



HEATHROW COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT BOARD
**QUESTION
TIME**

**Wednesday 23 January 2019 at 14:00
University of West London (Brentford Campus)**

Minute of the question time event

Rachel Cerfontyne welcomed attendees and explained that when she woke up, she felt tense and anxious. She had dreamt that the venue had been double booked, with an alternate venue outside. After speaking to Anna, she said in her dream that when it got to food, only melon balls were served.

Rachel again welcomed everyone to the first Question Time event and she was pleased to see a wide variety of people from the community, as well as stakeholders. She further thanked the panel and expressed her hope that it would be a stimulating discussion. She then thanked Nadine and said they were lucky to have such an experienced Chair, though they were sorry to have spelt her surname wrong. This had been corrected on the slides, however they had not been able to change it on the leaflets.

Rachel then offered a warm and personal welcome to Robert Light, the Head Commissioner of ICCAN (Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise). She stated that many may have noticed the sound booth upon arrival today, which was something that Heathrow used at community consultation events and had received positive feedback. Rachel felt it should really be called a Sight and Sound Lab, since it enabled one to actually see the plane, along with further variations to listen to and watch.

There were four main reasons for today's event:

1. Heathrow Airport has launched a major consultation on Airspace Strategy and Future Operations, which runs until 04.03.2019. There would be a chance for people to hear more information and to ask questions.
2. Being a new organisation, the HCEB is experimenting with different formats for community engagement. The predecessor body, the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee, had functioned as a big board event where the community could observe but not participate.
3. They had been listening to feedback, of which there had been a lot. Many people have said that they find it difficult to get clear and straight answers. Rachel therefore asked the panel to ensure their answers were simple and to the point.

4. There has been some feedback from members of the community who have advised they do not attend more community meetings because they find them hostile or intimidating, as well as that, the same people were dominating discussion, meaning that others felt they were unable to ask anything themselves. Rachel hoped that today's event would feel very different and that people would have a chance to ask their questions.

HCEB had received over 1000 questions, which had been separated into themes and then distilled into key issues. They had received help from members of the community and stakeholders in this task and it was noted that there would be opportunities to consider other topics later in the year. They had also tried to keep the questions open, since hostile questions often led to defensive answers. It was hoped that this would stimulate debate and she asked that people be courteous and constructive. They had selected a range of people to ask the questions, with different roles and perspectives. The panel had been given the questions in advance, however they did not know the order they were coming in.

Before Rachel handed over to Nadine, she wanted to touch on the theme of trust, or a lack of it. One of the frequently asked questions was also around where people lived. Rachel then handed over to Nadine.

Nadine Dereza thanked Rachel and welcomed attendees. Before she continued, she noted there were no planned fire drills. Therefore, if an alarm went off, it would be real and she asked that in this event, people make their way to the closest fire exits. She also reminded people not to use the lifts in the event of a fire alarm. Exits were to be found at the front and rear on each side of the room. These were unlocked and had been checked. The assembly point was behind the accommodation building next to the university campus and if anyone had any mobility issues, they should let the team know. She also asked that everyone's mobile phones and devices be silenced.

There was a photographer at the back of the auditorium and if anyone had an issue with their image being used, they would have five days to say as such. Audio was also being recorded and this would be deleted on 28.02.2019. Nadine asked that any comments on this be directed to the team.

Nadine referred to the frequent question asked in respect of where people lived. She stated that she had grown up in the Borough of Hillingdon, with her father having worked for British Airways at Heathrow Airport for 37 years. She herself had experienced the environmental and health impacts of living in relatively close proximity to the airport and had suffered from bad asthma as a child.

Nadine currently lived in South Buckinghamshire and that a consultation leaflet had been posted through her door in December. These were issues that affected her family as well.

Nadine's role today was to independently chair the event. She had shared some of her personal information to highlight that she did indeed have some understanding of the opportunities, challenges and impacts facing the Heathrow community. While doing research on this event, it was clear to her that the HCEB believes that the community and stakeholders together have the expertise to find solutions. Today offered the opportunity to ask questions and to make any comments or suggestions regarding Heathrow Airport's consultation on future airspace and operations.

Regarding airspace, Heathrow were consulting on two key areas:

1. Heathrow Airport's plans on redesigning airspace for arriving and departing planes, which could mean new flight paths over new areas.
2. They were also consulting over 'design envelopes' and changes to how their two existing runways were used. In particular, consideration was being given to changes to the way that some aircraft arrive with the proposed introduction of Independent Parallel Approaches (IPA).

