

**1. Will you please persuade all airlines to tell their aircrew to lower their undercarriage only just before the minimum distance of 6 miles ?**

When the undercarriage is lowered, the turbulence causes **considerable** noise. The turbulence also forces the aircrew to extend the flaps and increase power to gain lift and this causes **even more** noise. We all notice that aircraft become significantly noisier when and after they "change gear" on approach so airlines just need to minimize the time that they are in this "lower gear".

Mike Carrivick, the Head of BAR UK (The Board of Airline Representatives in the UK) said in an email to me that this is feasible. Also, it will save fuel !

BA must now have about 60% of slots at Heathrow. Add in Iberia, also owned by IAG, and **one conversation** between BAA, the CAA and Willie Walsh (CEO of IAG) could quickly ensure that about 65% **of landings** at Heathrow minimize noise purely by lowering landing gear at a minimum sensible and consistent distance from the airport. This would be especially beneficial because - by my anecdotal observation over the years - BA have always been the worst offenders ! Then BAA could persuade the next biggest operators to follow suit until the problem is solved.

Arrival procedures for some land-locked airports specify when landing gear should be lowered. For example, Frankfurt specify that aircraft should adopt "landing configuration shortly prior to or over the outer marker". The outer marker may be located between 6.5 and 11.1 km (3.5 and 6 NM) from the threshold. LHR makes no reference to when gear should be lowered (I reckon). So the CAA should issue and enforce a similar general arrival instruction.

Less noise => happier residents => greater chance of BAA getting their way on other issues.  
Less noise also => less fuel usage => happier everybody (except the fuel producers).

Surely in policy-making there are few examples where so few conversations and simple procedural changes could have such a significant benefit to so many people ?!

**2. Will you please ask Air Traffic Control (ATC) never to alternate (at 3pm) between the northern approach to the southern runway (27L) and the southern approach to the northern runway (27R) as residents along the centre line of the approach to LHR currently get no respite.**

Better options are between:

- the northern approach to the southern runway (27L) and the northern approach to the northern runway (27R)
- the southern approach to the southern runway (27L) and the southern approach to the northern runway (27R)
- the southern approach to the southern runway (27L) and the northern approach to the northern runway (27R)

When ATC schedule the 3pm switch for a week between the northern approach to the southern runway (27L) and the southern approach to the northern runway (27R), residents living between the two get no respite for a week.

See the attached "fag-packet" drawing. It should be easy to develop a roster which, over the course of 4-6 weeks:

- gives every area respite for half a day each day
- doesn't favour any particular area.

**3. Will you please get BAA to make their web page showing the schedule of approaches far more accessible to media and other web sites so constituents can plan outdoor events for days when aircraft will not be screaming overhead ?**

Put the link in a far more obvious place on the BAA website.

Encourage local newspapers and websites to list the information and/or provide a link to the BAA web page.

**4. When BAA plead to be able to increase the number of flights by x% in the next few decades, specifically what % reduction do BAA allow for the increasing use of the Boeing 787 and the Airbus 350 ?**

These aircraft ultra-light, wide-bodied, long-distance aircraft are **specifically designed** to carry passengers between secondary gateways eg between Birmingham and New Delhi. These are the "thin" long-distance routes which can't justify a jumbo jet but which can't be serviced by a small aircraft like an Airbus 320 as these don't have the range. The Air India Birmingham - New Delhi route will lessen the need for Birmingham-Heathrow and Heathrow-New Delhi.

In other words, the aircraft designers and their airlines are aiming, in future, to service **only the "thick" routes** with Boeing 747s and Airbus 380s feeding into local networks serviced by B737 and A320 aircraft ("hub and spoke").

So why don't airport owners buy more secondary airports, build more runways and terminals for B787 and A350 aircraft at these secondary airports (where there is always more space and fewer residents) and use the resultant spare capacity at their existing hubs like Heathrow for the jumbo jets ?

**Any case that BAA put for expansion should be tested by asking the above question.**

They should be able to show you the B787/A350 parameter in their spreadsheets and tell you what the parameter value is. If they can't, BAA is:

- either highly incompetent, ignoring obvious market trends
- or living like ostriches in cloud-cuckoo land (to mix some metaphors)
- or disingenuous.