

THE NOISE & TRACK MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP (NaTMAG) 24th November 2016

In attendance:

Lee Howes	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Corporate Responsibility Manager (Chair)
Brendan Sheil	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Flight Performance Team Manager
Andy Sinclair	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Head of Airspace Strategy and Engagement
Jessica Patel	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Flight Performance Team
Kimberley Heather	Gatwick Airport Ltd - Flight Performance Team
Vicki Hughes	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Arrivals Review Implementation Manager
Peter Long	Independent Technical Advisor to GATCOM
Nicole Park	ANS Gatwick
Andrew Burke	NATS Swanwick
Douglas Moule	Airline Operators Committee
Mike George	GATCOM
Liz Kitchen	GATCOM
Alan Jones	GATCOM
Clive Pearman	GATCOM
Ken Harwood	GATCOM
Peter Barclay	GATCOM
Charles Yarwood	GATCOM
Leon Hibbs	Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
Brian Cox	Crawley Borough Council
Gary Cobb	FLOPSC

Item	Action
<p>1. Apologies</p> <p>Charles Kirwan-Taylor - Gatwick Airport Ltd - Director of Corporate Affairs and Sustainability Tim May – Department for Transport</p>	
<p>2. Previous Minutes</p> <p>1. Mike George suggested that the attendance list for the NATMAG minutes should be separated into members and guests.</p> <p>2. Alan Jones referred to the wording for Action 55/2015 from the previous minutes and asked for it to be amended to read ‘no response from SESAR’.</p> <p>3. Mike George mentioned that in Item 4, the minutes did not state that Casper does not work on iOS devices. Brendan Sheil confirmed that it is possible to access the Casper website to make a complaint but the flight tracking service is not available as a flash player is required. Mike George reiterated that a large number of people use iOS devices rather than a computer and that they need to see the tracker in order to make a specific complaint. Brendan Sheil confirmed that this is an ongoing project with Casper and it will continue to be scoped to establish if it can be delivered sooner.</p> <p>4. Mike George also mentioned in item 5, paragraph 4, line 24; the line should read ‘turn the aircraft later’.</p>	

<p>5. Brendan Sheil confirmed that all the pre-meet notes have been agreed and the amendments requested have been completed.</p>	
<p>3. Action Tracker</p> <p><u>15/2015 – Invite FLOPSC member to attend NaTMAG</u> Gary Cobb, Head of Airside at Gatwick Airport attended the November meeting.</p> <p><u>51/2015 – Develop a timeline showing all planned initiatives of GAL, NATS and the CAA between now and 2025</u> Updated timeline was distributed 23rd November 2016. This will be kept a standing item as a live document to keep up to date with any changes.</p> <p><u>20/2016 – Vicki Hughes to circulate the draft agenda for the next NMB on the 15th November 2016 to NaTMAG members</u> Vicki Hughes circulated the draft agenda of the Noise Management Board (NMB) in November 2016 and it is also available on the website http://www.gatwickairport.com/business-community/aircraft-noise-airspace/airspace/noise-management-board/ - CLOSED</p> <p><u>21/2016 – Investigate whether it is possible to show ‘Real time data’ on Casper</u> As stated above, Brendan Sheil mentioned that this is an ongoing project with Casper and it will be investigated if it can be delivered sooner.</p> <p><u>22/2016 – Include Horley as an agenda item for the Nov 2016 meeting. Circulate latest Horley overflight data post-September meeting. NATS to provide update at next meeting</u> Horley overflight was added to the agenda for the November meeting and Andrew Burke presented the latest figures for the group. The Horley overflight figures were circulated to members on the 2nd November 2016 – CLOSED.</p> <p><u>23/2016 – Circulate hard copies of END to those members who have requested one</u> END circulated in November 2016. Any updates will be reviewed quarterly and this will remain a standing item and placed in the diary annexe – CLOSED</p> <p><u>24/2016 – Circulate the latest copy of the Q2 FPT report with the amendments requested in the pre-meet notes/September meeting</u> The amended Flight Performance Team (FPT) report was circulated to members on 4th October 2016 – CLOSED</p> <p><u>25/2016 – FPT to provide a presentation on complaint reasons for Horsham, Crawley and Copthorne</u> Jessica Patel delivered a presentation of the study of complaints received from these areas – CLOSED</p> <p><u>26/2016 – Update GNMG with new details of new monitoring sites</u> The Gatwick Noise Monitoring Group (GNMG) meeting was held on the 11th November 2016 and there was a discussion on the possible location of a new noise monitor at the November NaTMAG – CLOSED.</p>	

