

**THE NOISE AND TRACK MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP (NaTMAG) Thursday 03 August 2023
(virtual meeting)**

IN ATTENDANCE

Kimberley Heather (Chair)	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Airspace Office and Chair of NaTMAG
Richard Lipscomb	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Airspace Office and Secretary to NaTMAG
Kathy Coffin	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Noise Compliance & Reporting Manager
Andy Sinclair	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Head of Noise and Airspace Strategy
Goran Jovanovic	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Airspace Change Manager
Rebecca Mian	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Noise Management Initiatives Manager
Sam Tull	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Airspace Office
Liz Kitchen	GATCOM
Malcolm Fillmore	GATCOM
Mike George	GATCOM
Ed Winter	GATCOM
Victoria Chester (observer – partial)	GATCOM (Potential representative)
Monique Smart (observer)	GATCOM
Leon Hibbs	Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
Jonathan Drew	Noise Management Board Executive Board (NEX) Chair
Adam Dracott	Mid Sussex District Council
Ian Greene	Department for Transport (DfT)
Gary Marshall	Department for Transport (DfT)
Robin Clarke	NATS
Will Martin	Noise Consultants Limited (NCL)
Becki Edwards (observer)	Noise Consultants Limited (NCL)
Malvina Gjura (observer)	Noise Consultants Limited (NCL)

APOLOGIES

Alan Jones	GATCOM
Andrew Burke	NATS

MEMBERSHIP UPDATE

- The Chair welcomed Victoria Chester, the substitute GATCOM representative from Reigate and Banstead, and introduced Richard Lipscomb as the new Secretary to NaTMAG. Will Martin of Noise Consultants Limited who attended the May 2023 NaTMAG, was in attendance to present the Noise Action Plan (NAP) Fourth Round of reporting.

MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF NaTMAG

- There were no comments or corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting.
- A request was made to distribute the link to the Microsoft Teams meeting the day before NaTMAG and include the link on the agenda.

ACTION TRACKER

Action	Comments
03/2023 Airspace Office to work with the NMB (Noise Management Board) to consider producing an information sheet/poster regarding the WebTrak and Airspace & Noise Information Portal for distribution among NATMAG members.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Open – Action is longer term and will be carried forward into the NMB 3rd term.
01/2023 DfT to follow up with Airbus to provide an update on the Airbus A220 'whine' issue.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Open – The DfT will continue to follow up with Airbus and provide regular updates to NaTMAG, however a solution is not expected to be implemented until the end of 2024. DfT expect to provide an update in the Feb-2024 meeting

AIRSPACE OFFICE QUARTERLY REPORT (INC. GROUND NOISE SUMMARY)

- An overview of the Airspace Office quarterly report for Q2 2023 was presented.
- The total number of aircraft movements increased by 8.4% in Q2 2023 compared to Q2 2022, which also reflected an increase of 89.5% versus Q2 2019.
- There was an increased use of Chapter 14 aircraft compared to Q2 2022 as airlines continue to update their fleets to quieter aircraft.
- Runway split showed prolonged easterly operations in May and June.
- Northern Runway usage increased in Q2 due to the overnight closure of the main runway for works on the Rapid Exit Taxiway (RET).
- Go-Arounds increased in Q2 2023 versus Q1 2023 mainly due to the increase in traffic movements as summer season commenced.
- Regarding the ANPT, it was noted that Norse has become a home carrier and will appear in bold.
- Track conformance reduced to 91.98% from the previous quarter, mainly due to the use of revised Route 4 NPR monitoring in the NTK system. Point to note: The use of the revised Route 4 NPR does not affect tracks on the ground.
- CDO (Continuous Descent Operations) conformance was at 89.22% in Q2 2023, which was an increase on Q2 2022 of 2.14%, despite several days of adverse weather.
- The Airspace Office met with Wizz Air (UK & Hungary) in February 23 to review their low CDO conformance. Wizz Air Malta was not in operation at this time so this will be a separate airline engagement meeting planned for later in the year.
- The percentage of arrivals joining at less than 10NM or below 2,598ft decreased in Q2 2023 versus Q1 2023.

- The Airspace Office is working closely with the Sales and Operations Planning team, who are also engaging with the airlines and ACL to reduce the night schedule as the current levels exceed planned movements. However, as of week 14, the position is similar to that of last year.
- GAL has applied for 458 dispensations mainly due to Air Traffic Control (ATC) strikes in France, ATC staffing across Europe and Europe- wide adverse weather.
- The number of complaints and the number of individual complainants recorded in Q2 2023, decreased versus Q2 2022 mainly due to the South Terminal reopening in early 2022. There have been more complaints received for easterly operations than usual. This was mainly due to a prolonged operation in this direction in May and June. Local communities are generally more accustomed to the level of traffic and seasonal flows in Q2 2023. Tonbridge, Tunbridge Wells and Broadbridge Heath remain the top 3 areas for complaints recorded.
- Ground noise statistics included engine runs which remained below Section 106 limits, GPU usage remained the same as in Q1. Total minutes used for engine tests, which increased in Q2, mainly due to there being more aircraft on the airfield, and therefore more aircraft requiring maintenance.
- Referring to a complaint case in the Airspace Office report, clarification was requested of the categorisation of a “start of roll” complaint. It was explained that since the introduction of the complaint categorisation, a complaint, from a resident in close proximity to the airfield, that specifically referenced take-off noise, without being directly overflown would not be classified as a Gatwick arrival or departure complaint. Therefore, it was decided that categorising as “start of roll” would be the best course of action for this case. It was requested that the Airspace Office should provide further clarification on this type of complaint categorisation.

