

Noise and Track Monitoring Advisory Group

27 February 2014

Gatwick Airport

(FINAL MINUTES)

Present

Tom Denton	GAL (Chair)
Lee Howes	GAL
Brendan Sheil	GAL
Terry Gibbons	GAL
Andy Taylor	NATS
Mike George	GATCOM
John Byng	GATCOM
Alan Jones	GATCOM
Liz Kitchen	GATCOM
Matthew Balfour	GATCOM
Charles Yarwood	GATCOM
Ros Howell	GATCOM Independent Technical Advisor
Peter Long	EHO (Reigate and Banstead Borough Council)
Brian Cox	EHO (Crawley Borough Council)
Mark McLaren	CAA
Tamara Goodwin	DfT
Douglas Moule	easyJet

Item	Action
<p>1 Apologies Tim May (DfT), Keith Brockwell (GATCOM)</p>	
<p>2 Previous Minutes</p> <p>1. John Byng requested an update on the Airport Masterplan Ground Noise issue. Tom Denton replied that the matter had been addressed by the R2 options assessment modelling which would be taking into account mitigation means, including bunds and walls. Outputs from this would be available in the next few months.</p> <p>2. Ros Howell queried the continued absence of a NATS representation from TC Swanwick since most of the ATC issues under discussion occurred under the control of that unit. Andy Taylor would investigate and advise. ACTION 01/2014</p>	<p>NATS 01/2014</p>
<p>3 Action Tracker</p> <p>07/2012 – The proposed trip to Swanwick remains open to those who would like to attend and would find it beneficial. Tom Denton/Andy Taylor will endeavour to find a suitable date.</p> <p>25/2013 – Horley overflight rule to be reviewed by DfT – Tamara Goodwin indicated DfT should only be involved as last resort. It is up to NATS to prevent overflight and DfT were waiting to see what they would do. Closed - but the matter to be kept under review.</p> <p>29/2013 – Feasibility of social study remains open (in addition GAL is liaising with Eurocontrol).</p> <p>30/2013 – FPT to review KPI table. 2006 and 2011 levels to be included as indicators.</p> <p>32/2013 – NATS to review measures to avoid Horley overflight remains open.</p> <p>33/2013 – NaTMAG PRNAV paper for GATCOM – from 3 April 2014 all LGW SIDs will be PRNAV if the aircraft are so equipped and certified. Conventional SIDs will only be available on request. Closed.</p> <p>34/2013 – Airbus A320 retrofit remains open.</p>	

<p>4 END Performance Update</p> <p>1. Tom Denton advised there was no change to status – independent review of FPT communications outstanding, therefore this remains as ‘amber’ (END Action Plan Action No 39 refers).</p> <p>2. Tom Denton advised that the draft revised NAP has been submitted to DEFRA. John Byng expressed disappointment that NaTMAG members did not have sight of the revised plan prior to submission to DEFRA. Tom Denton advised the previous process with the original plan had been followed. John Byng did not accept this stating it was not good enough and requested (repeatedly) a copy which Tom Denton declined to provide. Ros Howell stated the DEFRA Guidance required GAL to show its response to consultee comments and Tom Denton stated this has been carried out and the NAP could yet change in the light of DEFRA feedback. Peter Long advised that John Byng could obtain a copy of the NAP under FOI to which John Byng responded that everything is being done ‘behind our backs’. Alan Jones commented that the process all started too late to which Ros Howell added her regret that GAL did not refer to NaTMAG for ideas/consultations/new actions/etc and suggested that NaTMAG could keep a running list of ideas for inclusion in any future NAP. Ros Howell also mentioned that some fault has to lie with DEFRA for not providing any timescales for this consultation in its guidelines to which John Byng responded by requesting that the draft NAP be circulated to NaTMAG members and he hoped Tom Denton will not say no yet again to which Tom Denton said he would not do so. Ros Howell then asked of Brian Cox how Crawley’s NAP – as required for the size of the “agglomeration” in this round of END NAPs was progressing and whether it referred to the Gatwick NAP. Brian Cox advised it had not been completed yet. Ros Howell advised that, together with those for Gatwick and Crawley, the M23, A23, and Brighton rail mainline NAPs all overlap.</p>	
<p>5 Ground Noise Report</p> <p>1. The ‘Executive Summary’ had been well received by the Group and a desire for this to continue for future meetings was expressed.</p> <p>2. Alan Jones stated we should actively communicate positive messages, for example ‘no ground noise complaints’, as they are published in the FPT Reports and cross-referenced between the 2 reports.</p> <p>3. Lee Howes clarified the nighttime restrictions on engine testing and was asked under what circumstances high power testing could be undertaken to which Lee Howes advised that due to the restrictions these tests would be undertaken only in extenuating circumstances and at the discretion of the Airfield Duty Manager of whom a report would be required.</p>	
<p>6 Flight Performance Report and Ground Noise Complaints</p> <p>1. The ‘Executive Summary’ was well received by the Group.</p> <p>2. Brendan Sheil presented highlights of the report. After discussion it was agreed that the KPI comparisons were confusing. 2006 and 2011 levels should be included as indicators ACTION 30/2013</p> <p>3. John Byng mentioned that he believes the report overstates the difficulty of Noise Preferential Routes and these are used as an excuse for poor performance. In addition he believed that community monitoring should be spelled out as to what it exactly is. Brendan Sheil advised that full details of the scheme and reports were on the Gatwick website. Alan Jones advised that the report should keep past and present monitor locations.</p> <p>4. It was discussed by the Group that there are variations at the stage of final approach that landing gear is deployed. Douglas Moule detailed the different scenarios which affect final approach and configuration of aircraft. From an easyJet perspective aircrew are advised to configure in an optimal manner as possible when preparing to land.</p>	<p>FPT 30/2013</p>

