

(DRAFT MINUTES)

**Present**

Lee Howes	GAL (Chairman)
Brendan Sheil	GAL
Terry Gibbons	GAL
Andy Taylor	NATS
Mike George	GATCOM
John Byng	GATCOM
Alan Jones	GATCOM
Liz Kitchen	GATCOM
Matthew Balfour	GATCOM
Keith Brockwell	GATCOM
Ros Howell	GATCOM Technical Advisor
Peter Long	EHO (Reigate and Banstead Borough Council)
Brian Cox	EHO (Crawley Borough Council)
Douglas Moule	easyJet
Tamara Goodwin	DfT

Item	Action
<p><b>1 Apologies</b> Tom Denton (GAL), Tim May (DfT), Charles Yarwood (GATCOM)</p>	
<p><b>2 Previous Minutes</b> Accepted. (John Byng suggested it would be useful if minutes of the previous meeting were attached when the agenda of the future meeting is circulated.)</p>	
<p><b>3 Actions Tracker</b> 07/2012 – The proposed trip to Swanwick remains open. Tom Denton will endeavour to find suitable dates. 25/2013 – Horley overflight rule to be reviewed by DfT remains open (Tamara Goodwin indicated this would be looked at early 2014). 26/2013 – FPT analysis of SID usage now closed (data circulated). 29/2013 – Feasibility of social study remains open (in addition GAL is liaising with Eurocontrol).</p>	
<p><b>4 END Performance Update</b> Lee Howes advised there was no change to status – independent review of FPT communications outstanding, therefore this remains as ‘amber’ END Action Plan Action No 39 refers).</p>	
<p><b>5 Ground Noise Report</b> Lee Howes advised that engine testing had decreased. Numbers were well within the S106 agreement WSCC/CBC/GAL. APU compliance continued to be monitored with excellent results – 50 aircraft parked and only one 1 was running (in compliance). The meeting observed this should be recorded as a key message to GATCOM. Lee Howes added that FEGP availability was excellent. Ros Howell mentioned key messages from Ground Noise Report were not presented to GATCOM since the focus was on the FPT Report. The key messages to GATCOM should be brought out in the presentation otherwise the benefits to local communities are not being relayed.</p>	

<p>John Byng stated that the masterplan envisages an increase in ground noise and was disappointed no suggestions how this was to be prevented had yet emerged. Keith Brockwell asked if GAL was aware of any manufacturer developing a quieter APU and Lee Howes responded that he was not aware of any and control of APU usage remains the focus.</p>	
<p><b>6 Flight Performance Report and Ground Noise Complaints</b>  Brendan Sheil presented highlights of the report. After discussion it was agreed that the KPI comparisons were confusing and it was agreed that the table should be reviewed.  <b>ACTION 30/2013</b>  Peter Long reported that the website option choices when making a complaint were different and it was agreed that the FPT would ensure they matched and, in addition, a multi-selection (main concern + other) facility would be investigated. <b>ACTION 31/2013</b>  Lee Howes mentioned that in future the '2006 Benchmark' would change to 2011 as per the revised END Action Plan - it was agreed to have 2006 and 2011 for the next report then switch to 2011 thereafter.  Liz Kitchen highlighted the number of go-arounds due to 'runway occupied' and Andy Taylor explained the reasons why. John Byng asked whether occurrences were referred to airlines and Andy Taylor gave a summary of what is reported back and reminded the meeting that safety is paramount.</p>	<p>FPT 30/2013</p> <p>FPT 31/2013</p>
<p><b>7 Horley Overflight</b>  Peter Long and Ros Howell suggested that in the light of current practice and the reasons for it, contraventions should be referred to the DfT for consideration of punitive action (as they are the regulator). <b>ACTION 25/2013.</b> Tamara Goodwin indicated ANMAC would be taking a wider look at noise controls in early 2014. It was further suggested DfT should look more deeply at the AIP in relation to the expansion of Horley (new housing estate being built under NPR).and Andy Taylor asked for feedback through the LAC consultation on housing development plans regarding Horley.  Mike George and Peter Long suggested to meet NATS needs to de-conflict with inbound traffic to Heathrow that contravenes the current AIP, that aircraft could follow the SID and be vectored after they had passed Horley such as when overhead from the M23 which would satisfy the AIP ruling and also maintain the flexibility that NATS controllers needed. Andy Taylor took an action to take a request to Swanwick to change their vectoring practice regarding Horley overflights. <b>ACTION 32/2013</b></p>	<p>DfT 25/2013</p> <p>NATS 32/2013</p>
<p><b>8 Analysis of Easterly Departure Tracks</b>  Brendan Sheil gave a presentation looking at the previous 3 years easterly departure tracks which were all shown to be within the NPR. It was agreed that there had been no change in the position of traffic in 2013 on the easterly departure routes other than the SFD route where, during 2013, the traffic actually moved away from East Grinstead.</p>	
<p><b>9 P-RNAV (RNAV) Update</b>  Andy Taylor reported that RNAV departures had gone operational with effect from 14 November 2013 and advised that since this time 21.33% of all departures had flown RNAV SIDs and some airlines were operating up to 90% of departures on RNAV. A message had been received from FLOPSC requesting RNAV be implemented expeditiously and, after discussion, NATMAG agreed having received assurance that the option to withdraw a RNAV SID in the event of difficulty remained. This response to be fed back to FLOPSC (action GAL). As previously agreed during the consultation, support would also be sought from GATCOM and a paper would be prepared accordingly (action GAL). <b>ACTION 33/2013</b>  It was also noted that the question of why airlines needed to request a RNAV departure had been raised at FLOPSC.</p>	<p>Chair 33/2013</p>

**10 Mobile Noise Monitoring**

Brendan Sheil advised the current status of noise monitoring terminals and stated that the next to be relocated is the one presently situated in Domewood. A new monitor at Billingshurst was installed in July 2013, and at Bidborough (north of Tunbridge Wells) in August 2013.