With regards to future operations, they were also consulting on the proposed expansion of the airport into three runways. This would take into account noise management, which would be a big part of today's discussion, as well as respite through runway and airspace alteration, directional preference and night flights.

An audience member, who knew who they were, would read out a question they had either written

themselves or contributed to. The question would represent several questions that make up a particular theme and the panel would be given the opportunity to respond. There would be one roving microphone on either side of the room, with an additional two helpers on either side as well. She asked that people wait until they had the microphone before introducing themselves, while they should also wait to be selected.

People were free to say their name if they wanted, though they were expected to say which organisation they belonged to and what their status was in respect of residency. Nadine further requested that panel members avoid airline/technical speak in order that everybody knew what was being discussed.

Questions had been sent to the panel in advance in order that they could not say they did not know the answers. There were 12 key questions, which allowed around eight minutes per question. Since they only had a maximum of 90 minutes, if they were unable to get through the questions, HCEB would follow them up and post any questions to their website.

Nadine would also come back to Rachel at some point for a temperature check, before then inviting her at the end for a quick interview to reflect on the discussion.

Comments could also be submitted via the HCEB Twitter handle, which was confirmed as @HeathrowCEB. The hash tag to use would be #HCEBQT. Sam from the HCEB team was sitting at the back and he would be monitoring tweets that were relevant to today's discussion. Nadine would also be checking in with Sam to see if he had any Twitter content to share and she invited him to put his hand up if he needed to attract her attention.

Today's panel included Ruth Cadbury (MP for Brentford and Isleworth), John Holland-Kaye (CEO, Heathrow Airport), Tim Johnson (Policy Director at the Civil Aviation Authority), Dr Charlotte Clark (expert in the health impacts of aviation noise) and Caroline Low (Director of Heathrow Expansion at the Department for Transport).

The main themes would be centred around trust, health, night flights, expansion, the environment, fairness, performance capacity and the process itself.

First on the panel was Ruth Cadbury, MP for Brentford and Isleworth, which included Chiswick, Isleworth and Osterley. She was elected in 2015 and she was also a member of the Transport Select Committee, as well as being Co-Chair of the All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Heathrow Expansion. Prior to that, she had spent 25 years at the London Borough of Hounslow.

Ruth Cadbury confirmed she would be present all afternoon. She had been a Hounslow Councillor for 25 years before her election to Parliament. Heathrow expansion had been a major issue and a major economic driver, especially with there being a lot of people who worked in and around Heathrow. The environmental impact was key to consider, with noise being the principal issue. She further noted the impact on traffic, which was particularly bad around Heathrow, however today they would just be talking about the noise.

From her perspective as a politician, today was for communities living under the approach path, since for about six miles, planes were locked into their final approach. If one lived in the south side of Brentford or Isleworth, one would have planes immediately overhead for the central runway. In central Brentford as well, one would be under the approach path in the event of the third runway going ahead. For those living in communities further away however, there were still issues with there being 480k flights a year. Another issue was around the new way of landing simultaneously on each runway. The additional 25k flights a year that Heathrow wanted would also impact on the existing respite arrangements.

Nadine Dereza stated that John Stewart had been earmarked to replace Ruth Cadbury on the panel, however he would now contribute from the audience. Nadine then welcomed John Holland-Kaye, CEO at Heathrow Airport and asked that he take them through the roles he had undertaken since being appointed and how he has championed the expansion of Heathrow.

John Holland-Kaye confirmed he had been with Heathrow for 10 years and that he had lived on a

flight path for 20 years, though admittedly he did not currently live on the flight path. He did however used to enjoy looking up at planes.

John became Chief Executive five years ago and on his first day, he visited a school and member of the community; some of whom were present here today. This really shaped the way in which he believed that Heathrow should work with the local community.

He further stated that he was unable to undo all the trust that had been lost in the past. He hoped that people would judge him by his actions and what Heathrow was actually doing, though he did identify issues in the complexity of the relationship between Heathrow Airport and the local community. He felt there was a sense of people feeling as if it was Heathrow versus the local community, though he still felt they had a hugely rich relationship with the community.

There were clearly issues regarding congestion on the roads and poor air quality. He affirmed the need to maximise the good things and to minimise the bad. There was a clear opportunity to do things better, especially since Heathrow was cut off from many local communities. With it being so secure, it acted as a blocker. With expansion now happening, it was important to maximise the opportunities that came with it and to see how local communities could be joined up. Some institutions had even been set up to help deliver this.

