



Tracker and would be added as 11/2013 Steeper Approaches presentation.	
<p><b>4 Ground Noise report</b></p> <p>The report was received positively, and the Airfield Team were thanked for their good work especially with the APU compliance audits. Despite more aircraft on the airfield and an increase in audit checks, there were no non-compliance events.</p> <p>John Byng raised the issue of Pre Conditioned Air (PCA) and possible environmental benefits. Tom Denton advised that PCA was being looked at by the Airport's Development Team, however because of the high compliance rate on APU running, the returns on using PCA would be low. Vic Franklin also advised that PCA would require a source of conditioned air. This would run off an engine start unit/GPU which itself would produce noise.</p> <p><b>*Action:</b> An update on PCA will be added to next agenda</p>	GAL
<p><b>5. Ground Noise complaints</b></p> <p>There were no recorded ground noise complaints in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter.</p>	
<p><b>6. Flight Performance Team report</b></p> <p>The group reviewed the data provided within the report.</p> <p>Tim May noted that although there had been an increase in passenger numbers, there was a fall in the number of movements. Both figures are accurate as load factors have improved, and as passenger numbers are often reported as month on month comparisons they don't match with the quarterly trend.</p> <p>Brendan Sheil reported that runway works continue to impact on the CDA performance figures. Although the main runway works had been completed there was still on going work on the RETS and taxiways.</p> <p><b>* Action:</b> It was agreed GAL would circulate the date for the completion of these works.</p> <p>The number of go arounds attributed to 'other reasons' was questioned. Andy Taylor explained that the figures were a rolling 12 month period and in that context were very low, however 'others' contained instances where none of the common reasons applied and were recorded as a narrative explanation.</p> <p>Brendan Sheil advised that following the completion of the Noise and Track Keeping tendering process Gatwick has signed a new contract for provision of these services with a company called Casper, based in Holland. This company was chosen because their product was considered more innovative than the competitors and provided a much enhanced graphical interface compared to the product it replaced. As a measure of this company's performance to date, it took less than six weeks from the contract signing to full mobilisation, a truly stunning achievement, with the system going live at the airport on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013.</p> <p>The public flight tracking service is also provided by Casper, and this service has been well received by those using this tool. As part of the improvements the Casper Flight Tracking service now displays 'real time' flights with a delay of 20 minutes rather than 24 hours. Another improvement is that noise data is available almost live as the system is downloading data every hour instead of only once a day and there is now no altitude cut off so aircraft can be displayed further out from the airfield. The new display of Noise Preferential Routes was a welcome new addition as it meant the mapping underneath routes was much clearer.</p> <p>Alan Jones asked whether complaints from Smallfield were recorded as Horley, it was</p>	GAL

<p>confirmed that the system records by postal town so those complaints were indeed recorded under Horley</p>	
<p><b>7. Horley overflight</b>  Tom Denton advised that this subgroup met recently, and noticed a large increase in the % of over flight that occurred in February. At the time NATS there was no obvious operational reason and NATS are to investigate - as Andrew Burke was unable to attend NATMAG,  <b>*Action</b> Andrew Burke will be asked to investigate reason for the increase in Feb - ongoing"  <b>*Action:</b> FPT to add a Horley analysis gate in the new system for statistical continuity  Andy Taylor responded to questions that LAMP may improve (for communities such as Horley) traffic patterns from both Heathrow and Gatwick - these changes would be subject to ACP and consultation, but are not likely before 2018.</p>	<p>GAL  GAL</p>
<p><b>8 PRNAV Update</b>  Tom Denton gave an update and advised that we are in the post consultation review phase with the Directorate of Airspace Policy. There is technical discussion as to whether the procedures/routes are flyable. Andy Taylor added that subject to CAA approval the PRNAV routes should be operational on 22 August, with a decision required by the end of May for the August operational date in order to provide enough time for ATC planning.</p> <p>Ros Howell queried the absence of data on the operational uptake of the trial since it had been agreed at GATCOM. It transpired that seven airlines were authorised to fly PRNAV departures, although as PRNAV is still a trial and therefore not a flight plannable procedure, uptake remains very low. Even so the PRNAV figures were not provided prior to the meeting as agreed. Decision required by end May for August operational date  <b>*Action:</b> GAL to provide latest figures on PRNAV uptake.</p>	<p>GAL</p>
<p><b>9. Mobile Noise monitor update</b>  The Gatwick Noise monitoring group met on 2 May 2013 to review data from the community noise monitoring programme and discuss future sites for study.  Brendan Sheil explained that it was proving difficult to find a suitable site in the North Crawley area. Although potential sites had been identified and visited the problem was getting the landowner's permission as the suitable sites were leased premises.</p> <p>With regards to the request for a monitor in Slinfold, it was agreed that since a monitor had recently been at that location and a report had been produced, we would not recommend a monitor be located there again at this time. Anyone with questions on the noise climate in that area can be directed to the community noise report for Slinfold produced in 2010. All of the community noise reports are available on the Gatwick Noise website: <a href="http://www.gatwickairport.com/business/noise/reports">http://www.gatwickairport.com/business/noise/reports</a></p> <p>After their recent period of deployment ended, reports for the monitoring sites in Leigh and Haywards Heath are being finalised and will be published on the website soon.</p> <p>There was also a request for a monitor to be placed at Dormansland, however after some discussion it was agreed that because of the proximity to current monitors we would not recommend this location at this time, however it would be added to the list for future consideration for future deployment.  Monitors are currently located at Lingfield, Oakwood Hill, Rusper, Rudgwick, Blindley Heath, Domewood and Hever.  <b>*Action:</b> GAL to provide latest mapping of mobile monitors.</p>	<p>GAL</p>