ACTION 04/2023: Airspace Office to provide further details of how complaints are categorised in Q2 2023 Airspace Office report.

- A question was asked about go-arounds, and why runway occupancy cases are so high. It was explained that go-arounds caused by an occupied runway have declined as per statistics provided during FLOPSC, but these are mainly due to Gatwick being a single runway airport and having an increase in the amount of traffic during the summer season. The Airspace Office confirmed that once completed, the RET should have a positive impact on reducing the number of go-arounds as they provide an expedited exit.
- A question was asked about whether the Main Runway had recently been closed for a time. This was confirmed that the runway was closed for a period of 30 minutes on 11 July due to an issue with the nosewheel on a landing Airbus A380 which prevented it from exiting the runway. It caused minimal disruption.
- A question was asked about whether dispensed flights go against the night quota. The Airspace Office confirmed that dispensed flights are removed from the night quota. It was then explained that the point of dispensations is to monitor flights that go into the night period, and to ensure that any flights that are removed from the night quota, are done so only if they comply with a specific criterion. The Airspace Office work within the limits set by the DfT.
- A question was asked about ongoing night studies from the DfT to establish during what period people are most affected by night noise. It was confirmed that the study results are due soon.
- A question was raised about Wizz Air CDO and their poor compliance, and what is being done to ensure this improves. The Airspace Office explained that they want to be as transparent as possible with airlines, and that a meeting in Feb 2023 was held where the ANPT was presented. They also shared data from other airlines to emphasise what good CDO looks like. The Airspace Office confirmed that Gatwick aims for 90% compliance for CDO. It was asked whether analysis can be provided to compare Gatwick against other airports for CDO. A comment was made that

Final Minutes – For Publication to the GAL website

CDO performance has many variabilities due to location and airspace setup, but it was agreed that analysis can be provided from NATS.

- **ACTION 05/2023:** NATS to provide analysis of how Gatwick compares to other airports for CDO performance.

NOISE ACTION PLAN ROUND 3 UPDATES

- An update on the Round 3 Action Plan Actions 39a and 51 was shared:
- **Action 39a. We will aim to reach a measure of consensus with community groups on future airport utilisation relative to noise impacts.**
 - GAL undertook a noise policy review and reported findings in January 2019. The COVID-19 pandemic impacted Gatwick traffic for the bulk of the NMB's second term so work in this area was paused. It had been agreed by the NEX that this would be raised when Gatwick's traffic levels returned to historical levels after the pandemic.
 - **Update:** This has not been reraised with the NMB
 - Clarification was provided on 39a wording "*had been agreed by the NEX*" should be "*had been agreed at the NEX*".
 - A comment was also made that this can be raised at any NMB.
- **Action 51. We will continue to engage with local planning authorities in order to ensure they are well informed about noise issues at Gatwick, and to provide information on the airport and its operation.**
 - GAL continued to engage with local planning authorities during 2022-23. For example, local authorities were provided GIS shapefiles of the Gatwick Noise Exposure Contours and were engage on the Section 61 planning application approval for the Main Runway works to be completed during summer 2022. Engagement on the Northern Runway Project was through a series of meetings under auspices of the NMB Noise Envelope Group and a noise specific Topic Working Group in which the local authorities were involved.
 - **Update:** GAL ensures it is sharing information, engaging through the Northern Runway meetings and NMB.

NOISE ACTION PLAN ROUND 4

- A recap was provided that under the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006, GAL are required to provide a NAP.
- It was explained that on advice from Defra, GAL are reviewing the NAP, and members of NaTMAG were thanked for their inputs.
- Round 4 slides were presented, and an update given that the next milestone is the final draft NAP to be produced during the week of 14 August, and the deadline for submission of the final document to Defra is 1 September.
- It was explained that NaTMAG is fulfilling the role as primary consultee on behalf of GATCOM, for the purposes of the regulations.
- A chart showing forecast noise impacts was shown, and a comment was made that GAL commits to include contour projections in the NAP, and a reduction in noise is anticipated compared to the 2019 baseline year. The chart showed from just over 10,000 people to just over 8,000 people.
- A question was raised about how much of the benefit from the actions of the Round 4 NAP would contribute to the reduction in the forecasts. It was stated that it is not possible to project the impact of individual actions, as an example, in 2017 and 2018 noise contours reduced compared to the

Final Minutes – For Publication to the GAL website

previous year partly due to the introduction of penalty charges for any unmodified A320 family of aircraft. It was not possible to accurately predict this contribution to the reduction in noise impacts.

