

**THE NOISE & TRACK MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP (NATMAG)**

The noise sub-group of the Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee

**Minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2014 between 10:00 and 13:00  
in the 'Barcelona' Meeting Room, Gatwick Airport**

**In attendance:**

Tom Denton	Gatwick Airport Ltd - Head of Corporate Responsibility (Chair)
Lee Howes	Gatwick Airport Ltd - Corporate Responsibility Manager
Brendan Sheil	Gatwick Airport Ltd - Flight Performance Team Manager
Louise Faber	Gatwick Airport Ltd - Flight Performance Team
Charles Kirwan-Taylor	Gatwick Airport Ltd - Director of Corporate Affairs and Sustainability
Alan Jones	GATCOM
Matthew Balfour	GATCOM
Mike George	GATCOM
John Byng	GATCOM
Brian Cox	Crawley Borough Council
Ros Howell	Independent Technical Advisor to GATCOM
Peter Long	Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
Charles Yarwood	GATCOM
Liz Kitchen	GATCOM
Colin Moffatt	GATCOM
Tim May	Department for Transport
Douglas Moule	AOC

Item	Action
<p><b>1 Apologies</b> Andy Taylor - NATS Gatwick As there were a number of new members present at the meeting the Chair performed a 'round-table' of introductions.</p>	N/A
<p><b>2 Previous Minutes</b> There were a number of amendments, and observations relating to the minutes of the previous meeting: 1. Peter Long was incorrectly recorded as representing the Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee (GATCOM) and not Reigate &amp; Banstead Borough Council. 2. John Byng made reference to page 2, paragraph 2 of the minutes regarding the ADNID trial and his statement that the time saving achieved was 'nonsense' was not recorded. Douglas Moule clarified that the flow of air traffic from aircraft stands to the active runway is a separate matter to runway capacity and it is the runway capacity that dictates the flow rate. John Byng responded by saying that 'nonsense' is the term he used and that's what he wants included. 3. Mike George observed that the number of aircraft noise complaints as mentioned in item 7f in the previous minutes was being fuelled by an item on an Air Traffic Control (ATC) blog regarding 'approach stabilisation' and A-CDM55 (Airport Collaborative Decision Making – a Gatwick Airport Ltd project aimed to achieve 55 aircraft traffic movements an hour off of the runway) 4. Alan Jones enquired if sufficient data was gathered from the Warnham noise monitor (page 2, item 7 of the previous minutes refer). Brendan Sheil advised that the monitor has been removed as the owner of the property where it was located was keen for it to be removed once the ADNID trial had ceased. 5. Mike George asked if there was an update to APU non-compliance (page 3, section 6b). BS</p>	BS

