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Description automatically generated**Heathrow Airport proposed Noise Action Plan for 2024-2028 Survey**

**Please refer to the privacy notice on this form for details of how we will handle your data.**

**We would like to have your feedback on our proposals for our Noise Action Plan 2024-2028.**

* Title
* First Name
* Surname
* Company/Organisation, where applicable
* Postcode
* Address
* Email address

Please respond to the questions below:

1. Our framework for noise management

At Heathrow, we have consistently worked hard to maintain our position as a global leader in noise management, as shown in the results of the noise mapping (Chapter 6).  
For this fourth Noise Action Plan, we have developed a noise management programme that delivers innovative initiatives to reduce the impact of aircraft noise, as described in Chapter 8.

Please rate our framework for noise management on a scale of 1 to 5 (tick one box):

1 – Excellent

2 - Above Average

3 – Average

4 - Below Average

5 - Very Poor

Please explain why you have given us this rating and any other comments you have related to our framework for noise management.

Your plan does not seem to take seriously enough the impact of noise of aircraft overflights on the health and well-being of residents particularly those in Windsor & Datchet. It lacks significant actions to reduce noise or credible investment proposals to provide mitigation, date and research, or credible and forceful scrutiny.

I would suggest a lot more research, serious consideration of your Duty of Care to those humans affect under the flight path and, think outside of the box; step aside and consider the impact of your neighbours. Please be a good neighbour to the people of Windsor, Datchet & Holyport.

There are two key issues that you seem to be failing on; 1. The distribution of overflights, noise & disturbance is currently unfair to those on the arrivals flight path for the Northern Runway, 2. The gross levels of noise and the disturbance suffered by those same living beings due to overflights is causing harm.

Heathrow Airport’s operations are causing harm and there is little in your track record or the weak plans you present which indicate that you are taking this issue seriously.

Heathrow Airport letting the planning consent lapse which was granted by the Secretary of State on 2 February 2017 for the groundworks is flabbergasting and could amount in a failure of your duty of care. Please complete the groundworks by 2025 and show that you are taking seriously the issues of Noise reduction and the probable Duty of Care you have to residents under the fight paths of aircraft using Heathrow Airport for the significant and serious health issue they cause residents.

See other comments for full list of suggestions
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We have explored the possibilities to incentivise the transition to a quieter fleet, as described in Noise Actions 1A, 1B, 1C, 2A, 2B and 2C.

Please rate our approach to incentivising quieter planes on a scale of 1 to 5 (tick one box):

1 – Excellent

2 - Above Average

3 – Average

4 - Below Average

**5 - Very Poor**

Please explain why you have given us this rating and any other comments you have related to our approach to incentivising quieter planes.

You have not set out any credible plans for achievement. Here are a few off my suggestions to help you;

• Establish grossly penal charges for landings and take offs between 11pm and 7am, further escalating for number in month and ratcheting over year.

• Proceeds to residents affected and Councils on landing and take off paths in proportion to noise level above 24Db"

• Incentives for aircraft below 50Db as measured during lowering of undercarriage including lower fees better PR.

• Perhaps change the livery on the model aircraft on the roundabout off the A4 each year for the quietest airlines

• Name and shame those that so and, those that don't

See other comments for full list of suggestions.

3. Quieter procedures

We are aiming to achieve our noise abatement objectives by covering all the operational opportunities (and trials) to reduce noise, as described in our Noise Actions 3A through 3L, 4A through 4D, 9A.

Please rate our new approach to improving our operational procedures on a scale of 1 to 5 (tick one box):

1 – Excellent

2 - Above Average

3 – Average

**4 - Below Average**

5 - Very Poor

Please explain why you have given us this rating and any other comments you have related to our new approach to improving our operational procedures.

Once again, your proposals are weak and unlikely to reduce harmful noise and disturbance to acceptable levels;

• Incentives for aircraft below 50Db as measured during lowering of undercarriage including lower fees better PR. • Perhaps change the livery on the model aircraft on the roundabout off the A4 each year for the quietest airlines • Increase glide angle of aircraft on take off (departures) to maximum

• Increase glide angle of aircraft especially on landing (arrivals) to 6% or maximum to reduce the amount of noise affecting ground residents • Lower undercarriage as late as possible and always below 2,000ft or you clear Windsor Castle, whichever if the latest • Stop using LDEN as this masks the impact of noise disturbance due to the averaging of values over an inappropriate denominator. • Start using peak decibel readings • Set peak decibel targets as the trigger for action, fines, remedial action, compensation etc • Use WHO guidelines or lower to set noise ceilings for noise from aircraft overflights i.e. 50Db peak not Lden • See also other WWRA Suggestions in other ""Framework Approach"" areas" • Heathrow allowing the planning consent to lapse re Cranford has caused residents unnecessary harm, which is permanent for many children so please Re-apply immediately especially as You have the power of the judicial review behind you so plan and start work immediately on grant of planning consent. • ATC should use 09R as preferable for landing as the approach to this runway passes over a less dense area before 7am and after 11pm

See other comments for full list of suggestions
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We have relaunched our mitigation schemes and are seeking a more proactive approach from local planning authorities to support our pillars on noise management, as described in Noise Actions 6A and 7A.