- There was a general discussion around the wording of the actions themselves. It was agreed that given the lessons learned from the current NAP, that actions should be drafted at a reasonably high level to ensure that subsequent changes would not be required as the plan evolved. The means of undertaking each action and the measures for assessing progress should include more detail as was appropriate.

Additional measures not in the plan

- **No QC 2 aircraft to be scheduled in the core night period 23:30 to 06:00 by winter 2028**

- NCL state:

“GAL will go away and consider including an action for conducting a feasibility study, during the lifetime of the Round 4 NAP, into the voluntary phase out of QC2 aircraft during the core night period. It should be noted that this would constitute an ‘operating restriction’ and therefore be subject to the ‘The Airports (Noise-related Operating Restrictions) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018’ (EU 598)”

- A comment was made about the need to achieve the same with QC2 aircraft as QC4 aircraft in the R3 NAP. It was noted that this was a benefit to communities at night, and restricting QC2 in the core night period should be the progression. It was stated that this would be an operating restriction, and the process to implement this would be lengthy. It was appreciated as a good idea, and that it may be considered. A comment was made that not many QC2s are currently flying at night.
- A comment was made regarding the wording in the plan, and that “ambition and intent to reduce QC2 at night across the life of the plan” should be included. This was agreed.

- **Commission an independent survey of noise attitudes around Gatwick. This would be in a similar vein to the UK SONA study but focused solely on Gatwick. (Note Heathrow have similar plans in their Noise Action Plan)**

- NCL state:

“The ongoing Department for Transport (DfT) commissioned ANNE (Aviation Night Noise Effects) study will be considering Gatwick amongst other UK airports. Additionally given the potential for a further DfT attitude study which is expected to include Gatwick Airport, this should provide a more than adequate evidence base. Heathrow no doubt have specific needs and drivers for their self-funded study, particularly in relation to respite associated with having runway alternation. Any action would therefore be to study to findings of any new evidence studies to identify the implications for Gatwick Airport”.

- A comment from the DfT stated that the latest ANNE study will be considering Gatwick amongst other airports. The study will include most airports, but not all, and there is no expectation for airport level results to be available.
- A question was asked on the data subsets and whether they are statistically significant. A response was provided outlining that a great effort had been made to include significant airports, and that there is a certain significance related to each airport.
- A point was made that Gatwick is a subset in the national SONA, but local resident groups don’t find it reflects what they experience. It was asked whether there was an opportunity to have a Gatwick specific study as attitude studies only look at fixed state. It was stated

that studies would be twofold by comparing against the national study and could inform the future DCO work and how attitudes change with rapid airport growth.

- A point was made that LHR's NAP was taking much more action on what is wanted, and it was put out for public consultation.
- It was mentioned that the DfT have requested that the CAA carry out an ANAS study that will likely go to airport level, but not specific to nights. Airports in this study have not been announced yet, so no confirmation of whether Gatwick is part of this study.

Action Specifics – Detailed

• Action 1

1	We will continue to review aircraft having potentially readily rectifiable industry acknowledged acoustic defects, for example, Airbus A320 family aircraft that have not had the Fuel Over Pressure Protector (FOPP) modification retrofitted. Where identified we will apply penalties to those operators of affected aircraft and report on charging penalties.	To encourage the uptake of remedial measures in the interests of reducing noise exposure.	Combination of previous actions 2 and 2a
---	--	---	--

NCL State:

“The GAL proposal is to retain the generic wording because specific defects will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis”.

- Understanding the need for being generic. FOPP issue has been resolved and the next issue is the A220 resonance, so this should be included. It was explained that this is not going to be a quick fix due to the need for potential engine redesign. GAL cannot drive airlines to do this in the same way.
- Change wording to emphasise the airports influence on achieving the changes.

• Action 3

3	We will work with our airlines and air navigation services providers to improve CDO at Gatwick. This will be supplemented by the introduction of	To encourage continual operational improvement in operational practices leading to a reduction in arrivals noise.	Combination of previous actions 15 and 16
	the Low Noise Arrival Metric (LNAM) on a trial basis which will be fully implemented if successful.		