Nadine Dereza then introduced Tim Johnson, Policy Director at the Civil Aviation Authority. His remit included preparations for Brexit and the UK's airspace modernisation. She asked where he was currently at with the UK's airspace.

Tim Johnson confirmed there were two main strands to this. Firstly, a strategy had been commissioned by the Government and published before Christmas after some engagement. This did not direct there to be airspace expansion in particular areas, since this was down to individual airports. They have recognised there is a lack of trust in the process and this was indeed a long process they had gone through, whereby they worked out what was expected from sponsors and considered issues around transparency, quality of engagement, as well as the quality of evidence used. This quality of evidence used was fundamental to the new process and Tim hoped he would be able to guide attendees in respect of this process and highlight any opportunities to engage in this.

They were now in the formal legal decision-making stage regarding changes to airspace and this is why he would be unable to get into some of the highly specific and detailed issues, since this would prejudice it. A key change in process however was around the nature and number of opportunities that stakeholders had to engage in the process.

Nadine Dereza confirmed they would be returning to this topic. She then introduced Dr Charlotte Clark, an expert in the health impacts of aircraft noise and also notably a Health Advisor on the UK Airports Commission's External Advisory Panel, as well as undertaking systematic reviews of evidence for the World Health Organisation Environmental Noise Guidelines in Europe. Nadine asked Charlotte to explain how she applied her research knowledge for health impact assessments for transport and large infrastructure projects.

Charlotte Clark stated that noise and health evidence had really exploded over the last decade. Since there was sometimes competing evidence, it was about working out which evidence to use. Ultimately, they were trying to bridge the gap between academic studies and processes.

Nadine Dereza then introduced the final panel member, Caroline Low. Caroline was the Director of Heathrow Expansion at the Department for Transport and had held this position since 2015 and Nadine asked her to explain a little more about her commitments.

Caroline Low stated her role had really changed since 2015, it started with the publication of the Airports Commission's report which led to the parliamentary vote last summer which set the policy for expansion at Heathrow Airport. She affirmed that her role was important, not just because of the decision for a new runway, but because of the comprehensive package of compensation and mitigations alongside it. The formation of HCEB was part of that package and would support people to shape the mitigations required for expansion.

Nadine Dereza invited Caroline Morison, Managing Director of the Hillingdon Clinical Commissioning Group, to ask the first question with regard to trust.

Audience Member - Caroline Morison stated there were many local people here today who felt that so many promises made by Heathrow and the Government had been broken and she asked whether trust mattered at all and if so, how could it be built?

John Holland-Kaye answered that this was an important issue and noted concerns raised in local community groups regarding the Terminals 4 and 5 enquiry process. Considering David Cameron's 'no ifs and no buts' policy, he understood why people felt there was a lack of trust. John added that he had apologised for his predecessor's making of a promise that he was in no position to keep. He further asked that he and Heathrow Airport be judged on whether they were doing the things they had been saying, which he felt they had indeed done during his time as Chief Executive.

They were global pioneers in converting their vehicle fleet to electric, which had helped the impact of air quality on the local community. They had also created real careers at the Airport and not just jobs. They have enhanced the prospects of colleagues through high quality training and indeed, many people who started out as security officers were now managing directors.

John understood why people questioned whether they were doing anything in respect of noise issues and noted that a key problem had been about the whistling noise coming from the sky. He had therefore made a list of all the things they heard and then wrote to the Chief Executives of all airlines that fly into Heathrow, asking them to change the design of their aircraft wings. 80% of them have now complied, which is an example of how Heathrow keeps their promises. He hoped this would show they were genuine, while reiterating that he could not change the past.

Caroline Low stated that the reality of living in a democracy was that one government could not bind the hands of a future government, this is what happened in the case of expansion at Heathrow and we recognise that it has created a great deal of uncertainty. Therefore, with regards to the Airports National Policy Statement, the Department had worked hard to secure cross party support, and in the vote last summer more Labour MPs voted in favour of expansion than against it. From a Civil Service point of view we act within our principles of honesty and integrity, and hold ourselves to a very high standard. During the government consultations we appointed former judge Sir Jeremy Sullivan to provide independent oversight on the processes we followed and his report was made public. Caroline's view was that when things had gone wrong in the past it was often an issue with communication, she felt that bodies such as HCEB had a role to play to help the dialogue between communities and Heathrow Airport, and that this would build trust.

