

GATWICK AIRPORT NOISE MANAGEMENT BOARD (NMB/7)

Wednesday 6th September 2017 - Hilton Hotel Gatwick

Meeting Minutes

Welcome and Introductions

1. The NMB chairman opened the meeting by welcoming Atholl Forbes, the new representative of PAGNE, and acknowledging with round table introductions, the NMB Observers present. The NMB was also informed that Colin Stratton-Brown, the member for HWCAAG, had recently been badly hurt in a car accident and accordingly sent best wishes from the board for his speedy recovery.
2. The chairman noted that two topics in particular had emerged that would shape the day's discussions. The first is the debate about the number of papers and volume of information prepared for the NMB, requiring assimilation by members. The second topic relates to the question of priorities sought by CNG, with demands for high priority attention on a wide range of work streams.
3. Having previously agreed both the priorities and workstreams for the board at NMB/6, the subsequent request from CNG, (NMB/6 IP13) to in effect set these established priorities aside in favour of the pursuit of a growth, noise and government policy agenda raises a number of important questions for the NMB which is discussed under agenda item three.
4. As regards the number of NMB papers, the chairman reminded the meeting that many of the papers and much of the information distributed to the NMB is provided in response to actions arising from prior NMB meetings, and to direct requests from CNG to NMB members for data. He noted that the NMB papers provide an audit trail for both the work that has been done in support of NMB objectives, and give details to the issues that have been evaluated, with outcomes, as a part of the process to identify and agree what noise reducing measures can usefully be implemented. In addition, the NMB now has comprehensive material available as background information to any new board member.
5. The chairman considers that it is not in the NMB interests to restrict the amount of information provided, and that the volume of data available to the NMB, together with that published by the FPT is already substantial. In order to reduce the load on NMB members, measures have already been taken to assist in the selection of papers for review prior to the meeting (see Documentation list at Annex 1) and those which can be deferred for review at a later date. It is also sensible for NMB members to consider carefully the purpose of making any additional information requests to the NMB. A helpful guiding principle that could contribute to the reduction in the volume of data to be assimilated by the NMB is to contemplate on the following question: will the information being requested make a practical contribution to the advancement of noise reduction? This topic is discussed in more detail under agenda item five, NMB Communications.
6. MP requested that the NMB decision on Imm-11 runway protocol be discussed in this meeting. This request reflected a proposal (NMB/7 IP21) to revisit the runway protocol outcomes and recommendations. The chairman agreed to add the topic to AoB, and on that basis the NMB approved the proposed meeting agenda (NMB/7 WP01).

Agenda item 1: Approval of the Minutes of NMB/6

7. Following a short discussion and a request from MW that in future more information should be provided in the minutes on suggestions put forward in the meetings, no other comments or proposals for adaptation were received. The NMB/6 draft Minutes were then unanimously agreed, are now ratified and will be marked as approved on the NMB web pages.

Agenda item 2: Review of Matters arising from NMB/6

8. NMB/6 Actions, The Secretary reported that each of the Actions arising from NMB/6 were now completed and closed. Relevant papers have been distributed. Where discussion and strategic direction is a consequence of the NMB/6 actions, the topics are included later in the agenda of NMB/7.
 - a. For NMB/6 Action 2, the information on the process applied by DfT for Night Flight Dispensations was discussed. MBa indicated that the DfT paper (NMB/7 IP03) responding to the prior CNG request (NMB/5 Action 11) did not address all of the points raised by CNG regarding handling of such dispensations.
 - b. TM agreed, reporting that;
 - I. As part of its decision on new night flight restrictions for the period 2017-2022, the Government announced it would 'carry out further work to consider whether the current process for issuing dispensations is appropriate, including the criteria under which they are allowed'.
 - II. We recognise that the current guidance on dispensations does not give an exhaustive list of scenarios when dispensations may or may not be appropriate, and particularly when disruption is of a level that could be expected and therefore factored into the airlines' schedules.
 - III. DfT have recently appointed Jonathan Friel (attending NMB/7 as an Observer) to lead on night flight issues.
 - IV. The detailed terms of the review are still being finalised and *we would welcome views from the NMB and other parties on what this should cover.*
 - V. It should be noted that any change to the rules around the issuing of dispensations would require formal consultation with interested parties.
 - VI. This occurred when the guidance was previously reviewed in 2013 and is required by Regulation (EU) 598/2014 which sets out rules for the introduction of operating restrictions, as any tightening of the dispensation rules could amount to such a restriction.
 - VII. TM reported that Government will be reviewing the process at the end of the current summer season and agreed that DfT will provide additional information at NMB/8: **NMB/7 Action 1**

Agenda item 3: NMB Work Plan and Priorities 2017/2018

9. *Consolidated Work Plan.* The NMB was provided with a copy of the Consolidated 2017/2018 workplan (NMB/7 WP04), this incorporated the changes agreed at NMB/6. An overview was also provided (NMB/7 WP03), this summary of the workstreams and intended reporting will be published on the NMB web site.