NCL State:

“Continuous Descent Operations (CDO) at Gatwick compliance is running at approximately 90%. Importantly compliance is very sensitive to weather conditions. Notably FASIS might be expected to deliver airspace which is more compatible with higher levels of CDO compliance. Importantly, the provision of LNAM is expected to deliver more substantial noise benefits than CDO alone. The purpose of LNAM is to incentivise increased initial and intermediate descent angles and consequent noise benefits. Gatwick is leading the trialling of this concept to understand the implementation challenges and the benefits. Consequently, it would be premature to set targets in relation to LNAM at this stage. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- A question was asked whether a target to aim for be included i.e., % increase in performance.
- A comment was made that setting of targets allows an assessment of the NAP's success, which is the issue with the current NAP. It was also mentioned that 90% is aspirational, but individual benchmarks for each airline should be set. It was mentioned that engagement with the airlines has shown individual airline improvements in CDO and could be used as evidence of performance against the NAP action.
- **Action for NCL:** add a foot note to define an aspirational target.

- **Action 6 & 7**

6	Every five years we will review the fines levelled against airlines which breach departure noise limits.	To encourage operational improvement in the interests of reducing noise exposure and outliers.	Previously action 24a
7	Every five years we will review the departure noise limits.	To encourage operational improvement in the interests of reducing noise exposure and outliers.	Previously action 25

NCL state:

“Departure fines and limits have recently been reviewed and will go live imminently. GAL cannot commit to specific dates within the R4 NAP given interdependencies with other ‘Designated Airports’. Additionally, this is likely to be towards the end of R4 given that changes are only just being implemented. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- It was mentioned that there will be a transition period for bringing in the new fines and limits, and so unable to set a date for the next review, but content to keep it within the 5 years of the next plan.
- It was mentioned that it would be difficult to measure when the 5-year period is over, and so it was suggested to reword to “...by 2029” (when the plan ends).

- **Action 9**

9	We will review the acoustic insulation schemes within the Round 4 Noise Action Plan period to ensure they remain appropriate and relevant, including benchmarking of schemes at other UK airports.	To maintain an appropriate and relevant scheme in the interests of reducing noise exposure inside properties for those areas most highly exposed.	Previously actions 28 and 28a and 29 which are part moved to ‘Core’ actions. Revised/updated.
---	--	---	---

NCL state:

“The wording does not preclude the scope of any studies. Additionally, any review is likely to be towards the end of R4 given that a review of grant amount has only recently been implemented. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- It was mentioned that wording should be changed to “within the life of the plan”
- A comment was made about the noise levels at which the grant becomes available.
- GAL should keep abreast of the annoyance studies and night noise disturbance studies from the DfT.
- Studies are expected to continually review all aspects.

- **Action 10**

10 *NEW*	We will develop a method to monitor and take account of residential encroachment in terms of population count around Gatwick Airport within the Round 4 Noise Action Plan period.	To help disaggregate residential encroachment and population growth from noise exposure statistics. To help inform efforts in relation to action J in the interests of minimising the population affected by noise.	NEW ACTION identified through benchmarking study
----------	---	---	--

NCL state:

“Population counts are based on a spatial dataset of which there are several suppliers. CACI data is commonly adopted, and the datasets are understood to be updated annually. The proposed approach will entail presenting population count data for both the year in question and an agreed baseline year for example 2011 (to coincide with the 2011 census). Additionally, GIS figures would be generated regularly which identify new residential (and other) uses based on Ordnance Survey (OS) Address base+ classifications. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- A comment was made to potentially align data to the Census, and to encourage the use of the same data provider to ensure data consistency.

Final Minutes – For Publication to the GAL website

- **Action 11**

11	We will review the Noise and Track Keeping (NTK) system within the Round 4 Noise Action Plan period to ensure that it is suitable, relevant and reliable, updating as appropriate.	To encourage operational improvement in the interests of reducing noise exposure and outliers.	Previously action 32
----	--	--	----------------------

NCL state:

“The NAP actions are regularly reviewed by NaTMAG and GAL can be held accountable for progress. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- It was mentioned that the NTK system is fit for purpose and will continue to be until the end of the plan. It is difficult to provide a specific date on this as it is continually evolving. The system will be developed to suit demands as and when required.

- **Action 13**

13	<p>We will continue to provide a Community Noise Monitoring Scheme (CNMS), operated under the supervision of the Noise and Track Monitoring Advisory Group and the Gatwick Noise Monitoring Group. We will review on an annual basis the feasibility of expanding the CNMS with additional noise monitoring terminals, as appropriate. We will review the reporting process on an annual basis incorporating stakeholder feedback and update as necessary.</p> <p>In conjunction with the Gatwick Noise Monitoring Group (GNMG) we will regularly commission noise studies to gain an insight into the noise climate in a particular area and holistically across the Gatwick area. We will publish these reports on our website.</p>	<p>To facilitate a deeper understanding of arrivals and departure noise for stakeholders.</p> <p>This can also benefit Gatwick Airport in terms of measuring the benefits of potential mitigation measures where trialled and / or adopted.</p>	Combination of previous actions 37 and 37a
----	---	---	--

NCL state:

“GAL cannot commit to how regularly any studies will be undertaken as this is stakeholder led via GNMG. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- Continual conversations had, and GNMG will continue to review. It was mentioned that studies are conducted by Anderson Acoustics, but there is not much appetite for these at the moment. The Airspace Office confirmed that they are looking to install more monitors. Meetings are currently every six months, and discussions around noise monitors will be revisited at the next meeting in December 2023. It was suggested that the current wording should be kept.