Ruth Cadbury stated that Heathrow was a large, commercial organisation and whether you were a passenger or indeed a resident, there had been a catalogue of avoidable situations, such as when the airport closed for a few days because of snow, the blocking of Crossrail and other much cheaper transport links like buses, as well as the ending of buses from Feltham straight into the airport. She also questioned whether there was any trust around drones, as well as affirming her doubt as to whether offers on regional links regarding conditional expansion were worth the paper they were written on. It was clear that residents had long memories.

John Holland-Kaye recalled there being a snow incident on 18.12.2009 that caused chaos. They had however also had a week of snow last year, during which time Heathrow did not close; indeed, they were one of the few airports in Europe who did not close during this period.

He added that Heathrow Airport was an accredited Living Wage Employer and while they had also got rid of zero-hour contracts, they were also investing in Crossrail, since they wanted this

completed as quickly as possible. Furthermore, they have invested in bus links that are pulled back from bus companies and increased the number of regional links. They have been taking action on local, national and global issues and since they were a good and responsible employer, he would not see them being undermined for things that had happened 10 years ago.

Audience Member - resident and member of Ealing Noise Action Group and Former European MP for West London stated that those who had been involved in airport issues knew how many promises have been broken. Regarding Terminal 4, they had been told that this would be all they need then Terminal 5 came along. He felt this had come about because in terms of aviation government had stuck to the out-dated concept of predicting and providing, which most governments in the last 20 years had stopped in relations to roads. He then questioned that since we didn't build more roads because there were more cars, why could the same logic not be applied to aviation.

Caroline Low recognised there were many different views about the need for further aviation capacity. That's why the Government had commissioned the independent Airports Commission to look at capacity. Their unanimous conclusion, based on evidence, was the need for one new runway in the South East. The economic benefits for the country would be huge.

Audience Member - Councillor John Bowden of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead stated that when he was first elected in 2015, his first job had been to go to the appeal process for the ending of the Cranford Agreement and the Northern Runway to be used on dual operations. After two years, Heathrow reneged on this and it morphed into a third runway. For 18 and a half hours a day, he noted, they had continuous landings on that runway. He therefore felt the trust had been broken, since Heathrow had gone back on their promise informing members of the Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee via email only two days before a meeting.

John Holland-Kaye understood why Councillor Bowden felt this and noted that a Government decision had been made in support of a third runway. Therefore, the way in which the airport operated would be very different to the way it did today. Given the complexities of the changes, they felt it was more prudent to do them all at once. He added that circumstances did change and that they were now consulting on changes that would have significant benefits to the Borough.

Audience Member asked panel members to use their microphones.

Audience Member - Bharan Kumar said that as a local GP, his primary concern was people's health. He hoped that minimising the significant negative impacts of aviation noise was a priority, especially when considering changes to airspace and potential expansion.

His question came in two parts: firstly, whether the panel could point to any independent health studies that have been undertaken so far relating to the airport's potential expansion or flight path changes and secondly, whether John Holland-Kaye could advise when the Health Impact Assessment required by the planning process would be started?

John Holland-Kaye said he would answer both questions. Health was important to him as well and he noted that the children in local schools were the children of his colleagues. He therefore wanted them to have a good quality of life and good health. Noise and air quality were clearly issues, while having outside spaces was important for health. Therefore, from a noise point of view, they were seeking to minimise the impact of this. There are independent bodies that do that, however in terms of their own research, the scoping document was available for anyone to look at. They would be submitting preliminary views on the initial consultation in June 2019, before then submitting more next year. One of the changes introduced as a result of direction from the Government, would be to ask sponsors to look at an assessment of the health impact. This was indeed a formal part of the process and he pointed to the quick guide on their airspace change process, along with a 250 page document that was far more detailed.

Charlotte Clarke was interested in the choice of words and noted there was a policy requirement to minimise the impact, which had to be reported in any case. This would be an evidence led process and she further confirmed that they would have to report noise effects on cardiovascular health. There was undoubtedly an opportunity to undertake research around this and she noted the

Germans have now taken the lead in this regard.

Nadine Dereza asked whether Charlotte had seen a change in the way health was considered in her work.