Please rate our new Noise Insulation Schemes on a scale of 1 to 5 (tick one box):

1 – Excellent

2 - Above Average

3 – Average

4 - Below Average

**5 - Very Poor**

Please explain why you have given us this rating and any other comments you have related to our approach on land use planning and mitigation.

Your offerings are tight, penny pinching and exclude many citizens and children you are harming;

• Extend the existing insulation & air conditioning offering to include all properties on approach and landing to 15 miles from end of runways with a 1/2 mile width corridor north AND south of both runways e.g. West to Holyport • Increase levels of compensation or set up own installation company with highest noise reducing standards and install free of charge. • Create a compensation scheme for Windsor, Holyport & Datchet residents for each day from July 2017 to the start of 100% runway alternation on Easterly operations"

• Work with local GPs and ICBs to identify the impact of overflights on local children who live or school under the flight paths and publish results publicly. • Work with health experts to find, deploy and assess solutions to reserve the impact of noise disturbance caused by aircraft overflights • Lobby government or UK airports to change laws to help you airport operator from safeguarding our children affected by aircraft overflights • ICBs to include NHS North West London, NHS Frimley and NHS Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West" • Extend the insulation offering to include all properties on approach and landing to 6miles from end of runways with a 1/2 mile width on both runways • Increase levels of compensation or set up own installation company with highest noise reducing standards and install free of charge where ambient noise levels for building users is below 50Db" • You cause harm to local residents unnecessarily since July 2017 by not undertaking the groundworks to allow take off over Cranford. Re-apply immediately. Plan to start work immediately on grant of planning consent.

See other comments for full list of suggestions

5. Operating restrictions and voluntary measures

We will continue to be compliant with all restrictions and will supplement this with voluntary measures aimed at reducing impacts on sleep disturbance, as described in Noise Actions 3A, 3B, 3G, 3J, 4A, 5D, 8A and 10E.

Please rate our new approach to reducing night noise on a scale of 1 to 5 (tick one box):

1 – Excellent

2 - Above Average

3 – Average

**4 - Below Average**

5 -  Very Poor
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Please explain why you have given us this rating and any other comments you have related to our approach on operating restrictions and voluntary measures.

Your proposals are weak and unlikely to reduce harmful noise and disturbance to acceptable levels;

• Would prefer this reduced by 25% but, understand that you have to make a profit. Noise i.e. residents health comes first though. • NO FLIGHTS between 11pm and 7am • ATC should use 09R as preferable for landing as the approach to this runway passes over a less dense area before 7am and after 11pm

See other comments for full list of suggestions

6. Working with local communities

We aim to better address community concerns by continuously investigating innovative methods to enhance understanding of our stakeholders and the effectiveness of our noise strategy, as set out in Noise Actions 7B, 10A, 10B, 10C, 10E, 10G, 12A, 12B, 12C.

Please rate our approach to working with local communities on a scale of 1 to 5 (tick one box):

1 – Excellent

2 - Above Average

3 – Average

4 - Below Average

**5 -  Very Poor**

Please explain why you have given us this rating and any other comments you have related to our approach to working with local communities.

Your proposals lack credibility with regard to efficacy, completeness, levels of collaboration or scrutiny;

• Please make sure that these include councillors from neighbouring local authorities

• These groups should be empowered to financially penalise Heathrow airport where targets are missed or progress deemed to slow. • For the sake of functionality members of such panels, groups, or fora should be compensated. • A greater number (every 1/2 mile up to Holyport and Bray including point where aircraft lower their undercarriage) of noise readers should be installed primarily along landing (arrivals) flight paths. Data from these monitors should be reported in real time. • Everything should be reported in a timely, ideally real time, manner on your website • Please specifically consult with local ICBs (former CCGs) in relation to the possible health impact of overflights on their patients living under flight paths

• ICBs to include NHS North West London, NHS Frimley and NHS Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West

See other comments for full list of suggestions
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7. Do you have any other comments on our proposed Noise Action Plan that will help our team better manage ground and air noise for communities?

It must also be noted that the consultation form is generally too complex for residents to complete as is the data and many technical aspects such as the LDEN measurement of noise. I have received many such complaints residents. The impact of this is to dissuade residents who are suffering or have some great ideas from becoming a necessary and valuable part of your process. You have disenfranchised tens of thousands of people if not more.

