



<p>5. Alan Jones suggested that the group re-arrange the agenda as it tended to discuss more important matters towards the end of the meeting when time may be running out. It was suggested that Agenda Item 11 be moved to Agenda Item 5 – this was agreed and matters arising from reports would be discussed by exception only.</p>	
<p><b>3 Action Tracker</b>  07/2012 – It was confirmed that members of the group would like visit Swanwick and Sam Wright will liaise with Tom Denton/Andy Taylor over suitable dates – remains Open.  29/2013 – Social study collaboration with Cambridge University has not produced any result and therefore social study will be picked up through Future Airspace Strategy Industry Implementation Group (FASIIG) - Closed.  30/2013 – KPI table has been reviewed and updated - Closed.  32/2013 – Horley overflight to be included as agenda item going forward - Closed.  34/2013 – GAL has done all it can to encourage airlines to retrofit Airbus A320 family aircraft – Closed.  01/2014 – NATS Swanwick new representative, Sam Wright, was welcomed to the meeting and will be invited to all future meetings – Closed.  02/2014 – Photon is a NE America based application which causes time difference - Closed.  03/2014 – CASPER to be available on mobile devices when budget permits - Closed.  04/2014 – Effects on RNAV 1 SID navigation on DVR/LAM and CLN SID routes of extreme strong wind conditions experienced on several days in December 2013 were explained by Andy Taylor with further explanation from Douglas Moule with regard to aircraft bank limits – Closed.  05/2014 – Provision of ADNID Trial data from Rusper noise monitor to Gatwick Noise Monitoring Group was provided at meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2014 - Closed.  <i>Tom Denton advised the group that in addition to the noise monitor currently situated in Rusper, an additional noise monitor had been installed in Warnham and will remain in place for the duration of the ADNID Trial and also afterwards in order to gain data from both scenarios. NaTMAG members expressed concern at this as it could set a precedent whereby those who shout the loudest get what they want! Reference was made to the established protocol regarding placement of noise monitors and that this is the second time this protocol has not been followed by Gatwick and the group was very concerned about this. Ros Howell also mentioned that herself, Liz Kitchen and the GATCOM Secretariat were all unaware of the placement of the monitor and Mike George concluded by saying that NaTMAG members should be made aware (by e-mail?) should similar situations arise in the future.</i></p>	
<p><b>4 END Performance Update</b>  1. Tom Denton advised that the NAP is currently with DEFRA. Minor amendments have been made due to policy updates between the time of drafting and submission of the document. We are expecting formal adoption by the SofS soon to which Ros Howell asked if we could be more specific with timescales considering the somewhat tight timescales GATCOM members had to feedback on the document during its revision. Tamara Goodwin advised this was a matter for DEFRA. John Byng enquired whether it would be possible to amend the document once adopted as this would remove the need to keep a running list of subjects to be included in a new NAP as referred to in the previous minutes. Tom Denton advised that it is a ‘live’ document therefore revisions and amendments could be made following the due process.</p>	
<p><b>5 ADNID Trial (including WPC Statement &amp; GAL Responses)</b>  1. Tom Denton made reference to the responses of GAL/NATS to questions asked by Warnham Parish Council and submitted via GATCOM. Tom Denton invited questions from the group. John Byng made the following observations:</p>	