<p>will provide an update from Gatwick's Flight Operations and Safety Committee (FLOSPC) under the Ground Noise agenda item.</p> <p>6. Ros Howell has concern that the Flight Performance Team (FPT) key messages and highlights aren't adequately presented to GATCOM. There is no longer a covering paper accompanying the report detailing the key messages together with an executive summary and the current practice of a 'couple of points with a few sentences' cannot continue. Tom Denton agreed to ensure adequate coverage of the key highlights is given.</p> <p>7. Peter Long queried if sufficient coverage is applied for the key messages from NATMAG to FLOPSC.</p> <p>8. Mike George commented that the minutes of NATMAG are very detailed however Ros Howell felt they are somewhat 'he said, she said' but the quality of them is very much improved</p>	<p>TD</p>
<p><b>3 Action Tracker</b></p> <p><u>07/2012 trip to Swanwick</u></p> <p>Liz Kitchen informed the group that the Passenger Advisory Group (PAG) is going to Swanwick so why is it taking so long for NATMAG members to go. Tom Denton advised that Swanwick has a dedicated person to facilitate such meetings and will arrange this. Liz Kitchen felt that this has taken too long and is there reluctance on the part of Gatwick to arrange it. Tom Denton clarified that the only reluctance regarding the visit was on the part of certain NATMAG members to which Mike George stated that a visit to Swanwick was more relevant to NATMAG than PAG considering NATMAG focusses on noise and air traffic related issues to which John Byng commented on the irony of that statement considering the absence of NATS representation, both from Gatwick and Swanwick at the meeting. Alan Jones commented that it is amazing that other groups can arrange a visit to Swanwick earlier than NATMAG, Ros Howell asked who needs to take the lead in arranging this, Gatwick or NATS? Tom Denton said Gatwick will arrange it and NATS will facilitate it and he will take a personal action to arrange the meeting and will circulate potential dates to NATMAG members.</p> <p><u>13/2014 APU non-compliance</u></p> <p>Brendan Sheil provided the meeting with an update from the FLOPSC meeting of 26 November 2014 where this matter was discussed. In summary, certain aircraft have been found to be running their Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) because the ground handling agents have not been in possession of the necessary key to activate the Fixed Electrical Ground Power (FEGP) units. The meeting was advised that all handling agents have specially coded keys that allow for accurate metering of FEGP. Douglas Moule advised the group that from an aircraft operator's perspective, it is extremely frustrating to have no FEGP activated. The Head of Airside Compliance will continue to pursue this matter. Alan Jones made the suggestion that handling agents could use a key card to activate FEGP and Brendan Sheil will feedback to FLOPSC at the next meeting. Peter Long commented that it is ironic handling agents are having difficulty in activating FEGP considering Gatwick's 100% availability of the service.</p> <p><u>16/2014 Redhill and Reigate overflight analysis</u></p> <p>This action was closed as Brendan Sheil provided the data to Mike George the previous week. John Byng enquired if this information can be provided to the rest of the group. Tom Denton responded in the affirmative. Tim May advised that these locations will also experience Heathrow Airport (LHR) related aircraft activity in addition to Gatwick and some of these aircraft will be at altitudes in the region of 6,000ft in order to fly under the LHR holding stacks. These aircraft, due to their similarity in height to Gatwick aircraft could potentially generate noise complaints to Gatwick. Tom Denton made reference to a recent meeting the airport attended with Crispin Blunt MP, where he made the point that these locations experience both LHR and Gatwick traffic and that the difference in air traffic is not discernable to those on the ground. Alan Jones then advised the group that the terms of reference of NATMAG require updating to properly reflect the fact that only two local authority officers now attend the meeting.</p>	
<p><b>4 END Performance Update</b></p> <p>1. Tom Denton advised the group that due to the busy agenda for the meeting, a request had been made to discuss the FPT and Ground Noise reports by exception and he suggested the same stance for the Environmental Noise Directive (END) Noise Action Plan considering it had</p>	