Charlotte Clarke replied that when she started 17 or 18 years ago, it was hard to get anyone to recognise the impact of noise and particularly the impact of noise by aircraft. If someone wanted to research noise, they were seen as a bit peculiar. Over the past 15 years however, things have changed and communities were now becoming more knowledgeable. There had been an explosion in evidence and it was no longer being ignored.

Audience Member - who lives in Feltham and does a lot of work around green spaces recalled the Cabinet Office having undertaken some interesting research in which they were exploring wellbeing indicators. They mapped this onto the flight path and they found a direct correlation. He felt this was a valuable data set to explore and noted that the noise affected his and his children's quality of life. The other concern was around air quality and he recalled finding a layer of thin tar on his roof when he was getting it done. The roofer said that this was found on all roofs around the airport. He did not think there were enough studies being done on the health impacts of aviation, which of course meant there would be a lack of evidence.

Caroline Low noted that a Health Impact Assessment would be required of Heathrow Airport as part of their planning application. On air quality specifically the requirements in the Airports National Policy Statement set out that development should not delay compliance with national air quality standards. Referring to the original question Caroline noted that a strategic health assessment had been undertaken by WSP (environmental consultants), and prior to that Ipsos Mori undertook an attitudinal survey to noise impact. This resulted in a change to the way the Government assessed airspace changes, since it showed that people had been becoming annoyed at lower levels of noise.

Audience Member - a resident of Hillingdon had concerns regarding health and trust. They would be going to Court on 11.03.2019 and if they won the judicial reviews, there would be no DCO. She had attended the Local Focus Forum and noted that there had never before been a Health Impact Assessment from Heathrow. She was concerned about Heathrow adding another 25k flights, regardless of the DCO.

Ruth Cadbury noted there have been more studies showing the impact of living near an airport and some of them have been referenced already. It was about the impact of depositing this black stuff on the roofs and garden furniture. Another study was around the impact of waves of aviation noise on students' learning: a comparative study showed that children who experienced waves of noise did not study as successfully as children who experienced constant noise. Hounslow Heath Infants was one of the study schools, with the study being done here and in three other countries. The reality was that in most areas of life, when more evidence came to the forefront, people tended to stop doing things considered unhealthy, however the logic did not seem to apply here.

Charlotte Clarke noted one of the key issues to be that if you did not know what the problem was, how would you know what could be offered to mitigate it?

John Holland-Kaye stated his aim was to get this right and that the health assessment would help to make a better plan. The DCO process was comprehensive and this is what triggered the health assessment. If they were unable to meet the standards, their Development Consent Order application would not be approved. He added that they were a responsible employer and that they cared about the impact on friends and neighbours.

Audience Member - Julia Ogiehor, Senior Public Affairs Executive, ABTA asked John Holland-Kaye how they balanced the needs of passengers with the needs of local residents to get a full night's sleep, especially when noting the World Health Organisation's view that 10 hours of quiet time was needed to enable all different sleep patterns to be met.

John Holland-Kaye responded that night flights were one of the biggest issues, along with respite and alternation. The World Health Organisation says that people typically spend 7.5 hours in bed

and so to cover the different times that people sleep, they would need to cover 10 hours. West of London however, there were lots of shift workers and so they would need to consider more than 10 hours. Currently, the night period is between 23:00 and 07:00. During this time, there are limits around the types of planes that can be flown. Between 23:00 and 04:00 however, there are no flights at all. The Heathrow Airport Community applies its own limits on what the airport is required to do and he noted that while the flights that depart from 04:30 to 06:00 were very important economically, they were also very disturbing during this time. There had been lots of campaigns to widen that period without flights, however the rule was that they are unable to extend this unless it offered some economic benefit. The Airports Commission recommended increasing this to six and a half hours and this has been accepted by both Heathrow and the Government. Though people are still looking at a longer period, John felt the balance was right. He further noted there were much higher charges for planes that take off at night, which has served to reduce disturbances.

Nadine Dereza asked what percentage of planes were taking up the lower landing fees.

John Holland-Kaye replied that they charged two and a half times the normal landing fee if they were to arrive during this period. Generally speaking, other than during the night period, there was a big difference between the loudest and the quietest planes. The 'Fly Quiet and Fly Green' table was published every year and this had a big impact. It got picked up in the local media and if one were to come bottom of this, it would drive change. It was however harder for home carriers to change since they were already based here.

A couple of years ago, John asked the main airlines' Chief Executives to voluntarily reduce by half the number of night time flights landing over five years and indeed, they were on track to deliver this. He added they had done this voluntarily without being forced, since they were a good neighbour.