<p>a. In light of existing air navigation guidance (below 4000' the primary consideration being the impact of noise) the amount of people overflowed at low altitude should be taken into account.</p> <p>b. What is the definition of overflight? Tom Denton responded that at present we deem overflight to be a radar plot on a map directly over a given location. Ros Howell mentioned that she is not aware of any technical definition however a noise monitor detects aircraft noise from a 30 degree cone upwards. Andy Taylor also mentioned that he is not aware of any formal definition and that industry interpret DfT guidance in terms of "directly overhead". Tamara Goodwin was asked to provide the DfT definition of overflight. <b>ACTION 08/2014</b></p> <p>c. Andy Taylor advised the group that as part of the next stage of consultation for the Gatwick parts of the London Airspace Change, the population count assessments will be provided independently by the ERCD of the CAA. The assessments will be below heights of 4000' and with several different swathe widths representing potential new widths of the NPRs NPRs. As yet, the (width) dimension for PBN/RNAV based NPR is not known and the industry is waiting for feedback from ANMAC.</p> <p>d. Should the needs of someone who is overflowed 10 times daily be considered over someone who is only overflowed once daily? Ros Howell asked Tamara Goodwin to confirm what is DfT policy on overflight – is it to minimise the number of people overflowed or to minimise the number of occurrences people are overflowed? Tamara responded that DfT policy is to reduce the number of actual people being overflowed. John Byng said that this is a nonsense. Ros Howell advised that this is Government policy to which John Byng responded by saying this contradicted the rules whereby the primary consideration below 4000' is the impact of noise. John Byng made the statement that overflight at 4000' and at 20000' are two different things. Tamara Goodwin said that the Government policy is to limit and where possible reduce the number of people significantly affected by noise. Liz Kitchen advised the group that the proposed reduction of the width of Noise Preferential Routes would affect people more or expose people not previously overflowed to new routes and it is important to note that people have moved to locations not presently overflowed for a reason.</p> <p>2. Tom Denton informed the group that as per the recommendations of the Airports Commission we needed to improve current airspace and utilise it more efficiently before the construction of any potential new runways. This could possibly expose new communities to overflight. Alan Jones said that people have a perception that they are directly overflowed when in fact they are not, however there is the issue of annoyance. He went on to say that aircraft are quieter but there are more of them, furthermore the introduction of RNAV allows aircraft to be more accurate in their navigation. He also mentioned that the industry is moving away from his idea of alternate routes within the existing NPRs to a narrower swathe, potentially 1.5km wide, and this 'conical' view from the ground could create a situation whereby due to technical improvements being made by the industry, more people on the ground become annoyed and he concluded by advising that a lot of work is taking place at ANMAC and there is still more to do.</p> <p>3. Mathew Balfour advised the group that we are about to have another airspace consultation and there is a depth of ignorance out in the community, as demonstrated in the recent Edenbridge runway exhibition, of what is today and what is about to happen. Tom Denton agreed. Matthew Balfour suggested that we must have absolute clarity as to what will happen going forward otherwise everyone will pick holes in the consultation. He also mentioned that Gatwick should consider that not everyone is IT competent. John Byng added that Gatwick needs to have total clarity as to what is being</p>	<p>DfT 08/2014</p>
---	------------------------

designed as GAL and NATS failed to provide this with the ADNID Trial to which Tom Denton responded that concentration versus dispersal is Government policy. John Byng added that overflight of communities below 4000' has to be considered especially in terms of concentration as certain communities are overflowed in greater numbers on a daily basis as opposed to more communities experiencing a lesser degree of overflight.

4. Andy Taylor reiterated that NPRs will have different widths in the future than at present and these widths have the potential to be up to 750m either side of the route centreline. This will be included in the forthcoming consultation. John Byng would like to see a similar approach taken with the current ADNID Trial to take account of numbers affected.

5. Charles Yarwood mentioned that in light of the current concentration we need to have guidance of what constitutes overflight and the accumulative effects of concentration, RNAV and increased flight numbers to which Matthew Balfour added that the statistics needed to be absolutely robust because GAL could face the potential audience of a judge/select committee.

6. Mike George enquired if there is a set number of departures on ADNID that need to take place in order for the trial to be concluded. Andy Taylor advised that 6 months maximum is CAA mandated and that there are not a set number of flights required but that the 6 month period was specified and agreed with CAA to take into account the impacts of periods of easterly runway direction operations and removal of any flight tracks with incomplete data or which are subject to factors such as weather avoidance etc. Andy Taylor clarified that it is a GAL sponsored trial and that they have the final say on cessation though all parties involved in the work are expediting the data processing, analysis and safety case work in order to obtain robust results as quickly as possible. The data collected needed to be cleaned, input and modelled to prove the safety case to the CAA. Ros Howell clarified that it is a qualitative safety case to which Andy Taylor confirmed that this is indeed the case and that the CAA has agreed to assess the data and safety case drafts while NATS is preparing them, rather than waiting for the work to be completed before review commences.

7. Andy Taylor made reference to the requirement to de-conflict departure route traffic on ADNID from the WILLO hold and stated that the ADNID route was designed to pass the fixed hold position by the intended future route spacing requirement that the trial is aiming to prove. John Byng responded by saying that the left hand turn (of ADNID) does not have to be at 1.6nm, it could be greater to which Andy Taylor responded by saying the 20/21 degree turn is necessary but not necessarily required at 1.6nm, however the GAL specification was the 20/21 degree divergence plus the requirement to avoid direct overflight of a number of villages, hence its current location. Stopping the trial now could waste the data gained thus far, would result in a new trial taking place (which would have to run for 6 months for reasons stated above) there would also be lead in for design time and CAA review/approval required, and as we are 3 months into the trial it was suggested that we should continue as present with the trial. John Byng accepted this and stated that he is not suggesting stopping and starting again, just stopping.