<p>recently been adopted by the Secretary of State. Ros Howell responded by saying she was happy to discuss the FPT and Ground Noise reports by exception however as the Noise Action Plan was dated 'November 2013' it was now a year old. Tom Denton clarified that November 2013 was when the Noise Action Plan was written however due to delays at the Department for Food, Environment and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) it was not adopted until August 2014, as referenced on the document.</p> <p>2. Ros Howell stated that a key responsibility of a designated airport such as Gatwick is to have a dedicated group (NATMAG) to oversee the implementation of Noise Action Plans, furthermore noise is a key issue and the group should be focussing more on implementation and document in the meeting minutes accordingly rather than discuss by exception. This would provide a greater reassurance to those reading the minutes that a 'living document' is being implemented. Tom Denton understood this concern however was mindful that the agenda for the meeting is already extremely busy and due consideration needs to be given to the time constraints. Peter Long advised that the terms of reference of the meeting could potentially need to be amended to reflect the scrutiny of the implementation of the Noise Action Plan. Alan Jones suggested a separate meeting to discuss how the Noise Action Plan could be discussed at NATMAG moving forward. Tom Denton advised the group that this matter would be considered by Gatwick Airport and will be discussed further at the next meeting.</p>	
<p><b>5 ADNID Trial</b></p> <p>1. The ADNID trial had concluded on 8 August 2014 and NATS are still building the safety case. A paper had been circulated to NATMAG members prior to the meeting which included data from the noise monitoring terminal that had been located in Warnham. Tim May enquired if this had been published publically to which Tom Denton advised it had only been circulated to NATMAG. Tim May made an amendment on page one: replace 'ICAO resolutions have mandated' to 'will mandate.' Liz Kitchen requested that the data from the Rusper monitor be made available; Brendan Sheil will forward the latest Rusper data to Liz Kitchen. <i>(After the meeting it was agreed via email that the Rusper data will be sent to all NATMaG members).</i></p> <p>2. Alan Jones suggested altering the title of the histogram on page 8.</p> <p>3. Matthew Balfour commented that given the quantity of conspiracy theorists in the community, the more information Gatwick publishes, the more information is available for people to refer to and to have an understanding of what is going on. It was mentioned that it may be useful for Gatwick to mention why the noise monitor was removed from Warnham and to include comparative data. Ros Howell stated that the ADNID trial commenced before the use of precision navigation (P-RNAV) was mandatory therefore the circumstance pre and post ADNID is different.</p>	BS
<p><b>6 Flight Performance and Ground Noise Reports</b></p> <p>As requested prior to the meeting, this subject was discussed on a 'by exception' basis and the Chair invited any questions or comments.</p> <p>1. John Byng made reference to the comments on page 1 of the FPT report regarding the cause of complaints. Complaints are to be taken seriously he said and not discounted as being generated by campaign groups. He believes it is disgraceful that the airport lists campaigns as causing factors but not others, for example flight path trials and increased numbers of flights.</p> <p>2. Mike George noted that there has been an increase in APU non-compliances in the Ground Noise report and asked for this to be notified to FLOPSC.</p> <p>3. John Byng raised the issue of track keeping on one particular route. Since the introduction of P-RNAV all aircraft tracks are now outside of the Noise Preferential Route (NPR) therefore all of those aircraft are 'off-track.' Tom Denton clarified that John Byng was referring to the '26 LAM / CLN / DVR' route and that prior to the introduction of P-RNAV, a number of aircraft flew outside of the parameters of the route and P-RNAV replication of the existing Standard Instrument Departure routes (SIDs) moved the route to its present location. Tom Denton also confirmed that the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) support the current reporting as the aircraft are flying the published route. John Byng advised that the FPT Report requires re-wording to state that aircraft are on the SID but outside of the NPR. Peter Long mentioned that changing the reporting structure wouldn't change the statistics to any great degree because most aircraft leave the NPR after reaching an altitude of 4,000ft. John Byng emphasised that the report is misleading because by being 'on-track' aircraft are actually flying outside of the NPR. Tom Denton confirmed that these aircraft are flying the published SID to which Douglas Moule</p>	

added that aircraft could remain within the NPR however they would have to fly slower and be configured in such a manner that would result in increased noise levels.

4. John Byng referred to the campaigns ongoing in the community seeking a return to the previous flight paths within the NPRs and also the commitment given by Charles Kirwan-Taylor at the recent GATCOM meeting to review the implementation of P-RNAV. Tom Denton provided the meeting with an overview of how this particular issue with the '26 LAM / CLN / DVR' SIDs could be resolved, for example re-aligning the NPR, changing the SID or utilising a different means of navigation. Gatwick continues to discuss the matter with both NATS and the CAA to see what can be done which will run alongside the P-RNAV post implementation review currently being undertaken by the CAA. It was noted however that the issue with the NPR is a historical one and there have been issues with track keeping prior to P-RNAV being mandated.

5. Tom Denton advised that the FPT are currently providing a significant amount of data to the CAA as part of the review and there are a lot of factors to consider in that review including Government policy and ICAO regulations among others. John Byng asked about not using the route or reverting back to a pre-P-RNAV state to which Tom Denton advised that nothing has been ruled out.