I also note a list of our suggestions set against the criterial of your Framework measures.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approach** | **Measures Used** | **WWRA Suggestion** |
| **Quieter planes** | • Variable landing charges | • Establish grossly penal charges for landings and take offs between 11pm and 7am, further escalating for number in month and ratcheting over year. • Proceeds to residents affected and Councils on landing and take off paths in proportion to noise level above 24Db |
| • Fly Quiet and Green | • Incentives for aircraft below 50Db as measured during lowering of undercarriage including lower fees better PR.  • Perhaps change the livery on the model aircraft on the roundabout off the A4 each year for the quietest airlines |
| • Voluntary agreements | • Name and shame those that so and, those that don't |
| **Quieter procedures** | • Fly Quiet and Green | • Incentives for aircraft below 50Db as measured during lowering of undercarriage including lower fees better PR.  • Perhaps change the livery on the model aircraft on the roundabout off the A4 each year for the quietest airlines • Increase glide angle of aircraft on take off (departures) to maximum  • Increase glide angle of aircraft especially on landing (arrivals) to 6% or maximum to reduce the amount of noise affecting ground residents  • Lower undercarriage as late as possible and always below 2,000ft or you clear Windsor Castle, whichever if the latest |
| • Noise abatement procedures | • Stop using LDEN as this masks the impact of noise disturbance due to the averaging of values over an inappropriate denominator. • Start using peak decibel readings  • Set peak decibel targets as the trigger for action, fines, remedial action, compensation etc  • Use WHO guidelines or lower to set noise ceilings for noise from aircraft overflights i.e. 50Db peak not Lden  • See also other WWRA Suggestions in other "Framework Approach" areas |
| • Preferential runway use | • Heathrow allowing the planning consent to lapse re Cranford has caused residents unnecessary harm, which is permanent for many children sp please Re-apply immediately especially as You have the power of the judicial review behind you so plan and start work immediately on grant of planning consent.  • ATC should use 09R as preferable for landing as the approach to this runway passes over a less dense area before 7am and after 11pm |
| • Ground noise management plan | • No specific suggestions |
| **Land-use planning and mitigation** | • Residential Insulation Scheme | • Extend the existing insulation & air conditioning offering to include all properties on approach and landing to 15 miles from end of runways with a 1/2 mile width corridor north AND south of both runways e.g. West to Holyport  • Increase levels of compensation or set up own installation company with highest noise reducing standards and install free of charge. • Create a compensation scheme for Windsor, Datchet & Holyport residents for each day from July 2017 to the start of 100% runway alternation on Easterly operations |
| • School and Community | • Work with local GPs and ICBs to identify the impact of overflights on local children who live or school under the flight paths and publish results publicly.  • Work with health experts to find, deploy and assess solutions to reserve the impact of noise disturbance caused by aircraft overflights  • Lobby government or UK airports to change laws to help you airport operator from safeguarding our children affected by aircraft overflights  • ICBs to include NHS North West London, NHS Frimley and NHS Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West |
| • Building Insulation Scheme | • Extend the insulation offering to include all properties on approach and landing to 6miles from end of runways with a 1/2 mile width on both runways  • Increase levels of compensation or set up own installation company with highest noise reducing standards and install free of charge where ambient noise levels for building users is below 50Db |
| • Local planning conditions and encroachment | • You caused harm to local residents unnecessarily since July 2017 by not undertaking the groundworks to allow take off over Cranford. Re-apply immediately. Plan to start work immediately on grant of planning consent. |
| **Operating restrictions and voluntary measures** | • Movement Cap | • Would prefer this reduced by 25% but, understand that you have to make a profit. Noise i.e. residents health comes first though. |
| • Night restrictions | • NO FLIGHTS between 11pm and 7am  • ATC should use 09R as preferable for landing as the approach to this runway passes over a less dense area before 7am and after 11pm |
| • Quiet Night Charter | • NO FLIGHTS between 11pm and 7am • ATC should use 09R as preferable for landing as the approach to this runway passes over a less dense area before 7am and after 11pm |
| **Working with local communities** | • Engagement forums | • Please make sure that these include councillors from neighbouring local authorities  • These groups should be empowered to financially penalise Heathrow airport where targets are missed or progress deemed to slow  • For the sake of functionality members of such panels, groups, or fora should be compensated |
| • Monitoring and reporting | • A greater number (every 1/2 mile up to Holyport and Bray including point where aircraft lower their undercarriage) of noise readers should be installed primarily along landing (arrivals) flight paths. Data from these monitors should be reported in real time |
| • Accessible information on websites | • Everything should be reported in a timely, ideally real time, manner on your website |
| • Industry groups | • Please specifically consult with local ICBs (former CCGs) in relation to the posible health impact of overflights on their patients living under flight paths  • ICBs to include NHS North West London, NHS Frimley and NHS Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West |
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