

Notes from TENAG Meeting 27<sup>th</sup> June 2019

Subject	TENAG comments and questions	Heathrow response
<p>Noise implications of steeper approaches following presentation (attached) by Dani Fiumicelli, Temple Group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The difference in noise level with slightly steeper approaches would be imperceptible to most people, but the size of the noise contour would be 5 to 15% smaller (on average around 7% smaller). Because the noise contours cover densely populated areas that means a large number (1000s) of people would fall out of the area covered by the noise contours, but not actually hear any difference.</li> <li>• With steeper departures those in line with the runway benefit from moderately lower noise levels, but engines with higher thrust levels to achieve steeper departures create more noise directly to the side of the airport and at a distance of around 4 to 5 nautical miles from the runway.</li> <li>• Why can't Heathrow move closer to RNAV rates at other airports? There are issues with using RNAV as not all aircraft are adapted and it can't be used in adverse weather.</li> <li>• Is a single mode contour a good way of assessment – why isn't this practical? Noise contours are based on the average of the direction of operation of the airport over 92 days from June to September (typically over a year there is an approximately 75/25% percent split between take offs and approaches to the west and vice versa to the east, depending on wind direction – mode of operation). This has been found to provide a reasonable estimate of overall levels of annoyance in affected communities. However, the noise levels on any particular day at any specific location will be different to this average as the airport will rarely if ever operate a 75/25% split in the direction of take offs and approaches on an individual day. Consequently, "Single mode" contours that show the noise distribution based on only one direction (mode) of airport operation provide a better picture of the actual noise levels on any particular day. Typically, the single mode contours extend further in the direction of take-off and shrink in the direction of approach compared to the averaged noise contours. However, research (SONA14) shows that "single mode" noise contours for westerly airport operations that occur for the majority of the time are slightly less well correlated with community response than the contours based on the 92-day summer average of the airport's mode (direction) of operation. Whereas, the same research shows that single mode contours for easterly operations that arise for a significant minority of the year are substantially better correlated with community response than the contours based on the 92-day summer average of the airport's direction of operation. The CAA describe the use of the single mode contours as not "practical", but this is arguably more a point regarding convenience rather than feasibility.</li> <li>• Is it possible for Heathrow to use real-world measurements to discriminate between which planes are less noisy rather than use the standard QC classification which for example rates the A380 as a 'quiet plane' – something not agreed by local people TENAG feel this issue requires more research and community input as part of the potential approach to the noise envelope being developed for the DCO.</li> <li>• There is a westerly/easterly imbalance in the direction of airport operation – not an even split – which reflects trends in wind direction plus a western preference i.e. where wind conditions are neutral the airport opts to use westerly operations as fewer (although substantial numbers) of people are affected by take-off noise.</li> </ul>	<p>The Heathrow Environment and Sustainability team would welcome the opportunity to attend a TENAG meeting to provide a detailed briefing and Q&amp;A session on the areas raised.</p>

<b>Subject</b>	<b>TENAG comment and questions</b>	<b>Heathrow response</b>
General discussion on noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are complaints about noise monitored?</li> <li>• What are the trends? What boundaries are used? What are the implications for compensation? Do the underlying rules need to change?</li> <li>• Are there more opportunities for noise reduction which distinguish between the same level but vary in public impact e.g. different flap settings or combinations airframe and engine combinations?</li> <li>• What is the timescale for quieter aircraft (given that the stock lasts for 25/30 years)?</li> <li>• Is 6.30 am for “the end of night-time” right? What public engagement and data has been used to fix this time? What impact does the recovery period have on this? Is the time LHR claim for the earliest arrival time when the aircraft lands or the time it gets to gate? i.e. can an aircraft land at say 0515 hrs and because it takes 15 mins to taxi and ground manoeuvring to get to gate be counted as having arrived at 0530 hrs?</li> <li>• Check Frankfurt study of impact of noise on mental health. What are the implications for noise measurement?</li> </ul>	As per the above
Holding Heathrow to account	TENAG would like to see Heathrow held to account in relation to targets. Scrutiny is welcomed but there should be an independent watchdog with assessment capacity and legally binding powers to stop developments if targets are breached. There should also be a tight legal agreement between the planning authority and Heathrow rather than the usual planning consents where conditions may be amended.	Heathrow is proposing an independent scrutiny panel be set up to ensure that Heathrow’s growth is managed within a framework based on the ANPS commitments. The approach is set out in our Environmentally Managed Growth – Our Framework for Growing Sustainably which can be found here in the suite of consultation documents.

<b>Subject</b>	<b>TENAG comment and questions</b>	<b>Heathrow response</b>
Surface traffic	Policy states no more of 'our' traffic on the roads than today but how is this defined? As the airport and economy expands there will be more indirectly related traffic – has this been modelled? TENAG suggest a DCO inspectorate a la Olympics.	<p>As stated in the Airports NPS, Heathrow will continue to strive to meet its public pledge to have landside airport-related traffic no greater than today. The proposed boundary for airport-related traffic is defined by land that is accessible only by Heathrow-controlled roads. We will measure the number of vehicle trips that go to these areas, although to measure performance against our pledge we will exclude Expansion-related construction vehicles, scheduled public transport vehicles and through traffic. This does not therefore mean that traffic levels on individual roads in the vicinity of the airport will not increase, either due to background growth or the redistribution of traffic due to changes to highway infrastructure and demand.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the no-more-traffic (NMT) pledge is separate to any mitigation measures which may be proposed in conjunction with the expansion of Heathrow to address any adverse impacts on the transport networks that expansion may cause. The Preliminary Transport Information Report presents preliminary information about the forecast changes to the use and operation of the transport networks over a much wider area than the NMT boundary but does not assess the significance of these changes nor identify any mitigation measures. This will be done in the Transport Assessment accompanying our DCO application, which will present the results of a full assessment of the impacts of expansion on the transport networks around the airport and identify mitigation measures as appropriate.</p>
Community fund	This is complex subject – TENAG welcome the increased amount but more engagement is needed as to distribution and calculation. What is the timescale and is it front loaded or a regular amount per year?	We will be engaging with Government, HCEB, local authorities and other relevant stakeholders as we develop the detail of the proposed fund, including taking on board feedback from our current consultation. There is no fixed proposal at this stage in respect of how long the fund would last for, how it would be distributed or the scale of the fund.
Southern Rail route and Western Rail Route	TENAG consider this essential to traffic and improve air quality. What can TENAG do to help support this proposal which will require a separate DCO. KB to discuss with Val Shawcross the idea of a joint HCEB/Heathrow Conference to support the Southern Rail Route. We also support the Western Rail Route which seems further ahead than the Southern proposal but the same offer of support applies.	Heathrow is fully supportive of a Southern Rail link to Heathrow and has been working with the DfT to progress the work currently being undertaken by the government. Heathrow would welcome any support that TENAG could provide in aiding the process along.
TENAG response current Heathrow consultation	Next meeting (September 19 <sup>th</sup> ) is a few days after consultation closes – request Heathrow to accept response a week later.	The consultation closes on the 13th September however late responses may be accepted at our discretion