6. Ros Howell referred to a statement in the 2012 P-RNAV consultation documentation:  
*"Should any route, which is part of this proposed P-RNAV implementation, be deemed to be of such detrimental effect that it should be permanently withdrawn, and traffic reverted back to the conventional procedure, this will be communicated to the wider population through GATCOM and other aviation stakeholder groups (FLOPSC etc.) and the route withdrawn."*

Ros Howell also advised the group that in their 'decision letter' the CAA referred to this statement and an explanation of 'detrimental effect' requested:

*"A post implementation management oversight process proposed that should any RNAV1 SID be deemed to be of detrimental effect, it could be withdrawn. The CAA has asked Gatwick Airport Ltd (GAL) to confirm these arrangements and provide clarity on what GAL deems to be a detrimental effect."*

Ros Howell clarified that the review of P-RNAV by Gatwick was not therefore just a GATCOM commitment but also a commitment undertaken as part of the overall process and therefore enquired if Tom Denton had provided the CAA with the required clarity regarding 'detrimental effect?' Tom Denton stated that Gatwick are producing a definition of 'detrimental effect' and this will be provided to the CAA as part of the required post implementation review.

7. Mike George commented that this quarter had witnessed the second occurrence where an aircraft had flown an incorrect heading (Crawley overflight section refers) and considered this to be a worrying trend. Tom Denton responded by saying he couldn't provide any further details nor could Brendan Sheil and it was unfortunate that there was not NATS representation at the meeting who potentially could have provided further insight into this matter from an ATC perspective.

BS

8. Alan Jones asked why there was no-one from NATS present to which Tom Denton responded by saying he was provided with apologies and no further details.

9. Tim May mentioned that on page 8 (Horley overflight) the 'Continuous Descent Approach' title was in the wrong place however the issue of Horley overflight has improved; a significant drop since the introduction of P-RNAV. Peter Long observed that Horley overflight was at its lowest level since monitoring commenced.

10. Ros Howell identified a flaw in the review process of the FPT report. When NATMAG members have 'ratified' the report and identified areas of improvement, corrections or have requested changes, the updated report hasn't been sent to members afterwards. Tom Denton and Brendan Sheil committed to ensuring this doesn't occur again and understood the need for members to have the final version in their possession.

11. Liz Kitchen commented on the number of go-arounds (page 14 refers) and in particular the fact that the majority are caused by an occupied runway. Douglas Moule suggested that Brendan Sheil raise this concern at the next FLOPSC meeting. Brendan Sheil advised that this has been discussed at FLOPSC and will reiterate this concern. John Byng said that these statistics suggest Gatwick was 'over' scheduling flights and some aircraft are slow movers therefore Gatwick shouldn't be scheduling so heavily. Mike George clarified that 'runway occupied' is caused by pilots being slow to roll or vacate and is not the fault of ATC or Gatwick