8. Liz Kitchen asked if there are more flights using ADNID to which Andy Taylor responded by saying we had had predominantly westerly operations recently, especially with the strong winds and all departures planned via BOGNA are flying ADNID route as has been the case since the start of the trial. Liz Kitchen also asked why this route in this location? Tom Denton responded by explaining the need under future airspace strategy to increase the efficiency of our airspace. The easterly 08 SIDs/NPRs are more efficient and effective whereas the westerly 26 SIDs/NPRs (used 70% of the time) are not so therefore they need to change. The ADNID route bypasses most areas of population and the 20 degree angle of divergence allows for greater efficiency as the current minimum

<p>45 degree angle of divergence would limit the possibility of positioning routes, potentially impacting larger population centres such as Horsham.</p> <p>9. Ros Howell raised a question received from CAGNE via the GATCOM Secretariat regarding why CAGNE was not allowed to attend a recent meeting between Warnham Parish Council and Gatwick as CAGNE believe they were instrumental in the setting up of this meeting. Tom Denton responded by saying that Gatwick had initially been invited by Warnham Parish Council to attend a public meeting alongside DfT, CAA and NATS. Gatwick did not believe that such a public meeting would be constructive or beneficial to all parties but offered a private meeting at Gatwick with the CEO of Gatwick, DfT, CAA, NATS and Gatwick representatives. Warnham Parish Council declined CAGNE's request to attend as the initial approach to Gatwick came from Warnham Parish Council. Tom Denton concluded by saying that Gatwick have offered to meet with CAGNE and other Parish Councils (Slinfold, Rusper and Rudgwick).</p> <p>10. Liz Kitchen placed on record CAGNE appreciated the co-operative nature of Tom Denton in his dealings with them.</p> <p>11. Matthew Balfour informed the group that Tunbridge Wells is hosting a meeting regarding aircraft noise in the west Kent area on 17<sup>th</sup> June and although Gatwick were not to be invited he thought it may be beneficial to have independent air traffic representation at the meeting to discuss technical issues only. <b>ACTION 09/2014</b></p> <p>12. John Byng stated that the responses to Warnham Parish Council require revision as they are too technical and do not answer the questions. Both Tom Denton and Ros Howell mentioned that the questions posed were extremely technical in detail hence the responses. Mike George interjected that as Warnham Parish Council themselves have not responded with any further questions or concerns then there is no issue. Tom Denton clarified that Warnham Parish Council received this response initially and a copy was provided to GATCOM who, due to the technical nature of the questions and responses, referred it to NaTMAG for consideration. Alan Jones stated that this is a GAL response not NaTMAG to which Mike George recommended that NaTMAG should note the responses made by GAL to the questions and take no further action.</p> <p>13. Ros Howell questioned GAL's statement to Q6. Brendan Sheil confirmed that the monitoring of the environmental impact, including noise, is in progress and he anticipated having details of this monitoring programme prior to the next NaTMAG meeting. <b>ACTION 10/2014</b></p> <p>14. Andy Taylor presented track maps to illustrate the difference of track density between pre-trial BOGNA flight paths and ADNID flight paths. He also illustrated the difference in flight paths with the other NPRs to reflect the fact that approximately 99% of flights are now flying RNAV to which John Byng responded by saying we need to compare like with like in terms of the BOGNA and ADNID as the BOGNA tracks are non-RNAV whereas ADNID is RNAV. This is especially important to clarify the exact numbers of people affected therefore we need to compare RNAV BOGNA to ADNID. Andy Taylor said that BOGNA departures (including RNAV) require a large amount of ATC intervention to de-conflict with other traffic whereas ADNID requires less intervention to which John Byng replied by saying that such intervention takes place after 4000' and that what happens below 4000' is what matters. Ros Howell clarified that she has observed flights over the north of Warnham at around 5000' to which Tom Denton reiterated that these flights close to the north of Warnham are at heights of typically 4500' to 5000' to which Ros Howell responded by saying that John Byng's assertion that flights below 4000' and Warnham are 'two of the same' is not the case.</p> <p>15. Alan Jones requested that we keep ADNID as an agenda item for the next meeting in September and it could be a report on ADNID as the trial would have completed by then. John Byng said there is a hope that the trial will be terminated before 17<sup>th</sup> August to</p>	<p>NATS 09/2014</p> <p>FPT 10/2014</p>
--	--