<p>Tom Denton concluded by advising the Group that Gatwick had invited the CAA to conduct an aircraft arrivals procedure assessment has had recently been conducted at Heathrow.</p> <p>5. John Byng advised the Group that in his opinion Gatwick does not need the night quota and associated nightflights and these should be voluntarily reduced. This was supported by Matthew Balfour and John Byng requested this be minuted. Tom Denton noted the request.</p> <p>6. There was general discussion amongst the Group regarding the CASPER flight tracking system being available on mobile devices. As CASPER requires Flashplayer it is not available on Apple and android devices. Matthew Balfour indicated there was an application called 'Photon' which would allow CASPER to be viewed on mobile devices however there appears to be issues with the timestamp when CASPER is utilised in such a manner with the time on CASPER being shown as some 4 or 5 hours earlier than 'real time'. Ros Howell agreed to provide examples to Brendan Sheil for his evaluation.</p> <p>ACTION 02/2014 Ros Howell went on to mention that there is an issue with overflights being displayed on CASPER to which Brendan Sheil responded that CASPER displays only Gatwick flights on the public facing website. Ros Howell regretted that CASPER flight tracking does not function correctly on mobile devices since in her opinion the majority of people now access the internet via mobile devices. Tom Denton agreed to raise the matter internally. ACTION 03/2014</p>	<p>GATCOM 02/2014</p> <p>Chair 03/2014</p>
<p>7 Horley Overflight</p> <p>1. Peter Long and Ros Howell suggested that in the light of current practice and the reasons for it, contraventions should be referred to the DfT for consideration of punitive action (as they are the regulator). ACTION 25/2013</p> <p>2. Andy Taylor reported that the overflight situation had improved, largely due to the increased uptake of PRNAV departures on the DVR route. Mike George advised that moving forward he feared this would be eroded as the town increased in size. Andy Taylor advised that the DVR SID conflicted with the LHR Biggin hold therefore Gatwick traffic had to be held down for a considerable distance or be given headings to avoid and enable climb (ATC radar vectored). However, the London Airspace Management Programme (LAMP) aims to deal with this over the long term, when LHR airspace changes are made in Phase 2. Andy Taylor went on to mention that traffic on PRNAV SIDs do not generally overfly Horley however Mike George reiterated that increased development is taking housing north into the Noise Preferential Route and a solution could be to keep traffic straight on until reaching the M23 then vector them away thus de-conflicting with the LHR hold as well as avoiding overflying Horley. John Byng suggested that the Horley analysis gate used by the FPT to identify instances of overflight should be extended further north to 'further improve the situation and make aircraft vector later'. Andy Taylor reiterated that the later the heading was given the more likely that traffic remains at low level for longer and advised that the best solution to ensure continued climb and avoidance of Horley overflight would be to redesign the tail end of the "DVR" RNAV SID route in Phase 2 of "LAMP". It was agreed that the matter would be reviewed at the next meeting, by when the situation should have improved, reflecting the April introduction of mandatory PRNAV SIDs (meaning that fewer aircraft will be on a radar vector). ACTION 32/2013</p> <p>3. Andy Taylor agreed to look at the effects of the very strong winds in Q4 and to provide a brief at the next meeting. ACTION 04/2014</p>	<p>DfT 25/2013</p> <p>NATS 32/2013</p> <p>NATS 04/2014</p>
<p>8 London Airspace Consultation Update</p> <p>1. John Byng states that any new airspace change that doesn't take annoyance into account is 'flying blind'. Tom Denton agreed that there is a research gap (as agreed at ANMAC) for any route design therefore in designing routes we will act in accordance</p>	