<p><u>27/2016 – Establish a process to exchange key messages between NaTMAG and the NMB</u> Lee Howes met with Graham Lake of the NMB to establish a process. Andy Sinclair attended the NMB and mentioned that he would feed any information back to NaTMAG members. The latest NMB papers were supplied for consideration and it was decided to keep this action open. Alan Jones indicated that it would be more useful to receive draft papers in advance of NaTMAG. Lee Howes and Vicki Hughes mentioned that they had only just received the documents otherwise this would have normally been the case.</p> <p><u>28/2016 – In line with the Diary Annex ensure all the latest reports and maps are circulated</u> The latest Noise Monitor Map, the Ground Noise page from the Q3 FPT report in 2015 and the latest Community Noise Report on Hever Castle were circulated on 30th September 2016 – CLOSED.</p> <p><u>29/2016 – ‘Go around’ causal factors analysis from NMB/FLOPSC/ANS work to be shared with NaTMAG</u> Douglas Moule mentioned that go-around analysis was a work in progress with FLOPSC and there will be an update at the next FLOPSC meeting once the airlines have had a chance to look at the proposed questionnaire to pilots.</p>	
<p>4. Departure Routes 2, 4 and 5</p> <p>1. Lee Howes mentioned that the Route 4 monitoring period was due to come to an end as of 23:59 on 26th November 2016. Then the FPT will collate the data packets to send to the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). It was reiterated that the Route 4 amendment is not a trial. Lee Howes also mentioned that due to the number of Route 4 feedback that the FPT have received, it will take time to collate this data into a spreadsheet for the CAA as feedback is still being received in large quantities. It was also mentioned that once the monitoring period ends, as of the 27th November, those aircraft using Route 4 will continue to fly the same SIDs whilst the CAA evaluates the success of the amendment. It is expected that this will take 3-4 months. If the CAA decide that the amendment is not fit for purpose, Route 4 will then return to using conventional navigation. Conventional navigation is not a permanent measure but will remain in place until an alternative solution is found. Leon Hibbs enquired as to how much feedback the FPT have received, Lee Howes confirmed that there had been 16,000 pieces of feedback received to date. Douglas Moule asked if the complaints received from outside of the Noise Preferential Route (NPR) constitute a valid complaint. Lee Howes confirmed that the FPT logged all feedback, whether positive, negative or indifferent from all areas around the airport vicinity. Douglas Moule questioned if NaTMAG was considering how to define the compliance of aircraft using the Route 4 NPR. Lee Howes mentioned that since the Route 4 amendment, all SIDs are included in the track keeping statistics. Andrew Burke referred to the NPR presentation from Andy Radforth in the September meeting and mentioned that the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) PANS-OPS design criteria for RNAV-1 meant that aircraft should be within 1 nautical mile (nm) of the SID for 95% of flights approximately equating to the 3km wide NPR. If an aircraft leaves the NPR early, then it is recorded as non-compliant. Andrew Burke anticipated that the CAA would follow this principle. Andy Sinclair stated that a significant number of complaints come from within the lateral dimensions of the NPR and often referred to aircraft above 4,000ft albeit the NPR extended only from the surface to 4,000ft. Peter Long stated that compliance with replicating a conventional SID (as is the requirement for the new P-RNAV SID) is a totally different consideration to track-keeping compliance once a SID is accepted and that we should not confuse the two different monitoring requirements</p>	

and not look to the FPT report track-keeping statistics as being particularly relevant to the CAA's assessment of the Route 4 (new) P-RNAV performance. He also mentioned that whilst some of those affected by noise may prefer dispersed tracks, as concentration is currently the Government's policy; the CAA would be expected to assess the new route in that light. Andy Sinclair reiterated that the Route 4 amendment is undergoing a period of monitoring and evaluation and is not a trial. There will be an opportunity during the Department for Transport (DfT) consultation to influence the legal arrangements and policies that will shape any future airspace changes, but for now SID designs and departure traffic flows are restricted to follow the NPR centreline. Community groups and Parish Councils are in agreement that this will be useful opportunity. Clive Pearman asked when the Route 4 data for the CAA will be submitted. Clive Pearman also mentioned that the data should be sent with recommendations for solutions. Lee Howes indicated that the FPT will need 2-3 weeks after the closing date for the feedback to be collated altogether for submission. It was noted that a summary of this information could be shared on the blog and also to members. Andy Sinclair has spoken with Phil Roberts of the CAA who had fully supported the sharing of this information to ensure total transparency. The submission to the CAA would focus entirely on the required data and would not include any recommendations now as this should be separated from the recent historical data. Clive Pearman suggested that this should be an issue for the NMB. Andy Sinclair assured members that the NMB and its member organisations would have the opportunity to contribute to the upcoming DfT consultation.