10. *Growth, Noise and Government Policy*. The chairman referred to the letter he received from CNG (NMB/7 IP13). This communication includes a copy of an e-mail letter from community groups; addressed to the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of GAL, and to the Gatwick Airport CEO. The purpose of the request to GAL is to advance proposals made to the NMB in April (NMB/5 IP18). The letter includes, while making several claims about noise performance that notably in the chairman's view have no scientific basis, a separate request to the Chair of the NMB to make the topics described and requested of GAL an immediate and urgent personal priority to ensure the continued credibility of the NMB.
- a. The CNG proposal from NMB/5:
 - i. That the aggregate annual utilisation of the airport should be capped at the 2016 level other than with the formal agreement of the NMB.
 - ii. That utilisation in any 24-hour period should not be permitted to exceed the peak level recorded in July 2016 other than with the formal agreement of the NMB.
 - iii. That the NMB will only agree to an increase in annual or peak utilization if the increase is balanced by a directly proportionate reduction in noise measured on a basis to be agreed by the NMB.
 - b. The chairman agreed that quite clearly there is always a relationship between the number of flights and the related noise disturbance perceived by individuals. On that basis and if noise was the only consideration, then there would be no need for the NMB, as travel would be limited and the numbers of flights would probably be more restricted by Government than they are today. However, the chairman also noted that as independent chair of the NMB representing all NMB members, the board cannot ignore the reality of the integral role of air transport in today's society.
 - i. Airports are under a legal obligation to develop strategic noise maps and produce Noise Action Plans based on those maps, on a five-yearly basis. The Government already expects the designated airports (Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted) to produce noise exposure maps on an annual basis.
 - ii. From the perspective of the Noise Management Board, and in accordance with the agreed NMB Terms of Reference and Code of Conduct, it would not be appropriate for the first, immediate and urgent priority to propose and pursue further limits to the number of flights permitted to use Gatwick. This is a matter for the Government and airport to address in accordance with established national policy and the fiduciary obligations of Gatwick Airport Limited.
 - iii. However, the NMB does have an important role with others, for instance in taking forward its agreed work programme, and in guiding the development of the Noise Action Plan for Gatwick. In the meantime, the NMB is expected to continue to develop and pursue strategies that lead to the reduction of noise disturbance from all aircraft using Gatwick. This could involve the identification and development of suitable criteria that could usefully link increased movement rates at the airport with clearly measured noise performance improvements, such as the introduction of next generation aircraft fleets or engine technology. Any such metrics should be based upon verifiable scientific criteria rather than notional concepts.
 - c. MBa reported that as a first step, CNG are looking for a viable metric to get the ball rolling and in his view this work is mission critical for the NMB. TM reminded the NMB that the Government has launched a process to put into place an updated Aviation Strategy, the call for evidence for which will seek to identify how to deliver a balance

between the positive economic impacts of air transport and the negative effects. MBa expects CNG to respond.

- i. AS outlined the GAL position, reporting that achieving a viable balance is a common aim for CNG and GAL and, that both the baseline, the long-term trends, rather than a single year for noise performance improvements and ATM growth, must be taken into account.
 - ii. AS agreed that GAL will review government policy and develop preliminary options for potential metrics, that could potentially be used to develop a utilisation vs noise performance formula, when planning airport utilisation. This will include the benchmarking of Gatwick against similar airports. AS cautioned against rushing to conclusions or prejudging the outcomes of the work and agreed to report progress at the next NMB. **NMB/7 Action 2**
 - iii. A number of remarks were made about the introduction of new quieter aircraft, such as A320 neo and FOPP modified A320, as well as the removal of older and noisier types, such as the B747-400, from regular use at Gatwick.
- d. In response to further comments about capping use of the airport or of particular departure routes, AS noted that while he understands that that CNG may choose to seek additional restrictions to the numbers of aircraft movements at Gatwick, this is a matter for discussion with the senior management of Gatwick. It is not a subject that can usefully be progressed within the confines of the NMB, nor is it a topic for which it would reasonably be expected to find consensus among NMB members.
- e. TM advised that when developing metrics, the Noise Action Plan is both strategic and a good starting point. IF suggested that GAL should consider the framework for the application of any metrics. PS advised that the utilisation of the airport and its future growth is something to be dealt with through the review of the Airport Master Plan.
- f. PS further advised that GAL had already indicated to GATCOM that it would start to review the current Gatwick Airport Master Plan in conjunction with the Government's newly emerging Aviation Strategy.
- g. The Airport Master Plan describes how the airport is expected to grow and develop over time. There is an expectation that any new master plan would consider key impacts (positive and negative) of the airport's operation and proposals for growth, including an outline of the strategies GAL could propose to manage and mitigate those impacts, such as the Noise Action Plan. There is also an expectation that the draft reviewed master plan will be subject to consultation. Local communities could provide their views on the impact of the airport's growth at that time.
- h. PS went on to explain that the current Section 106 agreement (see Annex 2) between GAL, Crawley Borough Council and West Sussex County Council underpinned the important relationship between GAL and its local authorities with responsibility for planning, environmental management and highways.
- i. As part of the agreement a Memorandum of Understanding between the all local authorities around Gatwick (Surrey, East Sussex and West Sussex county councils, Crawley Borough, Mid Sussex District, Horsham District, Mole Valley District, Reigate and Banstead Borough, and Tandridge District councils) was also entered into to ensure they could collectively participate in the management and monitoring of Gatwick's growth.
- j. There are a number of legal obligations in relation to noise mitigation and management and these are subject to an annual monitoring regime as required under the terms of the agreement. Looking ahead to the future and the review of the airport master plan,

GATCOM expects that the commitments in the new master plan would be backed by legal obligations in a similar way to the current S106 agreement.