- **Action 14**

14 *NEW*	<p>We will introduce to our website, on a yearly basis, the following strategic noise contours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual 24-hour L_{den} (actual modal split) • Annual 12-hour L_{day} (actual modal split) • Annual 4-hour $L_{evening}$ (actual modal split) • Annual 8-hour L_{night} (actual modal split) • Annual 16-hour day L_{eq} (actual modal split) 	<p>To provide more temporal granularity in relation to the strategic noise contours enabling long term trends to be more readily understood, having specific regard to all metrics which facilitate analysis in relation to dose-response research.</p> <p>To facilitate a deeper understanding of noise exposure for stakeholders.</p>	NEW ACTION identified through benchmarking study
----------	---	---	--

“This action relates to the Strategic (365 day) noise contours and not to be confused with ‘Core Action S’ which has now been reworded to include N60 and N65 contours. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording. Response to request for awakening contours to be considered, is included in GAL response to ‘Core Action’ S”

- A question was asked about whether N-above contours N60, N65 and awakenings can be added to the annual contours. A response was given that this could be introduced and that NCL would take this away to discuss. Awakenings is covered under Core Action S. It was mentioned that this will assist in understanding the full year rather than just summer period.

- **Action 15**

15 *NEW*	We will conduct forecasting of future noise contours towards the end of the Round 4 Noise Action Plan period for inclusion in the Round 5 plan. In support of this exercise we will benchmark new aircraft types which are expected to form the Gatwick Airport future fleet mix.	To provide visibility on the likely direction of travel for noise exposure to aid stakeholders and decision makers.	NEW ACTION identified through benchmarking study
----------	---	---	--

NCL state:

“GAL have committed to including noise contour projections within the Round 4 NAP in relation to 2029. This action (#15) commits to revisiting those projections towards the end of the Round 4 NAP for inclusion in the Round 5 NAP. GAL sees the merit in a midpoint (mid-term) review but will pick this up as part of the review of existing NaTMAG NAP oversight process. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- A point was raised that the only target is numbers of people affected which is detailed at the end of the NAP.
- A question was asked about whether there should be an annual review of how on-track we are to achieve that target. It was noted that in the past we have taken annual review of the NAP, and there is a plan to this round. It was also noted that single year snapshots are not the norm and noise trends are normally measured over longer periods of time, for example a 5-year period. Year on year results would be variable, but across a 5-year period, it would be expected to show a downward trend.
- A point was raised whether a mid-point review should be carried out to show how we are on track, and act if we are not. In answer to this, it was mentioned that modifying a NAP part way through would require consultation by Defra.
- A point was raised that anything that could not be raised in the NAP should be introduced to the NMB as the NAP is a fixed document. A response was provided that care needs to be taken that the NMB doesn't take on everything we don't see fitting within the NAP.
- **Action for NCL:** Formalise mid-term review of all actions in the current NAP.
- **Action for NCL:** Formalise 5-year plan review.

Core Actions

- **Action A**

A	<p>We will maintain a charging differential in our published airport charges which incentivises the use of aircraft with the best in class noise performance.</p> <p>Gatwick Airport Ltd will consult with its airline partners annually regarding the Airport Charges Structure. The Noise Management Board will also be asked for its feedback.</p> <p>As part of the Airport Charges, we will review our environmental differential charges (including noise) at least every five years.</p>	To encourage continual operational improvement in the interest of reducing noise exposure.	Consolidated actions 1, 3 & 4
---	---	--	-------------------------------

“The action commits to an annual consultation with airlines upon the schedule of airport charges. GAL cannot commit to specific dates within the R4 NAP in relation to differential environmental charges (which includes noise) given the required alignment with other environmental charges, which are subject to some uncertainty. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- **Action for NCL:** Amend wording to “*within the life of the NAP*”

• Action B

B	<p>We will continue to monitor adherence to and review the effectiveness of our ground noise operational controls.</p> <p>We will report on a quarterly and annual basis the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fixed Electrical Ground Power availability • The amount of Ground Power Unit dispensations granted • The number of audit checks of aircraft auxiliary power unit running • The number of non-compliances of aircraft auxiliary power unit runs identified. • The number of aircraft engine runs undertaken. <p>We will continue to minimise aircraft auxiliary power unit use in order to reduce ground noise and local air quality emissions via Gatwick Airport Directives and monitoring of compliance.</p>	To encourage continual operational improvement in the interest of reducing noise exposure.	Previously action 10, 11 and 12
---	--	--	---------------------------------

NCL state:

“Wording to be updated”.