2. Leon Hibbs asked what future solutions could be considered to Route 4 SIDs. Andy Sinclair said that aviation has better technology to exploit but also that fixed legal instruments around noise mitigation developed in the 1960s were not relevant in a contemporary environment as conurbations around the Airport are changing in size and shape. With better technology, routes could be designed to avoid these areas and even fly multiple tracks to disperse aircraft even more. Andy Sinclair suggested that this might be possible through airspace change in the future, however, the CAA are currently bound to enforce legislation which in many ways inhibits the full exploitation of technology in delivering a better suite of noise mitigation options. It was mentioned that the CAA want to improve engagement with the airline industry.

3. Douglas Moule re-affirmed that the most efficient way to operate an aircraft is the use of low power and low drag in descent and continuous climb which is best achieved through supporting the airspace change programme. Lee Howes mentioned that this would be facilitated by the London Airspace Management Programme (LAMP). Alan Jones noted that an integral part of the DfT consultation will be focused on airspace design. He added that too many aircraft using Route 4 are flying at low altitudes and that continuous climb would be an adequate solution to this issue. Alan Jones also added that the Airport Noise Management Advisory Committee (ANMAC) should have more of a role as it brings the major London airports together. There have been a number of projects that ANMAC could have been involved in but have missed out on. Lee Howes agreed that it has been over a year since ANMAC have had input so he suggested that this is a key message to GATCOM.

4. Charles Yarwood noted that communities are asking for more dispersion on Route 4 and if Precision Based Navigation (PBN) is not being mandated until 2020, there must be an alternative solution in the meantime. There are a number of initiatives that could be delivered in the next 2-3 years to improve Route 4 tracking for communities. Douglas Moule asked the group their definition of the term 'dispersion'. 'Random dispersion' is currently in use and conventional navigation also uses this method. It was noted that there is some difficulty in explaining to communities how Route 4 is dispersed. Douglas Moule added that 'controlled dispersion' would deliver measurable dispersion

FPT
30/2016

rather than the current observation of dispersion. Charles Yarwood mentioned that communities would prefer Route 4 to return to pre-2013 tracking. It was noted that this is an issue that it currently being discussed at the NMB. He also asked if Gatwick Airport could opt out of the Route 4 amendment anytime and return to conventional navigation. Andy Sinclair agreed that it was possible, however due to the increase in air traffic since 2013; Gatwick Airport would never be able to replicate pre-2013 routing. He also reiterated that we should no longer be looking at the past but to the future. Douglas Moule shared an image with the group showing how Budapest Airport uses multiple SID routings successfully. Peter Long added that in order to revert back to conventional navigation, this will require a 2 year trial; however this procedure would never be approved by the CAA. Andy Sinclair noted that this would not be the case as the conventional SIDs are still published in the UK Aeronautical Information Publication (UK AIP). Andy Sinclair also added that if the CAA adopts conventional navigation, then it will not occur immediately as it will take a short time for the RNAV-1 SIDs to be replaced in the Flight Management Systems (FMS) of each aircraft. Peter Barclay asked how the CAA will be sure that using controlled dispersion will be effective. It was suggested that the DfT consultation would be the best avenue to influence change in this area.

5. Lee Howes provided an update on the progress of Routes 2 and 5 and provided a hard copy of the draft briefing document for members with a one month period to provide feedback. Lee Howes mentioned that Route 5, also known as 08 Clacton, requires an amendment to bring the aircraft tracking back towards the centreline of the NPR. This will be achieved by introducing two new waypoints to encourage the traffic to follow the centreline. There have been two simulation trials of the new routing which were completed for a Boeing 737-800 and an Airbus A320 on the 16th October 2016. Lee Howes noted that following the simulation, the amendment has been working broadly as anticipated. The CAA were not in attendance to these simulations, however they were recorded on video and along with flight evaluation reports, these were sent to the CAA for analysis. Lee Howes also introduced an update to Route 2, also known as 08 Seaford, which requires an amendment as aircraft are currently 'ballooning' outside of the centreline on the turn. There will be no new waypoints on this route; instead a speed restriction of 220 knots on the turn will be introduced to keep aircraft on the centreline. These amendments are expected to be implemented in March 2017. Ken Harwood believed that the biggest problem for residents living beneath the NPR is when aircraft decelerate which produces a large amount of 'whining' noise as they make the turn before accelerating again. Ken Harwood also added that those aircraft that balloon out of the centreline fly over open ground so are not necessarily an issue. Douglas Moule noted that previously there was a speed restriction of 220 knots on the turn but this had been moved to further down the route so aircraft are naturally accelerating on the turn to gain height. Andy Sinclair suggested the best solution to this issue may be to adopt continuous climb. Douglas Moule indicated that this would not be effective as Route 2 has a height restriction due to Heathrow traffic. In respect of assessing changes generally, Peter Long suggested that the effects of changes to various different flying procedures were highly complex, often causing a benefit to some people or improvement in one aspect but a dis-benefit to others or worsening in another aspect and that we should be considering all factors and measure these scientifically rather than deciding what is best at NaTMAG, as that is not practical. Andy Sinclair agreed that it was also recommended at the NMB that we should be analysing empirical data on generates noise to inform SID design to allow aircraft to fly the cleanest wing possible.