11. *Fair and Equitable Dispersal*, Helios presented an overview of the proposed FED metrics (NMB/7 IP04) which has been developed in response to NMB/6 Action 3. These fall into two categories:
 - a. *Traffic characteristic metrics*, which have been used to support the implementation of the Arrivals Review Recommendations, should be retained for measuring the impact of operational measures and actions from the NMB. This includes dispersion across the swathe along with other traffic characteristics to measure specific operational initiatives such as CDO enhancements.
 - b. *Noise impact metrics* to measure the overall effects of aviation noise and should be used to assess larger initiatives such as proposed airspace changes. These metrics would allow options to be assessed against each other to find the one with minimum impact. It is proposed to use nationally-recognised metrics defined by the government, rather than community-proposed schemes. Government noise metrics are being revised and are expected to be updated based on the results of its consultation on UK airspace and a framework for balanced decisions.
 - c. Due to the ongoing consultations, additional research and assessments are ongoing to identify metrics which could be used for NMB work plan initiatives along with future airspace design activities. If additional options are identified, they would be presented to the NMB in an updated version of the FED metrics paper.
 - d. *Reporting of FED metrics*: The FED objectives will be monitored using gate analysis based on CNG proposed gates and heatmaps, these will be presented at each NMB meeting. No mechanism has yet been identified or agreed that could consistently achieve the proposed dispersal in practice. The information will therefore be reported for information only in these swathe areas, rather than adopting the comply or explain reporting as has been proposed by CNG.
 - e. *FED monitoring report*: Helios presented the results of the first FED monitoring report (NMB/7 IP18) which is based upon the proposed FED reporting structure (described in NMB/7 IP04).
 - i. The analysis is based upon the period between 1st January and 31st March 2017. The data is presented as vertical and lateral density plots, along with histograms and 'rugby post' charts. As noted in NMB-7 IP04, this report has been provided for information only. Additional information, such as the difference charts and comparative analysis will be provided in subsequent reports.
 - ii. MBa called for more information on the current distribution of aircraft in the swathe. Helios advised that a number of monitoring gates had been defined by CNG to measure aircraft activity in a small number of selected areas, and that regular reporting of both lateral and vertical parameters for these areas has been provided. Historical data is also available.
 - iii. IJ reminded the NMB that it is not possible for NATS to manage arriving traffic to achieve specific distribution of arriving aircraft in a particular area (such as a monitoring gate), using the current airspace design and technology solutions.
 - iv. CNG west of the airport (APCAG, CAGNE, PAGNE) in response confirmed that the runway 08 distribution monitoring targets should be those actually achieved in 2011. Benchmarking against this 2011 target will be added to future issues of the FED monitoring report: **NMB/7 Action 3**

- v. IJ provided an update on the FED Activity 7, due for completion by December 2017 and described in the FED paper (NMB/6 IP07). This relates to the matrix chart of options being considered by NATS as potential actions to improve the delivery of arrivals FED, prior to the availability of P-RNAV arrivals at Gatwick (after 2022).
 - vi. He advised the findings of the NATS workshop conducted to enable a detailed analysis of the identified options. The workshop concluded that the most effective, timely and safest mechanism available is to make increased use of the existing holding stacks when traffic permits. This in turn is expected to reduce the extent of so-called 'tromboning' of arrivals below 7000 feet altitude, reducing the numbers of people affected by arriving aircraft operating at those lower levels.
 - vii. These aircraft would hence absorb arrivals delay at higher altitudes in the stack, operating at levels considered by government policy to be beyond altitudes that affect noise performance (above 7000 feet). DM welcomed this news, affirming that airlines prefer the predictable fuel use of the hold procedure, rather than the uncertain fuel burn of the tromboning procedures currently used.
 - viii. Several CNG members suggested that more holding could lead to increased aircraft noise in the holding areas. IJ reaffirmed that this is not the case, the increased holding will be at higher levels, 8000 feet and above (7000 feet is already routinely used) and would have the effect of reducing aircraft manoeuvring at altitudes where noise disturbance may occur.
12. *Continuous Descent Operations (CDO)* Helios presented an overview of progress with CDO workstreams and summarised in the Implementation Report (NMB/7 IP15).
- a. A high-level project plan has been implemented with an overarching project management and coordination structure designed to maintain progress on all initiatives and provide trend reports to the NMB. This includes Flight Operations workshops, related to the NADP tasks, scheduled for October and November 2017.
 - b. The workshops are an example of continuing initiatives to improve CDO compliance at Gatwick, which while among the best performing of CDO airports in the UK, is still subject to the limits of the existing definitions of CDO procedures. The monitoring of aircraft descent profiles, while intending reduced noise and carbon emissions, are not optimised for Low Noise Approaches, further improvements are needed (NMB/7 IP15 Activity 9).
 - c. Coordination with UK stakeholders is accordingly underway to develop and agree a national low-noise arrivals metric for implementation at UK airports including Gatwick. This will enable consistent application of improved noise reduction procedures by pilots and controllers, and their related monitoring and reporting. It is expected that the improved metric could be applied from Q4 2018. Work to formalise this metric as a definition will commence upon completion of this task.
 - d. DM reminded the NMB that limits to the current airspace structure constrain among other things the delivery of low noise approaches at Gatwick, especially to runway 08 where controllers are obliged to descend arriving aircraft in good time to ensure that they are safely beneath in particular aircraft outbound from Heathrow.
13. *Reduced Night Noise.* Helios presented proposed next steps for a night noise relief evaluation programme as detailed in NMB/7 WP05. The NMB 2017/2018 consolidated work plan includes an activity to pursue reductions in night noise using RNAV routes. NMB endorsed the concept of a night noise respite programme at NMB/3 in November 2016.