- A question was asked whether targets can be added to better track progress. It was mentioned that targets are set internally to ensure compliance with S106. It was then explained that a maximum of 250 engine runs are permitted within a six-month rolling period and Fixed Electrical Ground Power (FEGP) availability target should be 99%.
- A question was asked whether it's possible to add these targets into the NAP. Whilst it was agreed that there would not necessarily be a problem with this, it was mentioned that there needs to be awareness of the likelihood of those targets changing, and then requiring re-consultation.
- It was agreed to publish the targets in the NAP in line with the current S106 to avoid need to change.

• Action E

E	We have adopted an annual limit of no more than 5% off-track departures. We will continue to compare on an annual basis the percentage of off-track departures against the average performance over the previous five years.	To encourage continual operational improvement in the interest of reducing noise exposure.	Previously action 20
---	--	--	----------------------

NCL state:

“The target includes Route 4. Recent track keeping conformance on all routes (inclusive of Route 4) was 94% and 99.6% (excluding Route 4). The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- It was mentioned that the only place where Route 4 is not reported, is in the Airline Noise Performance Table (ANPT). It is reported everywhere else.
- A comment was made that targets in the NAP are supposed to be challenging, and that 95% is not very challenging given the current performance. Can this be a higher level over the next 5 years. A response was provided by the Airspace Office that as FASI and the Route 4 airspace change process (ACP) work is coming to the fore, and they have held off putting more stringent targets on place. Changes will have a positive impact on track keeping.
- The Airspace Office further added that feedback from FASI-S and FED, and discussions with stakeholders is on dispersion, not concentration. This target being referred to is on concentration. It was also mentioned that policy was focussing on concentration but now is on dispersion. This needs to be thought about when creating targets. It was noted that PBN is a tight standard for dispersal, but there needs to be time allowed for airlines to update databases hence avoiding tightening of targets. A comment was also made that the predominant means for generating dispersal is respite routes. A response was given by GATCOM that they support random dispersal, but this needs to be within the NPR.

Final Minutes – For Publication to the GAL website

Action for NCL: Include intent to review target within the life of the action plan.

- **Action H**

H	We will continue to offer a scheme that helps with the cost of acoustically insulating homes against the effects of aircraft noise within the scheme boundary.	To reduce noise exposure inside properties for those areas most highly exposed.	Previously action 28
---	--	---	----------------------

NCL state:

“See Action #9, the wording of which does not preclude reviewing the provider. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- No comments

- **Action J**

J *NEW*	We will keep under review residential land-use legislation and policies and seek to influence them where practicable. This will be achieved through engagement with Local Authorities (including involvement in the Development at Gatwick Airport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)), representations to the DfT, DLUHC, and NMBs engagement with Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group (SASIG) and involvement in Sustainable Aviation initiatives.	To help disaggregate residential encroachment and population growth from noise exposure statistics in the interests of minimising the population affected by noise.	New ‘Core’ action based on benchmarking/NMB workplan.
---------	---	---	---

NCL state:

“This action primarily relates to influencing central government policy but will necessarily touch on local authorities in the immediate vicinity. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- A comment was made that this primarily relates to influencing Government policy but will touch on Local Authority.
- A question was asked about how far out Land Use Planning is done as most complaints come from well outside of the vicinity of the airport. Does it go further afield into key complaint areas. A response was provided that in influencing Government policy, the whole of the UK will be looked at. A further comment was that there had been recent discussions with the DfT and SASIG and active work was being done to determine the areas that are included. It was also reiterated that a lot of work was still to be done before determining what can be committed to. It was also mentioned that Land Use Planning is a hot topic across the whole of the UK and Europe. A comment was also made that reducing complaints is not part of the NAP.

- **Action L**

L	We will, as far as is practicable, take all necessary steps to manage the late running of aircraft to prevent scheduled day movements taking place during the sensitive night period. We will continue to report on a quarterly basis to the Noise and Track Monitoring Advisory Group the number of flights delayed from planned daytime arrival into night movements (after 23:30 local).	To incentivise the avoidance of aircraft movements in the night period in the interests of reducing noise exposure.	Previously actions 7 & 8
---	---	---	--------------------------

“GAL does not believe that it is appropriate, in the current circumstances, for a target to be set for a reduction in the number in late running aircraft when this is often due to circumstances outside of the airports and airlines control. For example, the current issues across the European airspace network, such as the restriction on Ukraine’s airspace, limited air traffic controller resources in some air traffic control centres, air traffic controller strikes, and significant storm activity are having substantial impacts on late running aircraft. The GAL proposal is to retain the current wording”.

- A question was asked why the NAP refers to the hours of 23:00 and not 23:30. It was explained that the NAP is referring to core-night and not night plus shoulder period.