Nadine Dereza noted it was about the long-term impact of sleep deprivation and everybody's right to have a good night's sleep.

Tim Johnson felt it came back to things Parliament had said. Section 70 of the Transport Act states that the CAA must take into account physical safety, access to airspace and environmental impacts etc and they would require evidence on these things.

Nadine Dereza recalled that Heathrow had put some of the strongest restrictions on night flights out of any airport in Europe. She then asked Caroline whether they wanted to make this any stricter.

Caroline Low replied that expansion is an opportunity to do more around night flights. The question is about balance and we do have to trade off the health impacts against the economic benefits of night flights. The Government have been absolutely clear about their expectations of a six and a half hour ban on scheduled night flights, and it was her view that there were significant opportunities for additional respite on top of that. Caroline noted that she lived under the flight path and in her household 06:00-07:00 and 22:00-23:00 were the most annoying times for aviation noise. There were historic issues with enforcing bans, and issues still existed, but it was important for both the existing regime and any new regime that a ban really meant a ban and only in the most extreme cases of safety would flights be allowed during this period. If in future there was more capacity at Heathrow, then there would be more chance to build resilience into the programme so delays could be caught up during scheduled flight times.

Ruth Cadbury stated there had already been breaches and leakages into the night flight period. Furthermore, guaranteed respite was not there. Heathrow was often landing at both runways at 06:00 and with a third runway, clearly something had to give. They all wanted a night flight ban between 23:00 and 06:00 and she questioned whether expansion was worth the inconvenience. She had never seen the economic case for night flights, though she imagined there was a commercial benefit. As the DFT figures clearly showed however, the case for the economic benefits of building Runway 3 at Heathrow were not very much. Additionally, quite a lot of early morning flights were arriving early because they were required to leave their airport early to avoid the night flight ban.

Charlotte Clarke affirmed that night flights were one of the community's biggest concerns and for her it was about balance. Having long enough sleep was a necessity for health and though the policy offers a six-and-a-half-hour ban, there was clearly a lot to be learned about how best to implement this. Charlotte herself liked the idea of adding respite on certain days for certain communities.

Audience Member - a resident in Putney shared that she had been woken up at 04:30 every morning for the last five years. She felt that John Holland-Kaye had not answered any questions and noted it was only possible to get five hours of quiet sleep. Despite him saying there was 10 hours for quiet time and seven and a half hours in bed, she did not feel Heathrow were working within these restrictions. This was where the lack of trust was coming from, since the loudest planes were coming at the quietest times. The ambient noise was measured at 30 decibels, however this was being raised to 70 decibels. Though a good point had been made regarding balance, she questioned why the economic benefits were worth people's lives.

John Holland-Kaye thanked the audience member for raising this point and stated he believed he had answered the questions. This was a chance to change how the night period works and he noted it may be the only chance for people in Putney and Richmond to get what they want. He did not however believe that this would happen without expansion taking place, since they would have to justify to the aviation sector why they were cutting back on night flights.

Audience Member – (as above) felt like John Holland-Kaye was coming at it from a one-sided commercial point of view. Though he said he wanted to listen to the community, here they were telling him about the health problems.

John Holland-Kaye replied that he had to put the case forward, since he was legally obligated to consider other stakeholders. He added that they had not yet touched on the insulation programme, which was very significant. John confirmed it had been tested for people living in the existing flight paths and though it would take time to roll it out, it was a very significant investment. They were trying to use a range of interventions to minimise the noise effect on residents and it had not been easy to get their airline partners to agree on that. He added that part of their compensation was the insulation programme.

Sam Matthews (HCEB) - Twitter comment "Why does Heathrow get to decide? Why can't the Government enforce it?"

Caroline Low replied that the Government was the competent authority for deciding on a night flight ban in line with European legislation. Heathrow Airport would be taking forward the consultation, but Government would make the final decision which would be evidence based. A strong evidence base would be needed to convince all stakeholders on the case for a ban, airlines felt just as strongly on this point as communities and would have no qualms taking the Government to court if they felt the final decision wasn't evidence based and justified.

Ruth Cadbury recalled how £5million out of £25million was spent on schools for insulation and that it had taken a long time. Although Heathrow and the Government talk about a world class insulation programme, she had not seen the evidence that it would be equivalent to the best in the world.

Nadine Dereza asked whether this was a once in a lifetime opportunity to make radical changes.