- a. An industry workshop was held to further develop the concepts and possible methodologies on 31 July 2017. The workshop outcomes are summarised in NMB/7 IP09, the related CNG proposals are described within papers NMB/7 IP10 and NMB/7 IP22.
 - i. The night noise workshop concluded that although no technological or routing options should be discounted, there is an opportunity to progress an optimised approach profile, which could better exploit quieter operating techniques and optimised vertical profiles to deliver a tangible noise benefit in a realistic timescale.
 - ii. The potential night time routes for consideration, which have not yet been scoped or defined, should be designed to allow aircraft to operate in a low power low drag configuration whilst also reducing the number of sub-optimal approach profiles that occur today. The reductions in noise impact could be measured and reported using established standard metrics, the “N60” contour was proposed at the workshop, but alternatives will be considered.
 - iii. Any night time trial will be constrained by the arrivals traffic levels that can be safely handled by RNAV routes reflecting the proportion of suitably equipped aircraft. Initially it is proposed that the trial will operate between 01:30 to 05:00 local time, subject to weather, traffic and operational needs. If successful, expansion of the evaluation to an increased night period could be considered.
 - iv. The workshop agreed with the CNG proposal to conduct the trial in the summer when the impact of night flights is greatest. In addition, the summer period provides the greatest opportunity to utilise an RNAV route as current navigation technology requires higher weather minima (i.e. visibility) than radar vectoring and therefore the long periods of good summer weather will allow for the maximum use of the new routes.
 - v. The replication of the current lateral distribution will avoid affecting new people to night noise whilst exploiting the benefits of new technology, potential alternative
 - vi. routes would require use of consultation processes that could introduce significant delay.
 - vii. The trial design will follow the CAA’s new process for temporary operational trials (Tier 1c). Although this new process has not yet been introduced it represents best practice in the industry and is likely to be implemented in Autumn 2017. For this trial, the process has been expanded to include additional engagement with community groups, this takes the form of a collaborative options and feasibility assessment, supported by the use of nationally recognised Government metrics as outlined in NMB/7 IP04. This process is required to identify the optimal scenario prior to any operational trial and a community technical workshop is proposed to commence this assessment process. Additional community engagement prior to the trial will take place in accordance with the CAA guidance.
 - viii. The proposed aim of the trial is to reduce the noise impact, during a defined night time period, on those people currently affected without introducing noise to people not previously affected. This is supported by the following objectives:
 1. Reduce the number of people affected by noise without affecting those not currently affected
 2. Increase the altitude of aircraft currently flying an excessively low or sub-optimal approach profile
 3. Validate the use of RNAV for approach
 4. To not increase the track miles normally flown by arriving aircraft

- b. CNG members made a number of remarks as generally outlined in their response to the preliminary proposals for a night noise evaluation, which in their view should be taken into account and in some cases, addressed before proceeding with any trial. These views are described in NMB/7 IP10 and IP22.
 - i. In addition, CNG are concerned that any trial, even as a first stage should be extended to consider the shoulder period hours beyond the suggested preliminary 01:30 – 05:00 target period.
 - ii. A number of opposing views were expressed by CNG about the scope of the proposed trial, and what if any options should be ruled in or out, for instance whether; to include departures traffic or a reduction to the night time ILS minimum joining point for arrivals. CAGNE proposed that work on night noise reduction should be stopped until broader agreement can be reached, but asserted that noise from departing aircraft should be taken into account in any night noise reduction trial. IF commented that there is also the opportunity with accurate P-RNAV routes and low traffic volume, for the night trial to seek to avoid those areas not previously overflowed at night before 2013.
 - iii. The chairman observed that if he were to take into account every request from CNG, work on a night noise trial would be overwhelmed and grind to a halt almost immediately. This would not serve the established NMB agreement to progress this difficult topic. LK, PS and IJ spoke in favour of continuing the work. IJ to assist the process, offered the use of the NATS route planning tool Comp-Air (which it is expected will be shown at the NMB public meeting in December). IF noted that it is useful to see where community misgivings are.
- c. The chairman concluded the discussion by proposing that work should continue, wherever possible, taking all opinions on board to further develop the principles and objectives for a reduced night noise trial, and to provide an updated proposal to NMB/8. **NMB/7 Action 4**

Agenda item 4: Airport Slot Coordination ACL-UK

14. *Airport Slot Coordination ACL-UK*. Richard Cann of ACL provided an overview of the slot coordination and management process used at airports in the UK, including at Gatwick and some airports overseas. A copy of the presentation was provided (NMB/7 IP17). Both RC and LT answered a number of related questions following the presentation. The chairman recorded the thanks of the NMB for the insightful briefing.