<p>with Government policy namely to consider respite opportunities and to concentrate routes rather than disperse them. Matthew Balfour advised the Group that this policy is not the fault of NATS or GAL – this is Government policy and is being addressed through the Airports Commission. Therefore it is for the Government to resolve and Tamara Goodwin advised that the DfT will respond to the Airports Commission accordingly. Matthew Balfour concluded by saying it is not for this Group to deal with. Mike George added that he found the LAMP briefing held with GAL/NATS/NaTMAG members useful and welcome.</p> <p>2. Tom Denton advised that GAL/NATS were now looking at routes that were “achievable” following the closure of the LAC consultation on the basis of comments received. He said that there could be further consultation should that be required by any change in the noise contour. In a discussion about potential consultation dates and timings, Alan Jones requested that Tom Denton take into account the Local Authority’s summer break. The formal Airspace Change Proposal would be submitted in September 2014 with a decision expected in 2015. The Safety & Airspace Regulation Group would make the initial decision with portions potentially referred to the Secretary of State in the event of change to NPR.</p>	
<p>9 Airports Commission Update</p> <p>Tom Denton provided the following updates:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We all know where we are on the shortlist. 2. GAL is assessing all options and assumptions in the interim report. 3. GAL is concerned with the variance between our figures and those stated in the interim report as we have evidenced our figures yet the Airports Commission have not evidenced theirs. 4. The Airports Commission has a different timescale for consultation than that of the airport. 5. The Airports Commission has asked us to consult on our favoured option however this could be open to judicial review. We are therefore consulting on all runway options in our public consultation exercise rather than pushing forward our favoured option (the 3 southerly options not the northerly). Tom Denton advised that legal advice obtained indicated that the Airports Commission could get into legal complications due to certain disparities and we wish to remain unaffected hence our method of consultation. John Byng then questioned if we are liable to questioning ourselves by not consulting on our northern option. 6. Discussion then turned to the possibility of the establishment of an independent noise body as suggested by the Airports Commission. Tom Denton advised that GAL does not support this suggestion as there already existing bodies in place, for example the CAA. The Airports Commission supports the idea of an independent noise body as do other airports. It was mentioned that we already have ANMAC and the question has to be who would pay for such a noise body? GAL will remain neutral at this stage as such a noise body needs to be airport specific otherwise, according to John Byng, it could be seen to be planting the long grass for issues to be kicked into. Alan Jones went on to say that aircraft noise is airport specific therefore such matters need to be dealt with on a local basis. Matthew Balfour advised the Group that the Airports Commission’s proposal is only the first stage, the CAA is not totally independent as they have many different accountabilities. An independent noise body in essence is a good idea and it could be the body that could commission much needed research. He therefore suggested he and John Byng should be lobbying the Government on this matter. 	