<p>because there can be numerous reasons why aircraft are slow to roll. John Byng stated again that Gatwick should schedule their movements to take this into account; Mike George responded by referring to the London Gatwick Aeronautical Information Publication (EGKK AIP) that advises pilots of the need for prompt start of roll after receiving clearance as well and the need for an expeditious vacating of the runway after landing. Matthew Balfour commented that the more efficiently Gatwick uses the runway, the more of a nuisance aircraft are to his residents and that go-arounds are a symptom of the wider problem.</p> <p>12. Alan Jones commented that when NATMAG refers issues to FLOPSC, the group rarely receives feedback. Tom Denton agreed that the two-way feedback process would benefit from a more formal approach. Mike George enquired whether meetings of FLOPSC are minuted to which Douglas Moule responded by saying there are no minutes but an action tracker is maintained. Charles Yarwood recalled that previously, a member of NATMAG would attend FLOPSC on a rotating basis and Tom Denton advised he was content for this to resume. Douglas Moule thought this was a good idea and would allow for greater visibility of actions. Matthew Balfour suggested nominating attendees at FLOPSC now for the January meeting and volunteers include John Byng, Charles Yarwood, Alan Jones, Liz Kitchen and Mike George.</p> <p>13. John Byng recommended changing the title of the go-around table to remove ‘casual factors.’</p> <p>14. Brian Cox pointed out an error in the track keeping table on page 10.</p>	<p>BS</p>
<p><b>7 Horley Overflight</b></p> <p>1. Tom Denton reflected that an ironic outcome of the implementation of P-RNAV on the ‘26 LAM / CLN / DVR’ route was that overflight of Horley is significantly reduced and is now at its lowest ever levels. Should the airport revert back to conventional navigation (i.e. turn-off P-RNAV) then in the current airspace configuration, overflight of Horley will increase therefore there are both positive and negative outcomes in both situations. Ros Howell mentioned that this will be picked up in the P-RNAV post implementation review currently being conducted by the CAA to which Mike George added that regardless of the circumstance, there should be no overflight by any Gatwick aircraft at any altitude over the town of Horley and by allowing aircraft to do so, NATS are breaching the requirements as detailed in the EGKK AIP.</p> <p>2. Tim May asked for his name to be removed from the ongoing action regarding Horley overflight. Mike George requested that the Department for Transport (DfT) comment on the matter as he believes there is reluctance within the DfT to do so. Tim May responded that historically there had been a tolerance of low levels of non-compliance with most of the EGKK AIP requirements and in any case the figures are now moving in the right direction. Peter Long commented that until the introduction of P-RNAV, the figures were heading in the wrong direction. Tim May advised that there are no plans to change the requirements of the EGKK AIP at present but this could be reviewed should a downward trend again materialise. Ros Howell reiterated that these matters will all be taken into consideration by the CAA as part of the P-RNAV post implementation review. John Byng advised the group that in his opinion, NATS were being careless in permitting the overflight of Horley.</p> <p>3. Tom Denton closed this matter by advising the group that the issue of Horley overflight has been discussed at great length on numerous occasions and the issue of expeditious departure together with the need to de-conflict aircraft from the BIGGIN LHR holding stack has been detailed to the group by NATS. Essentially it is a case of balancing numerous factors to achieve an acceptable outcome. The London Airspace Management Programme (LAMP) will aim to resolve this matter once and for all. John Byng commented that Horley overflight will get worse. Tom Denton advised that the current design of the airspace is congested and LAMP will seek to address this. John Byng enquired when the LAMP feedback report will be released to which Tom Denton advised the group he has the final report in his possession and is reviewing it to ensure it is complete, transparent and all feedback presented. It is envisaged the report will be issued in the next two weeks.</p> <p>4. Matthew Balfour commented that increased efficiency as envisaged under LAMP fills his residents with fear. Tom Denton responded by stating it is for those reasons why Gatwick have placed the airspace changes as consulted on under LAMP on hold in order for the airport to assess further the options that are available. Tom Denton went on to say that due to the impacts to those on the ground, the airport wishes to consider the options available for rotating</p>	

respite however feedback received thus far is contradictory with people saying they don't want rotating respite, some saying they don't want P-RNAV and others saying they do therefore it is a very complex situation with no clear emerging themes. Matthew Balfour stated that if you reduce the ground over which aircraft are flown then some people stand to benefit however it's ruined for others and this is a difficult situation and the pain should be shared. Tom Denton remains sympathetic to this but current Government policy favours concentration as opposed to dispersal.