Agenda item 5. NMB Communications

15. *Communications Plan*. The need to improve the quantity and content of communications from the NMB has been identified and agreed. The proposed communications plan (NMB/7 IPO6) was adopted. An overview of the planned public meeting will be provided to NMB/8. **NMB/7 Action 5**
16. *END Noise Action Plan*. Airports are under a legal obligation to develop strategic noise maps and produce Noise Action Plans based on those maps, on a five-yearly basis. The next Noise Action Plan is being prepared, and the NMB noted the preliminary proposals (NMB/7 IP14).
17. *NMB Public Meeting December 7th 2017*. Preliminary views were sought regarding NMB participation in the public meeting to be held December 7th. The proposals outlined in the Communications Plan for an interactive meeting with tutorials on a range of key issues was agreed.

Agenda item 6. Any Other Business

18. *IMM-11 Runway in use protocol.* The NMB Secretary met with GAL on 23rd August, to review the content of persistent complaints to the airport, and to establish whether any proposals had been made that should be reported to the NMB. While no matters were then identified for transmission to the NMB, a subsequent proposal meeting the criteria, had been received by the NMB chairman to revisit the NMB/5 decision on Imm-11, a runway protocol for noise purposes to be used in conditions of low/nil wind. The related information from NMB/5 was therefore provided to NMB/7 in case the NMB should choose to consider this proposal. Further, MP requested that the NMB/7 discuss the matter. The proposal to revisit the Imm-11 recommendation for a runway protocol to take advantage of still air conditions. This recommendation, although accepted by GAL, was not agreed by a majority of CNGs at NMB/5 for a number of reasons including that in the view of some groups it might disadvantage communities further from the airport to the detriment of those nearby. Extract from NMB/5 Minutes:

- i. NMB/3 was presented with the conclusions of the analysis of the issues arising from this Recommendation to more fairly and equitably distribute noise. The conclusion reached then was that a controlled evaluation of the noise effects of the proposal could allay some of the concerns that had been raised, especially by CAGNE. Additional information was therefore prepared for NMB/5 (IP08) together with a detailed proposal for a monitored evaluation (WPO6).*
- ii. The Chairman noted that more than a year had passed since the publication of this Recommendation, detailed analysis has been prepared for NMB/3, a written response to questions arising had been prepared and distributed to NMB and, that detailed proposals for an evaluation had been provided to this meeting of NMB. Accordingly, the question posed to NMB/5 by the Chairman is whether to reject the Recommendation, or to proceed with the proposed evaluation, while observing that to reject IMM-11 would be to reject an opportunity to deliver a fairer and more equitable distribution of noise.*
- iii. Suggestions by CAGNE that use of the protocol would lead to unsafe operations were rejected by the CAA, airlines and ATC providers, indicating that they are obliged to ensure safe operation and, that similar runway protocols are widely, routinely and safely used at busy airports elsewhere in the UK and overseas.*
- iv. SP and LK indicated their opposition to this Recommendation and the proposal to conduct an evaluation.*
- v. JG indicated that GATCOM is opposed to the IMM-11 evaluation proposal based on guidance from NATMAG and the views of communities located close to the airport expressed to GATCOM.*
- vi. CL reported that CNG had been unable to reach a consensus on IMM-11, with groups evenly divided, both in opposition and in favour of adopting the Recommendation.*
- vii. No NMB member spoke in favour of the proposal for an operational evaluation, the Chairman then closed the discussion, recording that NMB had agreed to reject the IMM-11 Recommendation to implement a runway in use protocol at Gatwick for noise purposes.*

- a. The NMB/7 discussion led to the following outcome:
 - i. MP, who has joined the NMB since NMB/5, added his support to the proposal to conduct a trial provided it was carried out in accordance with normal CAA processes in relation to trials. At NMB/5 his predecessor did not express a view. CNG positions were 4 in support of a trial provided it was conducted in accordance with normal CAA processes in relation to trials, 3 against and 1 neutral. No other NMB member expressed a view different from that taken at NMB/5.

- ii. Given the lack of member consensus and the NMB's view that CDO initiatives and night respite planning offer better noise management opportunities for all communities, it was agreed that a trial should not proceed at this time.
 - iii. The NMB also concluded that for good governance purposes it would not in future revisit prior NMB decisions within 12 months, unless a material change of circumstances had occurred in the meantime.
 - iv. The original decision of NMB was therefore reviewed and upheld.
19. *Departures*. MW raised a number of issues related to the Departures work streams and their coordination, requesting that future meetings of the NMB should provide more time for discussion of these important topics.
- I. MW and SP observed that the NMB had been informed of the GAL decision not to proceed with their request to GAL for an Independent Review of Departures and, that in their view this was unfortunate and that this decision should be revisited. The conclusion not to conduct a departures review was communicated to NMB/5 on 5th April 2017. The minutes of that meeting provide full details.
 - II. At NMB/5 GAL agreed to convene a departures workshop to identify additional tasks to address departure noise to add to that already underway. The departures workshop (NMB/6 IP06) gave rise to the departures work programme and priorities now forming the baseline for NMB departure activity 2017/2018 (NMB/7 WP04). The relevant sections describing the six departures work streams and the latest priorities agreed by NMB are included as Annex 3 to these Minutes.
 - III. MW requested that GAL measure and publish data on departing aircraft breaching both the lateral and vertical limits of the NPR and SID on Route 4. This to be in addition to the current departure measurement which is intended to assess NPR conformance, but not the related SID 'track compliance'. Exceptions will be departing aircraft following radar vector instructions. The objective of gathering the additional data is to validate the basis for remedial action by GAL to improve SID 'track compliance' by airlines. MW noted that this request was being made at NMB at the suggestion of GAL at a recent meeting in order that discussion amongst NMB members could establish if this was an appropriate measure and a priority to be addressed. AS agreed to look into the feasibility of this proposal, consulting Helios as necessary. **NMB/7 ACTION 6.**
 - IV. MW commented that it was unclear which project would be addressing the need for new measures to better evaluate noise mitigation on departures, some CNG had highlighted this as a high priority at NMB 6. AS confirmed that this would be considered within the scope of Project 2.
 - V. MW referred to the ongoing action by GAL to consider whether routes can be designed to allow aircraft to gain an initial higher altitude on the NPR for Routes 3 & 4 and noted that this was not clearly stated as being in the scope of any particular project. AS confirmed that this was included in Project 19 and work had already started.
 - VI. MW asked whether Continuous Climb was included in Project 14. AS reported that it is not included and that it would need to be considered as part of LAMP 2.
 - VII. MW requested that the scope of Project 16 be adjusted to consider increased use of vectoring as a means of creating greater dispersal,