6. Douglas Moule referred to Page 8 of the Route 2 and 5 briefing document and stated that the map does not show aircraft tracks up to 4,000ft. It was mentioned that the map does show aircraft up to and beyond 4,000ft. Peter Long commented that aircraft have to stay on the route until 4,000ft before

<p>they can be vectored by Air Traffic Control (ATC). Andy Sinclair added that there is a vertical and lateral profile to the NPR to which the aircraft must comply before vectoring. Andrew Burke also added that there are some airports that allow vectoring below the required altitude and thus they receive a large quantity of complaints. Peter Long questioned whether aircraft that are leaving the NPR below 4,000ft are not being vectored but are track deviations. This was confirmed by Andrew Burke as ATC will only intervene at 4,000ft to vector aircraft. An aircraft would be compliant as it would have been vectored by ATC instruction.</p>	
<p>5. Horley Overflight</p> <p>1. Andrew Burke introduced the issue of Horley overflight since the Route 4 amendment was implemented on the 26th May. He indicated that the Route 4 tracking had moved further south and NATS have been working on training their controllers not to vector aircraft over Horley. He noted that NATS have isolated individual controllers that are not performing adequately and mentioned one particular day where there were 19 violations, of which 18 were caused by one controller. He added that since NATS had taken a positive step to re-educate controllers, the percentage of Horley overflights have reduced. The data for October 2016 was shared with the group. Mike George had previously been in contact with Robin Clarke of NATS about the issue of Horley overflight and was pleased to hear that NATS have recognised the issue and working on a solution. Andrew Burke mentioned that Horley overflight will be included at the next FLOPSC meeting and that airlines will be reminded by the FPT to provide Route 4 feedback during the meeting. He added that the weekly data that he receives from the FPT is sent to the controllers with the link to the Horley Town Council website. Residents accept that Horley overflight will never reach 0% but NATS will continue to address on a weekly basis. Liz Kitchen suggested that there should be a key message to GATCOM on the positive improvement of Horley overflight.</p> <p>2. Alan Jones believed that the Route 4 ‘trial’ was successful but Horley overflight has led residents to believe that the amendment has been unsuccessful. Andy Sinclair noted that vectoring from the revised SID has changed from historical norms but NATS were working hard to address this issue and with some success. He also added that a large number of complaints are received from communities beneath the NPR. Lee Howes added that some residents with Horley postcodes are complaining but are not necessarily affected by aircraft noise; they may use their postcodes to add to the Horley complaints. Mike George highlighted the new development of a settlement in Horley planned for 2020 and suggested that there needs to be monitoring of the rule on Horley overflight, does it apply to the town presently or will it also apply to new builds? Peter Long mentioned that it is possible to have two rules (one relating to flying the NPR and the other for not overflying Horley) applying simultaneously without conflict. He quoted Tim May in that Horley will continue to grow but aircraft should not be allowed to fly over and therefore the area in which aircraft can fly is restricted further. Liz Kitchen suggested that restrictions on overflight of new builds should not be limited to Horley but to other areas too. It was mentioned that the recent Land Use Planning seminar in mid-November would have been a useful place to discuss this topic and Vicki Hughes advised that there may be further seminars in the future.</p>	<p>FPT 31/2016</p>
<p>6. Arrivals Review</p> <p>1. Vicki Hughes introduced an update to the group on the progress of the Independent Review of Arrivals and presented a dashboard of the 23 recommendations with colour coding to show the developments. She also presented individual slides of the priority items and mentioned that there</p>	

have been three NMB meetings to date with the webpage due to be updated with the minutes of the latest meeting (15th November 2016).