<p>which Andy Taylor advised that the CAA are working on data which is moving things as quickly as possible and Tom Denton closed this agenda item by committing to closing the trial as soon as sufficient data has been gathered to achieve the technical objectives of the trial.</p>	
<p><b>6 Ground Noise Report</b></p> <p>1. Tom Denton provided an overview of the 'Executive Summary' from the Ground Noise Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 35 engine tests were undertaken during the reporting period and this falls within our prescribed limits. Alan Jones commented on the length of 2 of the tests to which Ros Howell mentioned that the rationale for certain test lengths has been provided previously.</li> <li>b. APU checks and audits continue and there was 1 non-compliance notified which was dealt with at the time. Mike George enquired as to why the same airline has had a further issue of non-compliance and asked whether a trend was emerging to which Tom Denton advised that there did not appear to be a negative trend developing.</li> <li>c. There were 5 Ground Power Unit dispensations granted within the reporting period and Fixed Electrical Group Power Unit availability was 99.9% through the period.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7 Flight Performance Report (including Ground Noise Complaints)</b></p> <p>1. John Byng asked what is determined to be 'on track' as all ADNID departures should be deemed to be 'off track'. Tom Denton confirmed that for the duration of the ADNID Trial all departing aircraft on the ADNID route are deemed to be 'on track'.</p> <p>2. Brendan Sheil advised that all departures defaulted to RNAV with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> May – this had previously been due to take effect from March but was postponed due to a technical issue within ATC.</p> <p>3. Brendan Sheil provided the following highlights from the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. CDA figures are the highest ever recorded at Gatwick.</li> <li>b. There was a high number of Go-Arounds during the reporting period – probable cause winter storms with the main reason for Go-Arounds being 'windshear' and 'unstable approach'.</li> <li>c. The Winter 2013-14 season ended on 29<sup>th</sup> March and 41.4% of the quota limit and 46.5% of movement limit were utilised. Brendan Sheil informed the group that in line with the prescribed night flight rules we will be carrying over 10% of our unused movement and quota limit to the Summer 2014 season. This revised Summer movement limit is 11525 and 6400 quota count. John Byng asked if this had been done before and whether it would mean more night flights. Brendan Sheil confirmed that it had been done before as it is in line with DfT guidelines and we will be monitoring the situation on a daily basis. Ian Envis mentioned that this summer could be one of our busiest ever and there is every possibility that Gatwick could become capacity-constrained on certain days to which Matthew Balfour responded 'tough' as the local communities do not want night flights.</li> </ul> <p>4. Ros Howell commented that the FPT Quarterly Report does not currently detail the quarterly split of the runway and that this is mentioned in the 'Executive Summary'. It needed to be included in the quarterly report as this is published for the public to see whereas the 'Executive Summary' is not. Brendan Sheil advised this omission was an oversight and would be rectified. <b>Action 11/2014</b></p> <p>5. Brendan Sheil informed the group that the majority of complaints received related to the ADNID Trial to which John Byng questioned how the complaints were being logged as there was reports in the communities affected by the ADNID Trial that Gatwick are</p>	<p>FPT 11/2014</p>

not logging all complaints. Brendan Sheil assured the group that all complaints are registered and responded to (apart from when a response is specifically not requested) and the only exception to this is in the rare occasion when a complaint is received that requests, for instance, a whole day's worth of flights be recorded individually – we do not have the facility to do this and this type of complaint would be recorded as a single complaint. Brendan Sheil reiterated that even multiple complainants received acknowledgement of their complaints.

6. John Byng told the group that he has received reports that the FPT voicemail facility is not accepting calls. Brendan Sheil assured the group that the 0800 393 070 telephone line is fully operational and can hold a vast amount of voicemails. The number John Byng referred to was not an FPT telephone line nor was it a published number.

7. Liz Kitchen commented that a number of complainants relating to ADNID are pilots. Terry Gibbons added that the FPT had received a number of supportive messages from Warnham residents regarding the ADNID Trial and local activism.