acknowledging that whilst less vectoring might be appropriate for some Routes, on other Routes more vectoring might be a solution, provided that it was not done in a concentrated way. This was agreed.

- VIII. MW noted that no specific NMB project covered airport charges relating to use of noisier aircraft despite this having been an activity proposed at NMB 6. The Secretary responded that GAL was currently undertaking consultation on charging policies and requested that comments be fed into this review. Nevertheless, this is still a proposed activity on the workplan, it is Pending Activity 3, subject to other priority activities
- IX. MW referred to the discussion at NMB 6 about how CNG members could be kept involved in progress on departures projects between meetings. He noted that CNG's suggestion of a small steering group had not found favour because it was not inclusive enough and that instead AS had proposed to make more use of NMB workshops. Further information will be provided at NMB/8
20. *LAMP Planning.* The NMB was provided with a paper which provides a preliminary outline of the objective for the UK Future Airspace Strategy and NATS initial plans to identify, develop and implement solutions that meet those objectives. Insofar as this work will impact aircraft in the Gatwick area, the NMB will be regularly informed of progress and once the likely implementation options have been further developed, Gatwick community groups will be invited to share their views. It had been intended that the NMB be briefed by RP of GAL, insufficient time remained during the meeting, NMB members were therefore invited to familiarise themselves with the content of the paper.
21. *Flimsy papers.* DN wished to clarify the role of Flimsy Papers. The categorisation of NMB papers is described in the Minutes of NMB/2:
- i. *"NMB Flimsy Papers – those submitted by any organisation or individual, whether or not related to the NMB, and intended for either information or drafting purposes, but which will not form part of the NMB meeting record".*
 - ii. At issue is the question of whether and how such papers can be used to inform NMB work, in circumstances when the contents of the Flimsy may be at odds with the views of one or more NMB organisations. NMB/2 makes clear that Flimsy Papers are not intended by the NMB to reflect a formal position for the board.
 - iii. Any rationales postulated in such papers and considered for the NMB work, will therefore not be accepted as proven, without specific validation within agreed NMB work streams. If any such rationales are used in NMB work, these will appear within NMB Information Papers or Working Papers related to the topic, and for consideration by the NMB for possible adoption in accordance with established NMB protocol.
22. *NMB Code of Conduct.* The Secretary reported that over the past several months, a number of members have suggested that, in their view, the behaviour or actions of one or other members of the NMB is breaching the NMB Code of Conduct. While the Code is published and agreed by the NMB, no associated process for dealing with alleged breaches has been put in place. The Code is intended to support and ensure the harmonious and efficient conduct of the NMB in addressing the objectives described in the NMB Terms of Reference.
- i. Accordingly, to assist with resolving any related matters and with immediate effect, a Code of Conduct Register is established. Any alleged breach of the NMB Code of Conduct should be notified to the Secretary in writing, and will be recorded in the register.
 - ii. The Chairman and Secretary will prior to each NMB, review the Code of Conduct register, investigate any allegations, and will recommend conclusions and as appropriate, remedial actions to the NMB. **NMB/7 Action 7**

23. The chairman thanked members for their contributions and closed the meeting at 17:30.

Schedule of NMB Meetings

The following NMB Meeting dates have now been confirmed:

- NMB/8 15 November 2017
- NMB Public Meeting 07 December 2017
- NMB/9 11 January 2018
- NMB/10 11 April 2018

Attendance List NMB/7

Member	Representative	
Airline Operators Committee	Douglas Moule	(DM)
Civil Aviation Authority	Jim Walker	(JW)
Department for Transport	Tim May	(TM)
Gatwick Airport Limited	Andy Sinclair	(AS)
NATS	Ian Jopson	(IJ)
GATCOM	Paula Street	(PS)
Kent County Council	Michael Payne	(MP)
Surrey County Council	Helyn Clack	(HC)
West Sussex County Council	*Liz Kitchen	(LK)

Community Noise Group Pairs	Member/Alternate	
APCAG/HWCAAG	Ian Hare	(IH)
CAGNE/Plane Wrong	Sally Pavey/Mike Ward	(SP/MW)
TWAANG/ESCCAN	Irene Fairbairn/Dominic Nevill	(IF/DN)
PAGNE/GON	Martin Barraud/Atholl Forbes	(MBa/AF)