2. With reference to Imm-01 and Imm-02 regarding the retrofit of the A320 family of aircraft, this is an ongoing project with the airlines involved and progress was presented to the group as a percentage of each airline's fleet that has been retrofitted. Douglas Moule mentioned that he needed to verify with easyJet the percentage of modified aircraft. Bo Redeborn and Nick Dunn, Chief Financial Officer for Gatwick Airport, have written to every airline using A320 aircraft outlining the charging regime that will be implemented to all Gatwick-operated aircraft that have not been modified as of the 1st January 2018. The final action plan has also been sent and a request has been made for the airlines to provide a quarterly update on their progress. This may be difficult to achieve as it is not compulsory, however the first figures are expected to be received by the end of November 2016. Vicki Hughes quoted Airbus who stated that by the end of the Summer 2017, 90% of Gatwick Airport-based A320 aircraft will be modified.

3. With reference to Imm-05, the raising of the CDA altitude from 6,000ft to 7,000ft, this was introduced on the 1st August 2016 and was monitored for a 3 month period until 31st October. It has been requested that the DfT make this change permanent. Mike George asked if the trial had been a success and how it is possible that Gatwick Airport can measure at 7,000ft but Heathrow Airport can continue to monitor at 6,000ft. Andrew Burke mentioned that Gatwick Airport is still facilitating the same procedure but all that has changed is the altitude at which it is measured. NATS wish to facilitate the measurement from the highest level possible but Gatwick Airport will be from 7,000ft.

4. With reference to Imm-10, the amendment of the joining point from 10 nautical miles (nm) to 8nm, this was implemented on the 15th August 2016 and is still being monitored. The new issue that has arisen from Imm-10 is defining 'fair and equitable distribution' which is currently being discussed at the NMB. Vicki Hughes presented a graph comparing June and July 2016 (before the joining point amendment) and October 2016 (after the change). October 2016 illustrated a more evenly distributed curve compared to the summer months which indicated that the aircraft are joining across a wider swathe. Andy Sinclair noted that there has been a 25% drop in the number of aircraft joining between 11-11.49nm and that the largest number of noise complaints are from people living under the 'base leg' of the arrivals swathe for aircraft about to join the Instrument Landing System (ILS). Residents are not pleased with the change that has occurred as they are not seeing the benefits, despite the recommendation having been implemented. Andrew Burke mentioned that it has been a success as the joining point has widened to 8nm yet residents are asking for the swathe to revert to 2013 levels. This is not possible due to the increased arrival traffic numbers today compared with 2013. There is currently a six month monitoring period for Imm-10 and if deemed unsuccessful, then the join point will revert to a minimum of 10nm. Peter Long asked if this decision was clarified with the residents living beneath the swathe. Andy Sinclair was aware that residents beneath the swathe do not believe there is enough dispersion. Peter Long referred to the joining point comparison graph presented and noted that residents would like to see a flatter curve and that Bo Redeborn had not specified to residents that there would be any specific change to the swathe. Andy Sinclair agreed that the base leg turn needed additional discussion to understand the issues and what might be possible in terms of dispersion as well as agreeing how to measure traffic dispersion across the swathe. Andrew Burke stated that we delivered what the recommendation asked and that residents want to keep Imm-10 as an open item until they see the results they hope for. Andrew Burke added that there had been an increase in track stretching between the stack and touchdown at the airfield. NATS use a metric, known as 3Di, to reduce track stretching. It was suggested that a key message to GATCOM is raised