<p>10 Noise Insulation Scheme</p> <p>1. Tom Denton advised that the scheme is due to launch on 1st April 2014 and covers 40% more homes and the area has increased from 26 to 41 sq km and increased therefore not only the amount of homes covered but other noise sensitive buildings. Great care has been taken not to cut any homes or streets in half in terms of eligibility and the nature of the scheme is one where we make a contribution of up to £3000 to the noise insulating works. GAL will write to all eligible home owners advising them of the scheme and giving the next steps to be taken. Liz Kitchen enquired if home owners could choose their own suppliers and Tom Denton advised that home owners would be required to use our nominated supplier. John Byng wished it to be placed on record that that in his opinion the £3000 contribution is inadequate, the boundaries are better, the contribution needs to be doubled and house holders should have a say in who comes into their home. Tom Denton took note of these points. Charles Yarwood enquired if the home owner would get a better deal and Tom Denton responded by saying in formulating the new scheme GAL had taken feedback from previous schemes and we do not want to have multiple suppliers as this creates a risk of inconsistency of service, dispute resolution and quality. GAL has undertaken a competitive tendering process focussing on costs, quality and aftercare. John Byng said he was still not happy with these assurances and GAL should offer an arrangement with the house holder who then contracts directly with their chosen supplier.</p>	
<p>11 AOB</p> <p>ADNID Trial</p> <p>1. The Group was provided with Noise and Track keeping density/height plots comparing pre trial and in trial overflight data.</p> <p>2. Liz Kitchen told the group that Warnham should have been told of the intention to commence this trial. Certain people have lived there up to 40 years and suddenly are experiencing more aircraft noise.</p> <p>3. In response to a comment that there had been no consultation, Ros Howell stated that, whilst recognising the trial is a different matter, the ADNID route is within the departure (and arrival) route swathe of the recent London Airspace Management Programme (LAMP) consultation and, as such, Warnham residents have been consulted on their opinions of this type of route passing overhead although not in such an immediate timeframe. Andy Taylor advised that this trial route is not flown during the night time period as it temporarily replaces the BOGNA and HARDY SID routes, and when this route is not used traffic reverts to the existing departure routes. Matthew Balfour commented that this is how the future will look and people need to be aware. John Byng said the residents of Warnham were not told despite Ros Howell's explanation and furthermore GAL did not do so due to the risk of initiating complaints. John Byng went on to say that at a recent GATCOM he made the suggestion that the Parish Council should be notified but GAL did not do so.</p> <p>4. Andy Taylor advised the Group that the purpose of the trial is to prove a new separation standard as the most recent CAA data available dates from the 1980s (based upon upper air routes over Maastricht) and is not representative of today's modern aircraft or lower altitudes. It has been agreed with the CAA that a 6 month trial length is required to obtain sufficient data.</p> <p>5. Mark McLaren provided the group with an overview of his role at the CAA which includes oversight of such trials. He advised the group that this trial forms part of the mandatory Future Airspace Strategy (FAS). He confirmed that the ADNID Trial complies with the Government policy of concentration rather than dispersal and has a purpose to inform FAS and has a defined start and end date whereas the permanent change process of LAMP Phase I is continuing. Should this trial be adopted as a permanent airspace</p>	