Noise Management Board

Chairman	Bo Redeborn	(BR)
Secretary	Graham Lake	(GL)
Assistant	Vicki Hughes	(VH)

Observers and Presenters

ACL	Richard Cann	(RC)
DfT	Jonathan Friel	(JF)
ERM	Steve Mitchell	(SM)
Gatwick Airport Limited	Tim Norwood	(TN)
Gatwick Airport Limited	*Rick Pearce	(RP)
Gatwick Airport Limited	*Liz Townsend	(LT)
Helios	Nick McFarlane	(NM)
Helios	Matt Brookes	(MJB)
Plane Justice	Chris Quinlan	(CQ)

Apologies

Air Navigation Solutions	Markus Biedermann	(MB)
CNG Spokesman	Charles Lloyd	(CL)
East Sussex County Council	Rupert Simmons	(RS)
Gatwick Airport Limited	Lee Howes (Chair NATMAG)	(LH)
HWCAAG	Colin Stratton-Brown	(CSB)

*did not attend the entire NMB/7 meeting

Summary of Actions

<i>NMB/7</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Due</i>	<i>Responsible</i>
<i>ACTION 1</i>	Update on the process applied by DfT for Night Flight Dispensations taking into account the further review currently underway by Government (Current guidelines appear recorded in NMB/5 IP 19)	<i>NMB/8</i>	<i>DfT</i>
<i>ACTION 2</i>	GAL to identify preliminary options for potential metrics, that could be used to develop a utilisation vs noise performance formula, when planning airport utilisation	<i>NMB/8</i>	<i>GAL</i>
<i>ACTION 3</i>	Runway 08 ILS distribution monitoring report to benchmark against distribution achieved in corresponding month in 2011. Future issues of the FED Monitoring report to include this information and the previously agreed targets for runway 26	<i>NMB/8</i>	<i>Helios/GAL</i>
<i>ACTION 4</i>	To continue development of concepts and options wherever possible, taking all opinions on board to further develop the principles and objectives for a reduced night noise trial	<i>NMB/8</i>	<i>Helios</i>
<i>ACTION 5</i>	Provide a detailed overview of the planned NMB public meeting to NMB/8	<i>NMB/8</i>	<i>GAL</i>
<i>ACTION 6</i>	GAL measure and report on departing aircraft NPR and SID conformance for Route 4. The objective of gathering the additional data is to validate a basis for improved monitoring and reporting.	<i>NMB/8</i>	<i>GAL</i>
<i>ACTION 7</i>	To implement a Code of Conduct Register, which prior to each NMB, will be reviewed by the NMB Chairman and Secretary, will investigate any related allegations, and will recommend conclusions and as appropriate, remedial actions to the NMB.	<i>NMB/8</i>	<i>Chairman/Secretary</i>

Annex 1. Meeting Documentation NMB/7

Paper	Agenda Item	Title	To be discussed at NMB/7*
NMB/7			
		WORKING PAPERS	For Decision
WP01		NMB/7 Proposed Agenda and NMB/6 Action List	X
WP02	1	NMB/6 Draft Minutes for Ratification	X
WP03		NMB 2017/2018 Work Plan - Overview	X
WP04		NMB/6 Action 4 Consolidated 2017/2018 NMB Work Plan	X
WP05		QNA proposed objectives	X
		INFORMATION PAPERS	For Discussion
IP01		NMB/5 Meeting Documentation - issue 1	
IP02	2	Matters Arising NMB/6 Action List (attached to agenda WP01)	X
IP03	2	For NMB/6 Action 2 Information on the processes applied by DfT for Night Flight Dispensation (carry forward from NMB/5 Action 11)	
IP04	3	FED 1 NMB/6 Action 3 Impact Metrics for FED Swathe analysis	X
IP05	3	FED 2 CNG Objectives for FED reporting	
IP06		NMB/6 Action 6 NMB proposed communications plan	X
IP07	3	QNA 1 Quiet Night Arrivals Industry Discussion Paper	
IP08	3	QNA 2 Quiet Night Arrivals Industry Workshop Presentation	
IP09	3	QNA 3 Quiet Night Arrivals Industry Workshop Outcomes	X
IP10	3	QNA 4 CNG Quiet Night Arrivals Objectives	X
IP11	3	Airport Utilisation Planning CNG proposals (copy of NMB/5 IP18)	
IP12	3	Airport Utilisation Planning GAL response (copy of NMB/6 IP10)	
IP13	3	CNG Correspondence; growth, noise and Government Policy	X
IP14	5	NMB/5 action 9 Proposed NMB position for GATCOM for next cycle of Gatwick Noise Action Plan	X
IP15	3	NMB Implementation Report	X
IP16	3	GAL process for implementation of annual review of airline charges	
IP17	4	Slot Coordination Presentation (available after NMB/7)	
IP18	3	FED Monitoring Report	X
IP19	5	Future Airspace Strategy LAMP 2 Objectives	X
IP20		CAP 1554 Review of Arrival Noise controls	
IP21	5	Persistent Complaints	X
IP22	3	QNA 5 CAGNE Response to NMB/6 IP08 Quiet Night Trial Objectives	

NMB/7 Minutes

IP23	3	Imm-10 ILS Joining Point report	
IP24	3	NMB Chairman response to CNG letter on growth, noise and government policy ref NM/7 IP13	X
IP25		Preview of NMB/7	
IP26	3	Correspondence DfT - CAGNE Night Time Minimum ILS Joining Point	
		FLIMSY PAPERS	
FL01		David Howden, proposal for Quiet Night Arrival Route East of Gatwick	
FL02		James Lee, P-RNAV Night-Time Trial Parameters and Constraints	
FL03		James Lee, PRNAV Trials - Metrics	

*This does not preclude discussion of other NMB papers

Annex 2. Section 106 Agreement overview

In order to pursue responsible growth GAL has entered into a Section 106 agreement with Crawley Borough Council and West Sussex County Council. This agreement was first entered into in 2001 as part of Gatwick's Sustainable Development Strategy which placed legal obligations on GAL's commitments to put in place measures to minimise as far as possible its short and long-term impacts.