<p>about the issues with the joining point amendment are known. Alan Jones asked if there have been an increase in the number of complaints between 8-10nm. Lee Howes confirmed that complaints have not increased but there are particular parish councils that are encouraging people to complain. Vicki Hughes agreed and reported that there have been no noticeable ‘spikes’ in complaint numbers before or during the monitoring period. Clive Pearman suggested that as the NMB is a relatively new group, there needs to be more generosity with time in order for them to be able to discuss and analyse the issues at hand. Clive Pearman also mentioned that the NMB needs to reach a decision on the definition of ‘fair and equitable distribution’ and it may cause a divide in opinion at the NMB. Vicki Hughes confirmed that the definition is currently being discussed.</p> <p>5. With reference to Imm-03, the Land Use Planning workshop, this had been held in mid-November and a paper has been drafted. Vicki Hughes mentioned that this will be circulated once approved. Ken Harwood asked if anyone else was invited as he would have liked to have attended. Vicki Hughes advised that 20 local planning authorities had been invited and Liz Kitchen had also attended. She added that there may be plans to hold another seminar in the future. Ken Harwood requested that Vicki Hughes provide the papers from the seminar.</p> <p>6. With reference to Imm-04, the noise information booklet, Vicki Hughes has circulated soft and hard copies to NaTMAG members with feedback to be provided by the 30th November 2016. It has also been distributed to the National Association of Estate Agents (NAEA) and the Gatwick Officers Group (GOG). Mike George mentioned that the noise booklet repeats a large amount of information that is stated on the Gatwick Airport website and that it may be an unnecessary expense. Douglas Moule agreed that the document was a useful centralised document of information that benefits new residents.</p> <p>7. With reference to Imm-17, Brendan Sheil advised that the update to the Casper Noise and Track keeping system was completed on the 29th September 2016.</p>	<p>VH 32/2016</p>
<p>7. END 2015 Report (Issues By Exception)</p> <p>1. Lee Howes distributed hard copies of the Environmental Noise Directive (END) 2015 Report at the September meeting and asked the group if they had any feedback on the document. Peter Long mentioned that the report was not discussed in detail at their pre-meeting and requested that members have additional time to analyse it fully. Peter Long also noted that ‘issues by exception’ was confusing as members do not know what has been completed. The annual noise monitoring report only lists what has happened in the previous year and what is planned for the coming year and as such members need updates at each NaTMAG on progress during the year.</p> <p>2. Lee Howes also mentioned the Section 106 action plan which contains an item on noise. This report was extended in 2015 in light of uncertainty over the proposed second runway. It was also mentioned that there is a Section 106 noise action plan with a number of actions, however it directs towards the END noise action plan which is more detailed. One of the actions of the END report is for Gatwick Airport to hold an annual airspace seminar which was undertaken in March 2016. Peter Long requested a quarterly update of the END report and it was agreed that this remain a standing agenda item.</p> <p>3. Lee Howes also mentioned that the END report needs updating as Item 30 still contains a telephone number that complainants can use to make noise enquiries. This service was removed on 30th September 2016. As Peter Long noted that Gatwick Airport needs to publicly consult before removing the action from the END report it was agreed that, rather than doing that, the commentary will be changed to indicate that that the phone line has been removed and its status shown as red. Liz Kitchen</p>	

<p>noted her disappointment that the phone line has been removed as it is a disadvantage to older people who are not able to write letters, but understood why it was done.</p>	
<p>8. Ground Noise Report/Ground Noise Monitoring</p> <p>1. Lee Howes referred to the Ground Noise Report for the July to September period and mentioned that the number of engine tests has been reduced in the defined hours. Lee Howes attended a meeting with the Gatwick Airport authorities which highlighted positive improvements. It was noted that the Ground Noise Report was useful to show how well the airfield compliance team are performing.</p> <p>2. A summary of performance was stated including zero non-compliant engine tests, a low number of ground power dispensations and the Fixed Electrical Ground Power (FEGP) stood at 99% for the July-September period.</p> <p>3. Brian Cox asked for confirmation on the recent Boeing reports to develop a new hanger at Gatwick Airport. Lee Howes could not confirm any dates as it has not yet gone through the planning stage, but mentioned that this could impact noise on the ground with engine testing and could also affect certain environmental conditions.</p> <p>4. Ken Harwood agrees that the Ground Noise Report is useful. He referred to Page 25 of the report and enquired why there were 13 engine tests on Block 38S. Lee Howes confirmed that this block is used only during easterly operations.</p>	
<p>9. Flight Performance Report (inc. ground noise complaints) & Complaints presentation</p> <p>1. Brendan Sheil introduced the FPT report and mentioned that the Continuous Descent Operations (CDO) figure has decreased over the rolling 12 months; however the monthly CDO figure is on the increase. This is positive especially as the CDO monitoring height has been increased from 6,000ft to 7,000ft on the 1st August 2016 as recommended by the Independent Review of Arrivals (Imm-05).</p> <p>2. Brendan Sheil noted that the summer night quota season came to an end on the 30th October 2016 at 01:59 hours and that the usage was closer to the limit than previous years, yet still remained under (including the 10% carry over from the Winter 2015/16 season). Brendan Sheil noted that the usage increased for this summer period but this was due, in part, to having a 31 week summer as opposed to a 30 week summer of previous years.</p> <p>3. Brendan Sheil mentioned that the Gatwick Noise Monitoring Group met on the 10th November 2016 and a noise monitor report for the Cowden (#78) monitor was due to be uploaded to the Gatwick Airport website in the coming weeks. It was mentioned that there was a monitor available to be placed and suggestions for its location included Charlwood and Mannings Heath. A new monitor was recently installed on Route 2 (08 Seaford) in Newick Way, East Grinstead. Charles Yarwood requested the specification for the location of noise monitors. Brendan Sheil will provide this. Peter Barclay suggested that Newdigate may be a suitable location as there have been a number of noise complaints from this area and that the noise monitor data may be of interest to the local residents. It was mentioned that Charlwood used to have a fixed noise monitor so it has a history of noise data. It was also noted that Charlwood residents are already aware of the noise levels so the location may not be of best interest, however the fixed monitor was removed with an understanding that it will be reinstalled in the future. It was suggested that it would be good to honour this commitment. Mike George enquired whether there are other monitors which are in locations where there are little to no complaints from residents that could be relocated. Brendan Sheil noted that each monitor needs a minimum of 12 months monitoring, so as long as this is honoured the monitors can be relocated. Charles Yarwood mentioned that a large number of complaints have been sourced from Hookwood</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">BS 33/2016</p>