5. Tom Denton advised the group that the airport is currently exploring other ways P-RNAV could replicate previous aircraft track dispersal within the NPR swathes and there is scope to have more than one route. Others within the industry are surprised at the position Gatwick Airport has taken with reference to airspace change and P-RNAV as this will likely have knock-on effects elsewhere however the airport is engaged on this matter with some seriousness and are setting about what we said we will do. Matthew Balfour observed that getting bodies to agree to do things and be held to it will be difficult to achieve and risky given the political nature of those bodies however it was recognised that a lot of good discussion is required. John Byng was pleased that the process is happening however recorded his dismay that the only evidence for our policy stance is the consultation exercise and that evidence is lamentable. He added that Gatwick should gather evidence regarding the threshold of tolerance of overflight as nobody knows where that threshold of acceptance is and flight paths cannot be designed until that is known. John Byng also reflected on the other costs of overflight in terms of sickness, absence from work and hospitalisation and he levelled his criticism at Gatwick, DfT and the CAA for this lack of evidence and recommended that this time is utilised to gather useful evidence and not to use what isn't evidence based. Matthew Balfour agreed with John Byng however this missing evidence isn't Gatwick's responsibility; that needs to come from 'higher up the food chain.' Tim May added that in the Aviation Policy Framework, concentration is the favoured policy to minimise numbers of people affected, but with the caveat that respite options should be considered where there is intensive use of certain routes. However, providing multiple routes may contradict the current policy of 'minimum numbers overflown.' John Byng reiterated that we want evidence based policy, not consensus based policy. Charles Kirwan-Taylor warned that a policy based on evidence may provide an outcome John Byng might not like. Tim May commented that Gatwick was the first airport to implement performance based navigation therefore this is a case study in its own right. He added that the government are commissioning research into attitudes to noise around airports; however that will only be a snapshot and may not alone provide sufficient evidence to change current policy.

#### **8 London Airspace Management Programme**

1. Tom Denton reaffirmed that the airspace changes as detailed in the LAMP consultations are on hold. Ros Howell enquired that as the LHR changes were initially scheduled to take place after Gatwick, now that the LHR changes will be going ahead before Gatwick, will Gatwick experience negative knock-on effects due to this deferment? Tom Denton said that he did not know. Charles Kirwan-Taylor mentioned that he anticipates that other airports may find themselves in a similar position to Gatwick, citing the 'Ascot' trials at LHR as an example and the early termination of those trials as being potentially indicative of LHR's thinking. Ros Howell commented that LHR were going to have to fit in with Gatwick's airspace changes and routes and now Gatwick has gone to the back of the queue, will there be disadvantages or dis-benefits to Gatwick. Tom Denton confirmed that the 2020 deadline for implementation of LAMP still exists, other airports will continue with their own changes however any potential dis-benefits to Gatwick will not be known until other airports publish their routes.

2. Charles Yarwood commented that concentration of flight paths has not been well received and P-RNAV seems somewhat unsophisticated given its capabilities. P-RNAV should, in his opinion, replicate dispersal across a swathe as before. John Byng added that P-RNAV with 12 routes is more attractive than 1 or 2 furthermore one change to airspace is preferable to a series of changes. Tom Denton advised the group that airports don't define the timetables for implementation, the CAA does.

3. Matthew Balfour mentioned that over 2011, 2012 and 2013, the point at which aircraft intercept the Instrument Landing System (ILS) has moved further towards the east (of Hever). Tom Denton advised he will come back to this point shortly.

4. Colin Moffatt enquired if larger jets flying into London City Airport (LCY) have a knock-on effect to the wider Gatwick area? Douglas Moule advised that currently the largest aircraft to fly into LCY is the Airbus A318. Tom Denton mentioned that LCY is busier than it was hence the LAMP process which covers LCY airspace as well as Gatwick. Both LCY and London Stansted (STN) are in a similar situation to Gatwick and these airports too will experience changes due to LAMP. Tim May commented that LCY are currently consulting on performance based navigation (closes 27 November) and are facing a similar situation to Gatwick. Reference was also made by Tim May to a noise project currently being worked on by LHR, it was also mentioned that once aircraft get to 4,000 - 5,000ft, there would need to be a very large dispersal (1km maybe) between the varying 'respite' routes in order to achieve a discernable benefit on the ground.