<p>change proposal, then CAP725 consultation rules would apply.</p> <p>6. Ros Howell explained that the London Airspace Consultation (LAMP Phase I) stated no second consultation on routes will take place once they have been decided. John Byng mentioned this is exactly what is causing the issues and Matthew Balfour responded by saying there will be partial consultation after LAMP Phase I and this is better than nothing. Ros Howell reflected on Matthew Balfour’s previous statement regarding ‘this is what the future will look like’ and is an example of where the route is moved benefitting many people (Andy Taylor had advised that four villages previously overflowed were now avoided) while a smaller number could be more affected. However, this is in line with DfT policy.</p> <p>7. Ros Howell also commented that recent increase in complaints could potentially represent a small but vocal minority versus a silent majority.</p> <p>8. Liz Kitchen advised that country dwellers have different expectations due to quieter residual noise. Alan Jones mentioned that there are lots of workstreams and consultations ongoing however there will be winners and losers plus respite for others. GAL are going to be plagued with complaints however people want to fly and these people do fly.</p> <p>9. Peter Long questioned on what overflight actually is because if somebody can see aircraft from their garden they will consider this overflight even if the aircraft are technically not directly overhead. It was then suggested that as a noise monitor is in location in Rusper and is affected by this trial it would be prudent to supply the Gatwick Noise Monitoring Group with pre and post trial data for review. ACTION 05/2014</p> <p>10. Andy Taylor clarified that this is not an environmental trial but a technical one to allow a 20 degree split away from another SID route that also ensures separation from the “WILLO” hold therefore it is not possible to relocate it elsewhere.</p> <p>11. John Byng told the Group that people in Warnham are complaining because they bought their properties knowing where the flight paths are and now they have moved. Furthermore aircraft are climbing in a concentrated manner at 4000 feet. John Byng has been instructed to ask that the trial be terminated once sufficient technical data is sourced. Tom Denton stated that under FAS/LAMP some people would be better off, a smaller number may be worse off and some will see little change. Ros Howell referred previous and consistent responses from GATCOM to the previous consultations on CAA Strategy, CAA Future Airspace Policy, DfT Aviation Policy Framework, Night Flying Restrictions, and the London Airspace Consultation that pointed out that the increased use of PRNAV and the policy of concentration rather than dispersion will benefit the majority but that, increasingly, a minority will suffer to a greater degree, and that something needs to be done to address this issue. John Byng responded does the suffering of the minority ever outweigh the benefit of the majority?</p> <p>Matters Raised by John Byng requesting a GAL Response</p> <p>Predicted Ground Noise Increase in the Masterplan Document</p> <p>12. Tom Denton advised that within the Runway 2 work there is provision for noise walls/bunds/specific aircraft taxiing routes which constitutes a considerable amount of work. John Bing responded by saying he was very disappointed that there are 2 separate workstreams – the masterplan with 1 runway and the Runway 2 scenario. John Byng went on to say that in any case the scenario envisaged by the masterplan will occur first therefore he asked the question once again what is GAL going to do to mitigate the forecast increase in ground noise. He is protesting that what is done will not be enough – it has gone on too long.</p> <p>13. Ros Howell asked whether the consultation for Runway 2 could be covered in the next 2-3 months to which Tom Denton replied that it will be communicated as part of that consultation.</p>	<p>FPT 05/2014</p>
--	------------------------

<p>A320 Family Aircraft</p> <p>12. Ros Howell clarified the difference between retrofitting in-service aircraft and modifying aircraft in production. Douglas Moule indicated that easyJet have no intention to retrofit their entire fleet as it is currently in a continuous cycle of being upgraded. However Tom Denton advised that GAL is still in discussion with other airlines regarding this. John Byng advised the Group that he has heard from the manufacturer that new aircraft are being modified and they are currently writing up a procedure to do so to existing aircraft and emphasised that it is not quite possible to retrofit the aircraft at present furthermore he advised that easyJet (Carolyn McCall, CEO) has agreed to a GACC member to evaluate this option and John Byng hopes GAL will continue to apply pressure to airlines. Mike George added that evaluate means they may not do it as unless the regulator applies pressure airlines aren't going to pay money on aircraft that may be replaced. John Byng hopes a compromise can be reached and Matthew Balfour suggested GAL could enforce a 6-month deadline.</p> <p>13. Douglas Moule (not present at beginning of meeting when this was originally mentioned) provided an update under AOB regarding easyJet's position on this matter advising that there is a substantial fleet order in place for A320 NEO – which come modified. Certain other aircraft within the fleet will be retrofitted. easyJet continually rotate their fleet across the entire European network plus they are renewing it on a rolling basis. John Byng urges GAL to request all A320 operators to retrofit. Matthew Balfour suggested it would be good public relations to announce this. Douglas Moule stated that easyJet would be looking into this however was keen to point out that easyJet are not the only A320 operator at GAL.</p> <p>14. Charles Yarwood enquired if the airport is offering an incentive to airlines to retrofit. Tom Denton responded that GAL is limited as to what it can say and do and the executive management team are not minded to take direct action, for example banning A320s, due to commercial considerations. Douglas Moule concluded by saying that from a pilot's perspective the best thing they can do is an optimised approach that includes a continuous descent, decelerated approach and optimal deployment of flaps and undercarriage.</p>	
<p>12 Review of Actions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide noise data (pre and post ADNID Trial) from Rusper for the Gatwick Noise Monitoring Group. ACTION 36/2014 2. FPT amendments. ACTION 30/2013 3. Swanwick trip. ACTION 07/2012 	
<p>13 Messages</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To GATCOM – ADNID Trial update including Warnham complaints and locations with reduced complaints. 	
<p>14 Next Meeting</p> <p>Tuesday 13 May 2014 (1000-1300 hours) - Geneva Meeting Room, 5th Floor Destinations Place, Gatwick Airport.</p>	