and Norwood Hill in Horley and that it would be best to enquire with Parish Councillors as to where a new monitor could be placed.

4. Peter Long referred to Page 2 of the FPT report and mentioned that the value of the complaint response rate was very low compared with previous months (52.3%). Brendan Sheil noted that the FPT are now responding to each individual complaint since the 29th September as recommended by the Independent Review of Arrivals (Imm-17). The FPT are also compiling all Route 4 feedback from emails received (16,000 pieces of feedback since the amendment on 26th May) for the CAA. Brendan Sheil advised that the data for the CAA is taking additional time to record. It was also mentioned that complaints are not necessarily being sourced from individuals but being encouraged by local campaign groups which have an effect on the volume of complaints received. The FPT have received around 30,000 complaints this year. Leon Hibbs suggested that the number of complaints received for the year is included in the executive summary. Andy Sinclair added that Route 4 requires a detailed and lengthy data capture and analysis to create the monthly report to the CAA. Alan Jones enquired about the scope of the audience of the FPT report. Brendan Sheil confirmed that it was currently in draft form for NaTMAG to give feedback and would be finalised and distributed after the meeting.

5. Peter Long referred to Page 7 of the FPT report and suggested that the link to the website be removed and the wording to be changed to refer to the NPR map at the bottom of the page.

6. Peter Long also mentioned that Page 8 the definition of P-RNAV needs more clarification as it does not explain why the track keeping compliance percentage has decreased.

7. Brian Cox referred to the map on Page 10 and mentioned that we used to have a section in the FPT report on unusual tracks. Peter Long asked if the track of this aircraft can be investigated by Andrew Burke and NATS and feedback be provided at the next NaTMAG meeting.

8. Peter Long suggested that on Page 11 the density scale of the Horley track map be changed to match the maps on Pages 25 and 26.

9. Peter Long referred to Page 13 and noted that CDO is not advisory but compulsory as it is stated in the extract from the Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP). Brendan Sheil disagreed as further down the page in the AIP extract it states 'where possible'. Peter Long added that there was an additional 'to' in the AIP wording that needed to be amended. Andy Sinclair stated that the AIP was not written as a legal document although wording such as 'should' and 'shall' were often used. Peter Long noted that the Arrivals Code of Practice (ACoP) is advisory and is industry enforced. It was suggested that in order to solve this matter, the wording of the CDO definition in the glossary (Page 28) be altered.

10. Mike George enquired about the causes of go-arounds on Page 19 and asked for clarification on what is meant by 'narrative'. Lee Howes mentioned that this reason is sourced from the ATC log. Nicole Park advised that ANS provides all details of go-arounds and captures every reason and this is reported in the weekly ATC logs. Lee Howes noted that there were too many reasons for the causes of go-arounds to report in the FPT report. Nicole Park added that this can be due to compounded reasons and more than one aircraft can be involved. Alan Jones mentioned that there are so many different categories that 'narrative' does not fit and suggested that a new term, such as 'miscellaneous' or 'other' would be a better term. Peter Long added that this is why there is a need for Action 29/2016 and that the cause of go-arounds is an issue that needs addressing. Nicole Park suggested that an agenda item for the next NaTMAG be included for ANS to give feedback on the causes of go-arounds and reiterated that go-arounds are important for safety. Mike George added that it is important to investigate the root cause of a go-around rather than accepting the first reason provided by the pilot.