The S106 agreement underpins the important relationship between GAL and its local authorities with responsibility for planning, environmental management and highways. As part of the agreement a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the all local authorities around Gatwick (Surrey, East Sussex and West Sussex county councils, Crawley Borough, Mid Sussex District, Horsham District, Mole Valley District, Reigate and Banstead Borough, and Tandridge District councils) was also entered into to ensure they could collectively participate in the management and monitoring of Gatwick's growth.

The S106 agreement was renewed for a further 7 years in 2008 and in December 2015 it was extended until the end of 2018. Kent County Council was invited to be a party to the Memorandum of Understanding in 2014/15 but the County Council declined the invitation as at that time the Council was not in favour of growth at Gatwick.

The principal objectives of the current S106 agreement cover the desire to see the Airport continue to grow on a one runway two terminal configuration and the need to ensure that, as the airport grows, measures are in place to minimise so far as possible its short and longer term environmental impacts. The agreement sets out the importance of maintaining and enhancing the ways in which the parties to the Agreement and MoU can share information and work together and with other stakeholders to bring significant benefits to the airport and the communities it serves and affects.

To ensure delivery of GAL's S106 obligations, and additional commitments that GAL has made on sustainable development, GAL maintains a set of ten action plans on topics covered by the S106 agreement (this includes a noise action plan).

Performance against the S106 agreement (and the action plans) is reported in the S106 Annual Monitoring Report which covers GAL's actions to fulfil its obligations and commitments. The annual monitoring report gives a detailed end-of-year report, subject to external audit, of progress on the delivery of commitments and obligations. The annual monitoring report is published on Gatwick's website.

Annex 3. NMB Departures Work Programme and Priorities

Activity 14 Standardise Noise Abatement Departure Procedures (NADP)	<i>Due: April 2018</i>
<p style="text-align: center;">[This is a high priority activity]</p> <p>GAL have commenced a survey of Gatwick airlines. Additional works will be addressed within airline workshops which are due to take place in October and November 2017.</p>	
Activity 15 Review departure routes to minimise impact	<i>Due: December 2018</i>
<p>The NMB departures workshop, which took place in June 2017, provided initial inputs to this task. The project scope has been developed for a feasibility and options study which explores the ability to deliver multiple route options for runway 26 Route 4 departures. The output paper will document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constraints as to the maximum lateral displacement of Route 4; • Options with regards to a higher PBN specification which may allow a wider number of design options; • Multiple conceptual options for Route 4 departures. <p>This activity will be commenced after the feasibility and options study into raising the initial altitude of these SIDs is complete.</p> <p>This activity may be expanded to additional departure routes in a supplementary activity if this activity shows a benefit on Route 4.</p>	
Activity 16 Review departure vectoring practices	<i>Due: December 2018</i>
<p>The NMB departures workshop, which took place in June 2017, provided initial inputs to this task which has allowed for the task to be scoped and planned. Additional engagement with NATS is currently being planned to identify and review options. A further update will be presented to NMB/9 in January 2018.</p>	
Activity 17 Review of departures at night	<i>Due: TBC</i>
<p>The NMB departures workshop, which took place in June 2017 has provided initial inputs to the Gatwick Scheduling team for consideration. Additional follow-up actions, to work with and improve departures scheduling and on-time performance, in conjunction with Activity 20 are in the process of being scoped, planned and developed. As this activity is currently being scoped it is not possible to provide an estimated completion date in this progress report.</p>	
Activity 18 Conduct a feasibility analysis of SID rotation	<i>Due: December 2018</i>
<p>GAL has conducted some initial work (with airlines, NATS and ANS) around the feasibility of SID rotation and to understand how the airport can influence SID usage. The project is in its initial stages and work is needed to develop and assess the options available. A further update will be presented to NMB/8 in November 2017.</p>	
Activity 19 Review of constraints placed upon Gatwick departures by routes to/from other airports	<i>Due: February 2018</i>
<p>The project scope has been developed to identify which routes impact Gatwick Routes 3 and 4, how often they are used and their specific limitation on the operation. This will inform later discussions with NATS to identify potential options for assessment. The output paper will document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reasons for the existing initial altitude restrictions on both Route 3 (SAM/KENET) and Route 4 (DVR/ADMAG/LAM/CLN/BIG) departures; • The actions required to enable a higher initial altitude; • The feasibility and expected impact of making those changes which will be used to inform next steps. <p>A further update will be presented to NMB/8 in November 2017.</p> <p>This activity may be expanded to additional departure routes in a supplementary activity if this activity shows a benefit on Routes 3 and 4.</p>	