**8 Horley Overflight**

1. Andy Taylor advised that since 1<sup>st</sup> May the number of infringements of the Horley overflight rule had significantly reduced due to a later right turn on 26LAM/DVR RNAV route which takes aircraft slightly north of Horley. An issue had been identified that when ATC provide aircraft with a radar heading the aircraft FMS resulted in the aircraft deviating slightly therefore this instruction is now given slightly later to remove the risk of aircraft overflying Horley. Mike George said that this plan only dealt with aircraft within the NPR and that the AIP states that there should be no overflight of Horley irrespective of height. Sam Wright confirmed that their instructions at Swanwick are to avoid overflying and it is for ATC watch management to monitor and feedback. Mike George referred to his comments at the February meeting of NaTMAG asking why aircraft cannot head due east past Horley prior to turning towards Dover. Andy Taylor mentioned that the issue of de-conflicting traffic from the Heathrow BIGGIN hold remains. The fact remains there is now RNAV related reduction in overflight and controllers will continue to be reminded of the rule at any height. Andy Taylor mentioned that it may be possible to trial an amendment to the 'tail' of the RNAV SID track by replicating the ATC radar heading but so as to avoid overflight of Horley and also benefit from a slightly better continuous climb departure. Andy Taylor recommended this item be kept on the agenda moving forward, this matter could be considered as part of LAMP Phase II however altering the tail of the RNAV SID would necessitate a trial. Mike George asked if the 26WIZ NPR could be used as that flies over the BIGGIN hold. Sam Wright responded by saying this had great implications on other TMA sectors and Tamara Goodwin, upon questioning from Ros Howell, said that the DfT is happy to continue monitoring this matter through the NaTMAG forum.

**9 London Airspace Consultation Update**

1. Tom Denton reminded the group that the LAMP consultation focussed on Gatwick arrivals and departures and the first stage of the public consultation took place between October 2013 and January 2014. After considering the responses to the consultation and when designing new routes where changes are resultant we will consult again from 23<sup>rd</sup> May for 12 weeks. Tom Denton stressed that we will be re-consulting on areas negatively impacted (noise/SEL/LEQ contours) that were not previously consulted. This will once again be an on-line consultation which will include respite as well as any new noise impacts. The full airspace change proposal will be submitted in September 2014. Tom Denton advised the group that he had written to local authorities, parish councils and MPs. Matthew Balfour suggested that Gatwick may wish to attend the previously mentioned meeting in Tunbridge Wells.

2. Ros Howell mentioned that it would have been useful to have received something in

<p>writing. John Byng enquired of Tom Denton as to which SEL contour were Gatwick using to which Tom Denton advised that he did not know at this time. John Byng also stated that people beyond the 57dBA LEQ contour may also be affected however they will not be consulted. Ros Howell made reference to a note from the GATCOM Secretariat which states that the consultation would cover new NPRs and also areas beyond them should a new NPR be introduced. Matthew Balfour concluded this agenda item by emphasising the need for the upcoming consultation to be simple and easy to understand.</p>	
<p><b>10 Airports Commission Update</b>  Tom Denton provided the following updates:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. GAL have a series of consultations, exhibitions and workshops attended by approximated 6000 people.</li> <li>b. GAL will put forward a full and final submission taking into account consultation feedback.</li> <li>c. The Airport Commission will consult publicly later in the year. Charles Yarwood then mentioned a Gatwick press release circulated by the GATCOM Secretariat which claimed their submission would create 120000 jobs however the preferred option was not disclosed and the submission had not been published.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>11 Noise Insulation Scheme</b>  1. Tom Denton advised the scheme has launched and there had been significant interest in it. The first contracts are now at the installation stage. He confirmed that the scheme will run for 4 years after which we do not envisage having no scheme in place and in response to a question from John Byng, he confirmed there would be a further scheme in place should a second runway be constructed. In response to questions regarding quality control, Lee Howes provided an overview of the KPIs in place, client satisfaction surveys and scores and how he has regular meetings with senior Anglian management.</p>	
<p><b>12 Review of Actions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Visit to NATS Swanwick – 07/2012.</li> <li>2. Amendments to February 2014 minutes – 06/2014.</li> <li>3. CAA contact details to John Byng – 07/2014.</li> <li>4. DfT to provide definition of overflight – 08/2014.</li> <li>5. Attendance at Tunbridge Wells aircraft noise meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> June – 09/2014.</li> <li>6. ADNID Trial data to be provided prior to next meeting – 10/2014.</li> <li>7. Runway split to be included in FPT Q1 Report – 11/2014.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>13 Key Messages</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To GAL Senior Executive – Placement of noise monitor in Warnham out of protocol.</li> <li>2. To GATCOM – Gatwick’s best ever CDA performance.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>14 Next Meeting</b>  Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> September 2014 (1000-1300 hours) - Barcelona Meeting Room, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Destinations Place, Gatwick Airport.</p>	