Liz Kitchen (Horsham DC) had made representation on behalf of Slinfold Parish Council who have requested a mobile noise monitoring terminal be reinstalled in Slinfold. It was noted that as Slinfold had previously benefited from a noise monitoring terminal and as traffic figures were actually now fewer than when the monitor was in situ, it was agreed not to install a monitor here again although the group did not rule out relocation at a future date.

Brendan Sheil advised a request had been received for a noise monitor to be located in Cowden outside of the agreed process from Cowden Parish Council via Sir John Stanley, Member of Parliament for Tonbridge and Malling. It was disappointing that the Parish Council had not followed the correct procedure, as monitors are not located based on complaints from residents or requests from local MPs. However, in this instance it was agreed that as there had previously been no monitor located in the vicinity and, in addition, as this area may be affected by the London Airspace Management Programme and therefore it could be beneficial to have an understanding of the noise climate in that area prior to any changes that could potentially arise.

Brendan Sheil further advised that Holmbury St. Mary had been proposed as a suitable location with Neil Maltby from GATCOM being suggested as a local contact who may be in a position to offer advice with regard to a location.

Following discussion it was agreed that the current order of location, as monitors became available and if suitable sites could be found, would be:

- Horsham (south of the town, perhaps Mannings Heath)
- Cowden
- Holmbury St. Mary

**11 Night Noise Respite**

Andy Taylor gave a presentation and reported that the trial was now complete. He advised that points arising from the trial included:

- Generally a good outcome with regard to track positioning and overflying heights achieved.
- An improvement in the CDA (primarily owing to the removal of the altitude step to avoid outbound Heathrow traffic (that did not operate at the times of the trial)).

Some elements of the respite operations – those relating to height procedural change – could be implemented without an airspace change proposal (ACP) but an ACP would be required before any implementation of the concept of respite zones to the east of the airport Andy Taylor also reminded the meeting that the current London Airspace Consultation contained questions about respite options and locations. It was noted that there had been no increase in noise complaints during the respite trial.

**12 Airbus A320 Family Airframe Noise**

Ros Howell talked through a slide presentation. It was reported that Airbus had found a solution to the problem and this will be fitted to new aircraft coming into service. Lufthansa had announced they would be retro-fitting the modification but it was not known how the cost of this was being borne. John Byng suggested that GAL should press airlines at Gatwick to retrofit. Lee Howes agreed to ask the question at FLOPSC whether airlines operating at Gatwick had any plans to retro-fit. **ACTION** 34/2013

Chair  
34/2013

<p><b>13 London Airspace Consultation</b></p> <p>Andy Taylor gave an abridged London Airspace Consultation presentation which had already been seen by the majority of NATMAG. He emphasised that the consultation sought the input of stakeholders to design the future route and added that the consultation closes on 21 January 2014. NATS and GAL invited NATMAG members to an airspace design session which was welcomed by the group – date will be arranged prior to consultation close date.</p>	
<p><b>14 Airports Commission Update</b></p> <p>Lee Howes gave an update on the position of the airport’s submission. We are awaiting the publication of the shortlist of options which should be announced around 16-18 December 2013. Should Gatwick be shortlisted we are expecting to publicly consult in April 2014 in advance of our final option submission late Summer 2014.</p>	
<p><b>15 Key Messages</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>For GATCOM</b> – RNAV be implemented expeditiously and, after discussion, NATMAG agreed having received assurance that the option to withdraw a RNAV SID in the event of difficulty remained. This response to be fed back to FLOPSC (action GAL). As previously agreed during the consultation, support would also be sought from GATCOM and a paper would be prepared accordingly.</li> <li>2. <b>For GATCOM</b> – Excellent ground noise performance. Key messages from Ground Noise Report were not presented to GATCOM since the focus was on the FPT Report. The key messages to GATCOM should be brought out in the presentation otherwise the benefits to local communities are not being relayed.</li> <li>3. <b>For FLOPSC</b> – Airbus A320 retro-fit. . Airbus had found a solution to the problem and this will be fitted to new aircraft coming into service. John Byng suggested that GAL should press airlines at Gatwick to retrofit and Lee Howes agreed to ask the question at FLOPSC whether airlines operating at Gatwick had any plans to retro-fit.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>16 AOB</b></p> <p>John Byng asked if a list could be produced ranking airlines - similar to what Heathrow had issued. Tom Denton will respond at the next meeting.</p> <p>John Byng noted that the noise contours had increased since 2012 and asked what was being done to reduce them. Ros Howell pointed out that the large increase in numbers of population affected was primarily attributable to the exceptionally high proportion of easterly operations in the period which had caused the contour to shift eastward and clip Lingfield. John Byng pointed out that a 16% increase in the population (after adjustment for normal modal operations) has been attributed to a change in the fleet mix. Tom Denton will respond at the next meeting.</p> <p>Ros Howell expressed her concern that the Noise Action Plan had not been included on the agenda and there was no time to discuss it at the meeting. It was agreed that Noise Action Plan would be included as an agenda item at the next meeting.</p> <p>Ros Howell expressed disappointment that Night Flying Regulation Stage 2 consultation was not on the agenda and that there was no time available to discuss it.</p> <p>It was agreed that all presentations would be circulated to attendees with the minutes from the meeting. <b>ACTION</b> 35/2013</p>	<p>FPT 35/2013</p>