Tim Johnson responded that this would be assessed through the DCO process. The airspace change process would be looking for the airport to meet with stakeholders and bring about the necessary mitigations. They would need to ensure all the options were considered and that the full range of stakeholders were engaged.

Nadine Dereza asked how well-informed people had to be to make the right decision.

Tim Johnson replied that Airspace could be a very complicated subject and that the reason for ICCAN being set up by the Government was to help with how to articulate this so that all stakeholders could engage. They had now set new standards and they would be holding the airport to account. He felt that this current consultation was absolutely the right time for everyone to come

forward and participate fully in the process.

Audience Member - Rob Light, Head Commissioner for ICCAN explained they were a new, independent body going since 2018, dealing with issues of noise. They have a range of experts in aviation noise and they have been listening to community groups and different stakeholders, absorbing all the facts they hear and developing a view on what they consider to be emerging issues. Communication was one of these issues and there had been lots of inconsistency across how airports communicate with communities. They were also very keen to look at what could be done in terms of technology and the pace of change.

Mr Light felt it was right that communities question that since they were taking the pain and wondering where was the gain. Although a lot of things had happened in the past, this was not their remit. If a decision was reached for there to be expansion, their challenge to all bodies would be around how they could deliver on a number of key areas and how communities can get proper compensation for suffering in terms of noise.

Nadine Dereza asked how technology could help communities.

Audience Member - Rob Light, Head Commissioner for ICCAN replied there were lots of things available today that were not being used, such as how aircrafts approach and leave airports. He found the pace of change frustrating as someone who was new to this arena. He questioned that if an engine could be developed to make a plane fly quieter, why did they have to wait 20 years for this to happen.

Audience Member - Resident of Harmondsworth stated that his family spanned four generations and lived within the compulsory purchase zone. Despite solemn promises from Heathrow and Prime Ministers, both past and present, that there would be no third runway, for the last 15 years, they have lived with significant uncertainty and the threat of eviction in the event that a third runway was built. This has been and continues to be for him, an extremely stressful and anxious time. He likened being threatened with eviction from one's home to that of a trauma second only to bereavement. He was interested in the views of Dr Charlotte Clark on the health impact and whether the panel felt this psychological impact over a long period of time should now be a subject for compensation.

Charlotte Clarke thanked the resident for his eloquent question and for the raising of such important issues. She understood the psychological impact hanging over communities, though she did note that the policy allowed for the whole process to take a long time. This was not a criticism of the situation, which was a natural part of such a big development like this. Ultimately, it all came down to policy and she noted the national policy framework did not allow for this type of compensation. This however was not to say that this problem was not here. There had clearly been continued missed opportunities to study the impact on influencing people's day to day wellbeing.

Over 20 years ago, a friend of hers (Charlotte's) studied the effects on residents when a railway was being built and she was threatened with being sued by the company building it. There was now thankfully support for starting studies like this now and since it was a matter for policy, it was not for her to say whether there should be compensation. Ultimately, they required more hard evidence to quantify that.

Nadine Dereza asked Heathrow whether it was a fair call to think about compensation when considering a situation spanning over the last 15 years.

Caroline Low confirmed that in terms of Government's policy it was a very complex area, where the evidence base is starting to be developed. In the future it may be that statutory compensation could be available, but that is not the case now. What is available now to many of those in the identified compulsory purchase zone is the statutory blight offer, which allows those who wish to move now to do so. Later in the planning process there is Heathrow Airport's voluntary additional property compensation offer which goes beyond the statutory level that would be received, for example, in relation to High Speed 2. Caroline accepted there was still uncertainty and that this would have a significant impact on people's lives.

Audience Member –They felt that should be established for major projects to prevent companies returning to the same communities. Her mother was 87 and had lived in the same house all her life.

Although she was in the compensation zone for the last scheme, when Heathrow Airport Ltd returned with a new scheme, a line had been drawn around the street and she was no longer entitled to compensation. She felt there was barely time to catch one's breath before there was a new proposal making a major impact on a new sector of the community.

Nadine Dereza stated that a price could not be put on what people have had to go through and that if you had been waiting 50 years and were still affected by it, a certain generosity in spirit was required.

Caroline Low replied that as a Government, they had to stick to the statutory policy to be fair to people all around the country impacted by infrastructure projects. The airport had more discretion on the property compensation arrangements they put in place. Government very much recognised that it was not just about the money but also about providing support to communities, especially to those who had to grapple with moving house, which could be a complex and very traumatic experience. Government see HCEB as a body to support this process and backs the appointment of the new Residents Adviser.