Final Minutes – For Publication to the GAL website

GATWICK AIRPORT LIMITED, DESTINATIONS PLACE, GATWICK AIRPORT, WEST SUSSEX, RH6 0NP
Registered in England 1991018. Registered Office Destinations Place, Gatwick Airport, West Sussex, RH6 0NP
www.gatwickairport.com

- A question was asked whether percentages of aircraft that were running late into the night period from the day in 2019 could be included as a footnote. It was stated the situation would be specific to 2019, not the current year and so targets would be based on issues that are not current. It is difficult to set targets against aspects that Gatwick has little control over.
- A point was mentioned that easyJet have cancelled a number of flights in the coming months so the airlines can be influenced. Is there anything that can be done to incentivise other airlines to reduce their schedule of night movements.
- A question was asked whether there is a way to forecast for late flights that may be delayed due to weather or ATC issues like the French ATC strikes that happen yearly, but timings are not predictable. The Airspace Office will take this away and look at actions within the airport's control.

• Action S

S	<p>We will continue to update to our website with the following noise contours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer 16 hour day L_{eq} (actual modal split) • Summer 16 hour day L_{eq} (standard modal split) • Summer 8 hour night L_{eq} (actual modal split) • Summer 8 hour night L_{eq} (standard modal split) • The above compared to the previous year. 	To facilitate a deeper understanding of noise exposure for stakeholders.	Previously action 39
---	--	--	----------------------

NCL state:

“Wording to be updated to include N60 and N65 contours. GAL will consider the inclusion of awakening contours as suggested in comments on Action 14, but the potential for technical difficulties is noted hence proposal to cascade to NMB in the first instance”.

- A comment was made that there is a preference for awakening contours on an annual basis, then on a summer basis. It has been confirmed as possible with ERCD as part of the DCO work.
- A comment was made that GAL will consider the inclusion of awakenings contours. The response was welcomed, and thanks given to GAL.

REMOVED ACTIONS

Candidate Action from Benchmarking Study	Audit of EASA database. Audit of noise certification dataset and comparison with EASA central database. Ensure accuracy on noise certification data and provides support to the computation of noise contours around airports.	ERCD do this routinely as part of their work, not GAL.
--	--	--

NCL state:

“This issue is not specific to Gatwick Airport. This is expected to be picked up by routine ERCD QA procedures. Calibration of ERCD contours is based on Gatwick specific NTK data. The GAL proposal is to remove this action.”

- No comments

• Action 26

26	<p>We will work with our airlines and noise governance groups to explore the feasibility of introducing supplementary charges for aircraft departures which persistently fail to operate in accordance with Noise Preferential Routes prescribed for the airport as measured by the noise and track monitoring system operated by Gatwick Airport Ltd, with all such monies passed to the Gatwick Airport Community Trust.</p>	Removed as track-keeping remains high and is continually reported through 'Core' action C.
----	--	--

NCL state:

“The abovementioned justification remains. The GAL proposal is to remove this action.”

Final Minutes – For Publication to the GAL website

GATWICK AIRPORT LIMITED, DESTINATIONS PLACE, GATWICK AIRPORT, WEST SUSSEX, RH6 0NP
Registered in England 1991018. Registered Office Destinations Place, Gatwick Airport, West Sussex, RH6 0NP
www.gatwickairport.com

- A comment was made that a target should be set, and if target is breached, then a penalty be imposed.
- There was a dichotomy in the enforcement of NPR conformance and the feedback frequently received from communities that sought various forms of dispersion for departures. It would be counterintuitive for GAL to promote and seek to create dispersion through design whilst at the same time proposing to penalise airlines for being slightly off track.
- It was appreciated that this is not an easy balance to strike.

• **Action 27**

27	We will continue to provide a vortex-damage repair scheme to repair roofs that have been damaged by aircraft vortices.	Not applicable to noise.
----	--	--------------------------

NCL state:

“It will still be reported but will no longer form part of the NAP. The GAL proposal is to remove this action”

- It was mentioned that the policy for Vortex damage will remain in place, and the point made that it's not widely reported on. It was also mentioned that few of these are received.

• **Action 9**

9	We will implement a voluntary ban on operations of Quota Count 4 aircraft within the core night period by the end of 2022.	Superseded by updated night flights regime.
---	--	---

NCL state:

“GAL will consider including an action for conducting a feasibility study, during the lifetime of the Round 4 NAP, into the voluntary phase out of QC2 aircraft during the core night period. It should be noted that this would constitute an ‘operating restriction’ and therefore be subject to the ‘The Airports (Noise-related Operating Restrictions) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018’ (EU 598).”

- Agreed a review of the feasibility of QC2 reduction, but as this action was completed at the end of Round 3 this can be removed.