5. Further to the earlier comment from Matthew Balfour, Tom Denton provided an explanation of the issue with the ILS joining point. This particular matter has been contributing significantly to the amount of complaints the airport is receiving and has been fuelled by a choice of wording in a NATS blog. The airport is currently waiting for formal wording from the CAA regarding this matter however Tom Denton provided an overview of the situation thus far. During the summer of 2013, there was some activity on the part of NATS to tweak arrival routeings in an effort to improve the stability of inbound traffic and so reduce the potential for go-arounds and the associated negative impacts. NATS identified an opportunity to give aircraft greater time to stabilise of the approach and minimise go-arounds, particular on runway 08R where a reduction in go-arounds of 60% was achieved. To achieve this stability, an optimal ILS joining point was identified. Previously aircraft could intercept the ILS from a minimum joining point of approximately 6.5m outwards however the optimum minimum joining point to vector aircraft to was found to be around 10nm. Discussions regarding this optimum joining point were held between NATS and the CAA's Directorate of Airspace Policy and Safety and Airspace Regulation Group. The CAA deemed this to be a modification to an operational process within the same airspace (which itself has not changed) that NATS could implement at any time. No instrument procedures were changed. The CAA considered this modification in light of the requirements of CAP 725 and as it did not trigger any consultative exercise, gave NATS the go ahead to implement this modification. The statement in a NATS blog that that says that approach stabilisation is critical to A-CDM55 is not true. Approach stabilisation reduces go-arounds and the NATS blog has an unfortunate combination of words in it which the airport and the CAA have to explain.

6. Tom Denton explained that the CAA have been subject to a freedom of information request and have provided density plot maps that illustrate the movement of the downwind and base-leg swathes of air traffic. Tom Denton commented that it was unfortunate there was no data accompanying the maps to illustrate how many air traffic movements were represented. From viewing these maps there has been a maximum of 10 more aircraft per day overflying certain area and this is significantly different year on year. Tom Denton also advised that there have been increased air traffic numbers this year when compared to previous years.

7. Matthew Balfour commented that it was unfortunate that those in authority have been saying that there is no change when in fact there has been a change as described by Tom Denton. This has contributed to the mistrust that exists in the community. Douglas Moule advised that from an operational perspective, the increased approach means that less application is required of the aircraft speedbrakes, the landing gear can be deployed later and the aircraft kept in a cleaner configuration for longer. Ros Howell commented that approach stabilisation made for a quieter approach.

8. John Byng endorsed the comments of Matthew Balfour and advised Gatwick that the communities need this explaining fully to them. The airport hasn't admitted there has been a change where clearly his has taken place. By issuing correspondence stating 'nothing has changed' and attributing noise complaints to 'perception of change' the airport is actively recruiting for the Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign; it is not a perception of change but a fact.

9. Peter Long enquired if go-arounds had reduced as a result of approach stabilisation to which John Byng stated it has got more aircraft on the ground. Douglas Moule stated that the statement from John Byng was absolutely wrong and that this was implemented solely to stabilise approaches and not to increase declared runway capacity or to allow air traffic