**FPT
34/2016**

**FPT/NATS
35/2016**

**ANS
29/2016**

<p>11. Ken Harwood noted that on Page 23, the 'No Cause' reason in the pie chart should be changed to 'No reason specified'.</p> <p>12. Jessica Patel introduced a complaints presentation compiled for the four areas which received the highest number of complainants during the April-June 2016 period. These areas were Horsham, Newdigate, Copthorne and Crawley. Jessica Patel provided a map of the complaint locations for Horsham and also a set of graphs with a selection of quotes from complainant testimonies. It was mentioned that Horsham was affected by departing aircraft which had been diverted from the NPR due to weather avoidance. There were a number of incidents of storm activity during May 2016. It was also mentioned that a complaint had been received about an aircraft travelling at 10,600ft which did not belong to Gatwick Airport but was in transit to another airfield. Mike George asked whether overflight complaints were counted in the FPT statistics. Jessica Patel confirmed that every complaint the FPT receives is logged. Lee Howes added that the team often receive complaints from helicopters sourced from Redhill Aerodrome and that some complaints send standard complaint templates to multiple airports. Jessica Patel provided a map of Newdigate complaints and also a breakdown of complaint types. She mentioned that since the Route 4 amendment, the number of complaints from Newdigate has risen. It was also mentioned that there have been issues with the track keeping of Emirates A380 aircraft across Newdigate. Peter Barclay noted that most people are content until they are disturbed. Charles Yarwood added that with the removal of the phone line, people are unable to speak out properly. Jessica Patel provided data for Crawley and Copthorne and mentioned that Crawley complaints are generated by go-arounds and Copthorne is overflown by departing aircraft vectored by ATC due to weather avoidance. Mike George suggested that there needs to be communication that any weather avoidance is further afield as residents cannot see this on the ground.</p>	
<p>10. AOB</p> <p>1. Peter Barclay suggested that Gatwick Airport need to pre-design a feedback form that residents can fill in for Route 4 feedback and subsequent amendments to Routes 2 and 5. This would be useful to reduce the labour intensiveness of the next consultation so that there is a single form that residents can fill in to be sent to the CAA. Lee Howes advised that the FPT are working with Casper to have a filter function to separate Route 2 and 5 feedback. The Route 2 and 5 briefing document is being prepared for information for residents who may be affected by the amendments and Gatwick Airport is aiming to be as transparent with information as possible. Peter Barclay mentioned that he has received 1,000 complaints related to Route 4. Mike George suggested to Vicki Hughes that Imm-11 (the Landing Direction Protocol) needed more time to collect feedback on the work required for completion. Vicki Hughes has received positive feedback from communities on the content of the booklet provided. This booklet along with the Imm-04 Noise Information Booklet has been circulated to GATCOM; however the Landing Direction Protocol booklet is for viewing only whereas the Noise Information Booklet is open to feedback. Mike George suggests that there should be more communication between the NMB, NaTMAG and GATCOM to bring all feedback together. Alan Jones mentioned that if there are changes to be made to the Landing Direction Protocol, even minimal changes, then it may be best to avoid making changes otherwise there is a risk of generating more complaints. There has to be recognition between what NaTMAG does and the NMB so that the responsibility is evened. A key message to the NMB was suggested that runway direction is not an issue and that changes to the protocol will not improve the situation.</p>	

YOUR LONDON AIRPORT

Gatwick

<p><u>Key Messages to GATCOM:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated above (4. Departure routes 2, 4 and 5) ANMAC will be invited to have more input in future airspace design as it has been over a year since it was last involved in airspace projects. • NATS are successfully retraining their controllers to reduce aircraft vectoring from Route 4 over Horley and they will continue to work to minimise overflight in line with the AIP rules. • There are issues with the joining point amendment (Imm-10) as residents are not pleased with the result of the swathe widening. <p><u>Key Messages to FLOPSC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airlines will be reminded to provide Route 4 feedback for the CAA at the next FLOPSC. <p><u>Key Messages to NMB:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to the Independent Review of Arrivals recommendation (Imm-11) it was mentioned that runway direction is not an issue and that changes to the protocol will not improve the situation. 	
<p>13. Dates of Next Meetings</p> <p>FLOPSC – Wednesday 30th November 2016, 9:30 – 11:30 in Barcelona, 5th Floor, Destinations Place.</p> <p>NaTMAG - Thursday 23rd February 2017, 14:00 – 17:00 in Barcelona, 5th Floor, Destinations Place.</p>	<p>For Info Only</p>