asked if routes would be evaluated against the Design Principles as combinations or individual routes. LF advised that Stage 2 would look at individual routes and Stage 3 would look at systems. DG asked about arrivals and holding stacks. JS advised that some arrivals options were fully PBN while others included a degree of vectoring as it was not currently feasible to use PBN for all arrivals without affecting landing rates. LF anticipated that stacks would be used less often in the new airspace design but would still be needed for safety reasons, adding that it was not yet known where they would be positioned. SC argued that it was therefore not possible to carry out a qualitative assessment.
- 5.6 BC acknowledged that Airspace Modernisation was an important issue, noting that some of the questions raised required more time than was available. She once again reminded members to engage through the correct process.
- 5.7 BB referred to Heathrow's complaints system and said it was sometimes unclear which response related to which complaint. RB felt that Heathrow's complaints system was out of date, adding that Frankfurt Airport had an independent complaints system which received five million complaints per year because it was so easy to use. AL committed to look into Heathrow's complaints system. **ACTION AL**

6 Data Dashboard

- 6.1 MG presented an updated data dashboard showing Heathrow's flight performance Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in a more visually engaging format. The presentation is provided with the minutes.
- 6.2 AL encouraged members to provide feedback, noting that the dashboard could evolve over time. The new dashboard was broadly welcomed, and BB thanked MG for including separate graphs for arrivals and departures.
- 6.3 PW proposed including KPIs from Heathrow's Noise Action Plan and adding a section on noise complaints. RB recommended putting the dashboard on a website. AL thanked members for their suggestions and said they would be considered. **ACTION MG**

7 Monitoring Deployment Plan

- 7.1 Andy Knight (AK) provided an overview of noise monitors and how they are used at Heathrow. He advised that community noise monitor deployment would be resumed in 2023, with three new locations in line with 2020 recommendations. The presentation was circulated prior to the meeting.
- 7.2 AL noted that DP had submitted a list of questions relating to noise monitors before the meeting and these would be responded to in writing. **ACTION AK**
- 7.3 MM referred to the Hanwell noise monitor deployed four or five years ago, asking how frequently mobile monitors were moved and how the results would be communicated. RN explained that part of the reason for deploying the monitors was to leave them out for a long period. AL added that the data would be collected and fed back to the forum and communities.

- 7.4 RB stated that there were 300 noise monitors at Frankfurt Airport. AK advised that Frankfurt Airport provided 28 monitors and RB clarified that the 300 were owned by the community. He advised that monitors could be purchased for £600 plus a subscription to a network to make the data available for open scrutiny, adding that there was one in Windsor paid for by the council. RN recalled that this had been mentioned in the first NAP workshop and asked RB to provide a link. **ACTION RB**
- 7.5 BB was disappointed that it was not possible to see which boroughs the noise monitors were in and asked why the Kiln Green monitor was regarded as a mirrored environment for London. **ACTION RN**
- 7.6 PW understood that the monitors could only measure down to 55dB because of background noise. RN confirmed that the threshold had to be set above the background noise, otherwise the monitors would only capture one continuous event.

8 Noise Action Plan Update

- 8.1 Pierre Sohier (PS) provided an overview of the NAP workshop on 18 January entitled Working with Local Communities and Audits, covering topics such as reporting, website data, flight analysis tools and ongoing engagement. The presentation was circulated prior to the meeting. The next two workshops will take place on the following dates:
- Wed 15 February (14:00-17:00) - Land-Use Planning & Mitigation
 - Tue 14 March (14:00-17:00) - Quieter Planes and Procedures

9 AOB

- 9.1 PB asked for an update on the proposal to measure Continuous Descent Approaches (CDA) from 7,000ft. **ACTION MG**
- 9.2 DG asked how much noise reduction the NAP would deliver. AL asked him to feed that in through the NAP workshops.
- 9.3 MM asked for future meetings to be held at the Heathrow Academy or Compass Centre. AL explained that others had asked for meetings to be held in the local community, but he would take it into consideration. **ACTION AL**

Date of Next NACF

- Wed 29 March (13:00-16:00) - London Heathrow Marriott Hotel, Hayes, UB3 5AN.