numbers to increase.	
<p><b>9 Airports Commission Update</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Airports Commission are now running their public consultation for the shortlisted options and an invitation only 'evidence session' is scheduled for 16 December in Crawley.</li> <li>2. Matthew Balfour drew the groups attention to a meeting scheduled that evening (27 November) in Hever that representatives from the Airports Commission will attend.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>10 CASPER Noise and Track Keeping System presentation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Brendan Sheil provided an overview of the capabilities of the CASPER system. CASPER, based in the Netherlands was originally a software company who branched out into Noise and Track Keeping (NTK) systems and noise monitoring equipment. Current clients of CASPER are Frankfurt, Leeds – Bradford and Amsterdam Schipol airports as well as Gatwick. CASPER also provides the A-CDM55 situational awareness tool at Gatwick. The NTK system combines radar data, flight plan data, aircraft data and noise monitoring data (both through fixed lines and 3G) which is then correlated to provide full noise and tracking functionality.</li> <li>2. The system has a range of analytical tools to allow for in-depth studies of individual areas, satellite imaging, height analysis at certain locations and bespoke query builders.</li> <li>3. CASPER came online in April 2013 and historical flight data dating back to 2010 was uploaded into it. It is proving to be a very flexible system with bespoke monitoring options. There is a potential upgrade available next year where noise monitoring recordings will have a playback function.</li> <li>4. The system is currently programmed to detect infringements by running a report which can be manually or automatically scheduled. The system also has to ability to automatically match complaints to aircraft noise events, including non-Gatwick traffic.</li> <li>5. Brendan Sheil offered a personal demonstration to NATMAG members should they so wish.</li> <li>6. Mike George enquired if this was available on tablet devices. Brendan Sheil clarified that this system relates to the 'back-office' interface of CASPER and not the flight tracking system on the airport website. There is the opportunity to have the flight tracking system configured to work on mobile devices however there are cost implications in doing so. Gatwick is considering working with another airport to share the costs in doing so.</li> <li>7. John Byng asked if the flight tracking system could be changed to display non-Gatwick traffic. Brendan Sheil did not feel this was particularly desirable, to which Louise Faber explained that an app, Flight Radar 24 and others can illustrate all air traffic and a number of noise complainants already send screenshots of these apps to send noise complaints to the FPT, these complaints now include a considerable number of air traffic movements unrelated to Gatwick. John Byng reiterated his belief that having non-Gatwick traffic illustrated on the flight tracking system would be useful to allow people to identify fully the aircraft overflying.</li> <li>8. Ros Howell advised the group that the new noise contours have been released which this year use central post code locations for population counts. This is new for this year together with night time noise contours.</li> <li>9. Tim May asked if Gatwick were happy with the reliability of the system as he was aware there had been times where data was missing. Brendan Sheil and Tom Denton stated that they were aware of the issues, and that they have been swiftly remedied.</li> <li>10. Tom Denton advised the group that the CASPER system has greater functionality and is better for the team. Tom Denton also mentioned that at present the FPT are receiving a considerable amount of requests for map and data analysis, even with CASPER's capabilities, the time it takes to deal with as this workload is not insignificant and the FPT will always endeavour to assist. It was mentioned that while CASPER can generate bespoke queries, to set those queries up can take the most time which has to be taken into consideration with the teams full workload (noise complaints handling, FPT reporting, CAA P-RNAV post implementation review data collation and the night jet reporting).</li> </ol>	
<p><b>11 AOB</b></p> <p>No matters were raised under AOB</p>	
<p><b>12 Review of Actions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement, review and analysis of the END Noise Action Plan</li> <li>2. Report to Rusper Parish Council on the findings from the noise monitoring terminal</li> </ol>	

<p>located there</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Amend FPT report wording regarding the 26 LAM / CLN / DVR NPR and SID issue</li> <li>4. Circulate amended FPT report</li> <li>5. Circulate FLOPSC dates to NATMAG members</li> <li>6. Circulate Redhill / Reigate overflight data to NATMAG members</li> </ol>	
<p><b>13 Key Messages</b></p> <p><u>To GATCOM:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Excellent FEGP availability continues to be maintained thus removing the need for ground power units or aircraft auxiliary power units to be used.</li> <li>2. A NATMAG member will resume attending the bi-monthly meetings of FLOPSC to improve communication between the groups and provide greater coverage of issues.</li> <li>3. Horley overflight is at its lowest level ever due to the introduction of P-RNAV on the 26 LAM / CLN / DVR route.</li> </ol> <p><u>To FLOPSC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NATMAG has noted the increased number of go-arounds and would welcome feedback from FLOPSC regarding this.</li> <li>2. The suggestion that 'keycards' be introduced to allow ground handling agents to activate the fixed electrical ground power.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>14 Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>FLOPSC – Wednesday 28 January 2015, 09:30 – 11:30 in the Penthouse Room, 9th Floor Destinations Place.</p> <p>NATMAG – Thursday 26 February 2015, 10:00 – 13:00 in the Geneva Meeting Room, 5th Floor Destinations Place.</p>	<p>For Info Only</p>