<p>The group recommended to the NATMAG that we locate monitors at suitable sites at Tunbridge Wells, Billingshurst and Horsham. If a site at North Crawley can be found then we shall locate a monitor there first. These recommendations are based on the view that the programme is designed to analyse the noise environment in local communities and not as a response to complaints. NATMAG agreed with these recommendations.</p> <p>Reports for the recent</p>	
<p><b>10 Night Noise Respite</b></p> <p>John Byng pointed out that he had criticised the proposal at GATCOM for lacking any means to measure the impact on communities. Tom Denton had agreed to consider seeking input from a suitable academic institute at the next NATMAG, and this was discussed. John also questioned whether it was right to conduct a trial that might impact peoples' sleep patterns without a suitable study in place to reveal the consequences (positive or negative). Ros Howell suggested that the DfT ought to be taking the lead on research into annoyance and any study should be part of a national approach, but John explained that this is a separate issue.</p> <p>Tom Denton advised that Heathrow had conducted a similar respite trial without full consultation and in line with our proposed methodology in co - operation with HACAN. They were yet to publish their findings, although anecdotal conversations seem to suggest a general positive response.</p> <p><b>*Action:</b> Andy Taylor will follow up the social survey study with a university currently working with GAL.</p>	<p>NATS</p>
<p><b>11. Night Noise Consultation response</b></p> <p>GAL have submitted their response, which confirms that GAL will not be requesting either an increase or decrease in the current limits. John Byng expressed disappointment that GAL had not taken the opportunity to explore lower limits (perhaps matching current use) as he is concerned about future noise impacts.</p>	
<p><b>12. Runway Options</b></p> <p><b>*Action:</b> Amend item on agenda to Airports Commission update</p> <p>Tom Denton advised that the airport is further forward in its planning, with a number of options being considered. These involve different runway locations/terminal locations/surface access needs and options on operational scenarios. Alan Jones questioned why more options were on the table, the current Masterplan shows a potential runway south of the existing one. Tom Denton advised that all options are still on the table, although the airport will specify any favoured options to the Commission in July 2013.</p>	<p>GAL</p>
<p><b>13. Key messages for FLOPSC and GATCOM</b></p> <p>GATCOM – The Ground Noise report was positively received. Despite more aircraft on the airfield and an increase in audit checks, there were no non- compliance events. The request for a monitor at Dormansland was reviewed but because of nearby monitors was deferred for future consideration.</p> <p>FLOPSC - NATMAG request that more (eligible airline) crews start flying trial PRNAV SIDs and indeed any/all ones that are approved and implemented to be flown as often as possible during the trial period. It was also agreed to have a standing invitation for a NATMAG representative. GAL will supply delays of future meeting dates and times.</p> <p><b>*Action</b> GAL will provide details of 2013 FLOPSC meeting dates and times</p>	<p>GAL</p>