• **Action 39a**

39a	We will aim to reach a measure of consensus with community groups on future airport utilisation relative to noise impacts. In order to achieve this we will conduct a review of Government policy including how Government policy should be interpreted and how that policy has been applied in practice. Following the establishment of a workable policy baseline we will aim to develop new noise metrics and reporting to complement the current noise contours and measure our future noise performance. This work will be used to more precisely describe outcomes to support this END Noise Action Plan.	Removed. Partially superseded by DCO noise envelope.
-----	---	--

NCL state:

“No proposals have been made with respect to noise envelopes to avoid cross cutting the DfT's night flying restrictions (which are a form of noise envelope) and proposals that are being brought forward by GAL as part of its DCO. Although no noise reduction targets have been included in the NAP, GAL has already committed to providing forecasts which will indicate how noise exposure could change over the duration of the NAP. The GAL proposal is to remove this action”.

- A point was mentioned that no proposals have been made in respect of noise envelopes to avoid cross cutting DfT night flying restrictions.
- It was mentioned that this was raised at working groups in the past, and that the airport should have a noise envelope.

Final Minutes – For Publication to the GAL website

- It was explained that there should be a trigger to generate the creation of an envelope, but GAL understands the views expressed by some members.
- A question was asked whether the fact that there will be an increase in passengers, regardless of the DCO, is enough to trigger an envelope requirement. It was mentioned that this wouldn't trigger a need for an envelope.
- A further comment was added that if a significant change to the operation of the airport occurs, then these must be assigned to the correct legislation to calculate the envelope.
- It was mentioned that noise envelopes can be requested by local authorities.
- A further comment was made stating that a noise envelope could be introduced voluntarily if felt that it was a requirement to control noise.

- **Gatwick Airport Community Trust (GACT)**

Candidate Action from Benchmarking Study	<p>Track Community Trust Fund contributions</p> <p>Track long term contributions from noise fines etc and link to community projects</p> <p>To provide transparency on the effectiveness of noise fines and other sources of funding and demonstrate community benefits.</p>	We propose that this is cascaded to the NMB for initial consideration for inclusion in their workplan.
--	--	--

NCL state:

“The GAL proposal is to remove this action”.

- A comment was made that providing transparency on the effectiveness of noise fines, not connected to the GACT, should be included somewhere as it demonstrates the efficacy of activities and actions. A comment was added that it is difficult to disaggregate where the funds have come from, and it was mentioned that the funding is not predominantly from noise fines.

- **Strategic Noise Contours**

Candidate Action from Benchmarking Study	<p>Update presentation of strategic noise contours</p> <p>Have R1 - R4 strategic contours represented in terms of common noise bands</p> <p>To facilitate better long term comparison of trends.</p>	Under discussion with GAL for potential referral to NMB.
--	--	--

- GAL will consider reporting population of highly annoyed and sleep disturbed.
- GAL will also consider awakening contours, but potential for technical difficulties.
- A comment was made that awakening contours have already been done.

AOB

- Thanks were given to NCL for their R4 presentation.
- Feedback given was that meeting was positive.
- Feedback was received that the briefing notes worked well, and there was a request for these to become the norm going forward.
- A request was made for the notes to be sent with the request for pre-meet to alleviate the time spent on the agenda items.
- Next steps for the NAP: 1.) Reviewing of comments 2.) Revise wording.
- A request was made for the slides presented by NCL to be circulated.

KEY MESSAGES

KEY MESSAGES TO GATCOM

- The discussion from NCL presenting on the Round 4 NAP actions and skeleton plan was found to be very useful amongst NaTMAG members.

KEY MESSAGES TO NMB

- The discussion from NCL presenting on the Round 4 NAP actions and skeleton plan was found to be very useful amongst NaTMAG members.

DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

FLOPSC – Tuesday 26 September 2023, 13:30 to 15:00, via teleconference or, in person Destinations Place.

GNMG – Wednesday 6 December 2023, 10:00 to 12:00 via teleconference.

NaTMAG – Thursday 9 November 2023, 10:00 to 13:00, via teleconference.

ANNEX A: ACTION SUMMARY

Action No/Year	Action/Decision/Next Step	Raised	Responsible	Plan date	Actual date	Status	Comments: Updated August 2023
01/2023	DfT to follow up with Airbus to provide an update on the Airbus A220 'whine' issue.	Feb 2023	DfT	May 2023		OPEN	The DfT will continue to follow up with Airbus and provide regular updates to NaTMAG, however a solution is not expected to be implemented until the end of 2024. DfT expect to provide an update in the Feb-2024 meeting.
03/2023	Airspace Office to work with the NMB to consider producing an information sheet/poster regarding the WebTrak and Airspace & Noise Information Portal for distribution among NATMAG members.	May 2023	AO/NMB	Nov 2023		OPEN	Action is longer term and will be carried forward into the NMB 3rd term.
04/2023	Airspace Office to provide further details of how complaints are categorised in Q2 2023 Airspace Office report.	Aug 2023	AO	Nov 2023		OPEN	
05/2023	NATS to provide analysis of how Gatwick compares to other airports for CDO performance.	Aug 2023	NATS	Nov 2023		OPEN	