John Holland-Kaye had met many residents who had asked about compensation, of which there were a range of views. He understood that for many people, it was not just about the money. Therefore, they were determined to treat people fairly and so they felt it right to pay more than the 10% statutory minimum. They had planned for 25% above the market boundary.

Ruth Cadbury understood that the resident was raising a specific point about living under major uncertainty, which had caused stress over many years. She also highlighted the people of Heston, Osterley, Brentford and West Chiswick, who did not know they would be under the flight path of the third runway and accordingly, did not know that they would experience the noise that people in Isleworth and Kew currently experience. They were therefore talking about three different things: compensation for noise, compensation for psychological effects and compensation for compulsory purchase. She also doubted that the insulation programme would provide the necessary cover for significantly more noise.

John Holland-Kaye stated that this was the biggest airspace change consultation that had ever taken place in the world. They had learned a huge amount from poor airspace changes in 2014, which had not been planned and therefore, he apologised for what had happened on his watch. The HCEB has encouraged them to get as much feedback as they can and to get good feedback across all the demographics. He further thanked everyone who had made a statement, since they had really needed to hear this.

Audience Member - a student at West London University asked what could be done to ensure that consultations were effective and that things would be put in place.

Tim Johnson responded that this was the second of four opportunities for stakeholders to have their say. People were encouraged to put forward their views, just as the airport would be encouraged to look at and respond to feedback.

Nadine Dereza affirmed that communication was very important, which would allow as wide a section of the community to be involved as possible. She then asked what they would be focussing on after the consultation process in March.

Charlotte Clarke felt it would be useful to hear more feedback regarding night flights and respite. Since it was all up for grabs, it was important for people to speak up.

John Holland-Kaye added that in terms of what happens after receiving people's feedback, since they were a democracy and since they wanted to do things the right way, they would have to consider what they took into account and why, as well as what they did not take into account and why. It was important that they hear from a wider group of people. John then thanked attendees for their contributions today.

Ruth Cadbury wished she could answer this question after looking at the Hammersmith exhibition tomorrow. Her experience was that there was an awful lot of money in marketing and that it was

clear that Heathrow wanted their expansion. Sometimes the crossover was blurred however. She has even had to pull very angry residents off people who are just at exhibitions to do their job and urged attendees not to take out their anger on Heathrow employees.

Caroline Low wanted to echo what had already been said, noting that this was a massive opportunity to change the way the airport operated with night flights. Her team had got to know the community groups and she felt it was very exciting the way Heathrow were getting involved with everyone through social media.

Nadine Dereza stated that they had run out of time. She asked that the panel be given a round of applause and expressed her appreciation for everyone's participation. She then invited back Rachel, the Chair of the Heathrow Community Engagement Board, for a brief temperature check.

Rachel Cerfontyne was pleased with how the event had gone, though also frustrated that there were so many more questions to get through. She assured attendees they would try and get answers to these and put them on the website.

Nadine Dereza referred to the remit of the HCEB and that part of its role was to provide challenge and scrutiny of the airports day-to-day to day operations as well as expansion proposals. How much teeth did HCEB really have? And, in light of this event, did Rachel think that more trust had been built today?

Rachel Cerfontyne explained that in her previous role at the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC), she was often asked the question about how much influence/teeth she/the IPCC had. Teeth were for biting and that it was not her role to go around biting people, but instead to be challenging, advising and engaging with people and not to just be a persuader and a communicator. Trust was clearly a really important issue and this had to be earned. It could however take a long period to build it back up. She asked that with HCEB's role, for people to judge them on what they were actually doing and to call them to account. She was hoping these kinds of events would start to build platforms that would lead to trust. She then asked for attendees to fill out their feedback forms, which would allow them to carry on taking suggestions on board.

Nadine Dereza reiterated the feedback form was very important. She then thanked Rachel and advised the audience that there were refreshments in the mezzanine and an exhibition area. Some of the panellists and their colleagues would be available to talk to people, aside from Charlotte Clarke. If people wanted to look at the demonstration booth however, there was a chance they could be asked to come back later, since they could not have too much footfall in the foyer at once. She also suggested that people stop by the HCEB stand in order that they may register. Finally, she thanked the audience for their questions, which had contributed to a lively and challenging afternoon.

The event came to a close at 16:00.