

**(DRAFT MINUTES)****Present**

Tom Denton GAL (Chairman)

Brendan Sheil GAL

Lee Howes GAL

Andy Taylor NATS

Mike George GATCOM

John Byng GATCOM

Alan Jones GATCOM

Ros Howell GATCOM Technical Advisor

Matthew Balfour GATCOM

Peter Long EHO (Reigate and Banstead Borough Council)

Brian Cox EHO (Crawley Borough Council)

Douglas Moule Easyjet

Tamara Goodwin Department for Transport

Item	Action
<p><b>1.Apologies</b> Vic Franklin BALPA, Tim May Department for Transport , Keith Brockwell GATCOM, Charles Yarwood GATCOM. Tom Denton took the opportunity to welcome Matthew Balfour from Kent County Council as a new member and he also re-introduced Lee Howes who has returned to GAL as Corporate Responsibility Manager.</p>	
<p><b>2 Previous Minutes</b> 10. It was agreed that paragraph 10 of the minutes of 13 May 2013 should be amended to read : <b>“10 Night Noise Respite</b> 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 but the proposal still lacks such an input. John questioned whether it was right to conduct a trial that might mess with people’s 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 survey but John explained that this is a separate issue. Tom Denton advised that Heathrow had conducted a similar respite trial without 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. <b>*Action:</b> Andy Taylor will follow up the social survey study with a university currently working with GAL.” John Byng also suggested that it would be helpful if the agenda for future meetings were to have the necessary papers attached, in the manner of GATCOM agenda.</p>	
<p><b>3 Actions Tracker</b> 07/2012 The proposed trip to Swanwick remains open. Tom Denton will endeavour to find some suitable dates. 11/2013 Add Steeper Approaches to agenda – completed.</p>	

<p>12/2013 Update on pre conditioned air – to be discussed during meeting.  13/2013 Runway maintenance schedule circulate – completed.  14/2013 FPT to incorporate an analysis gate over Horley – the request has been made to the new supplier - remains open.  15/2013 PRNAV uptake usage – added to agenda – completed.  16/2013 Map showing the latest disposition of noise monitors was circulated – completed.  17/2013 Follow up with university the possibility of a social survey – Andy Taylor provided an update – completed.  18/2013 Amend agend item to show Airports Commission update – completed.  19/2013 FLOPSC meeting dates were circulated – completed.  20/2013 Meeting governance – Noise Action Plan, WSP Noise Benchmarking added to agenda and AOB moved – completed.</p>	
<p><b>4 Ground Noise report</b>  Tom Denton went through the highlights of the quarterly report, and noted that the total number of engine tests per month remained well below the legal agreement limit of 250 or more over a rolling 6 month period.  There were two instances of non-compliant APU running, the explanations for which were discussed. It was understandable that the private flight aircrew were unaware of the rules, but however it was surprising the crew had expressed ignorance and this has been taken up with Virgin management.  There were a small number of APU runnings compared to last year which was a positive indicator.  The Airfield Team were thanked for their good work especially with the APU compliance audits. Despite more aircraft on the airfield and an increased number of audits there were very few instances of non- compliant APU running this year.</p>	
<p><b>5 Flight Performance report and ground noise complaints</b>  Brendan Sheil presented highlights of the report, which continue to show an improved track keeping performance, and zero noise infringements for the quarter. The complaints section of the report has been face lifted to give a much clearer and more concise pictorial analysis of noise complaints.  Alan Jones suggested that in future all data tables and graphs ought to show at least 15 months of data so that a comparison of the previous quarter can be made. It was agreed that these changes would be made for the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter. <b>ACTION 22/2013</b>  Alan also mentioned that some residents had suggested the tracks of departing aircraft heading east had drifted north compared to previous years. The FPT agreed to look at the distribution of tracks on the easterly Noise Preferential Routes. <b>ACTION 23/2013</b>  Page 12 Horley overflight -The recent increase in the percentage of Horley overflights particularly in February was discussed. Andy Taylor offered a possible explanation for the increase which may be the distribution of departure SIDs on that that particular route. It was agreed that NATS and the FPT would follow this up by conducting an analysis of SID routing. <b>ACTION 26/2013</b>  Page 17 Arrivals over congested areas -Mike George pointed out that exceptions such as the Dash 8 overflight of East Grinstead should be accompanied by an explanation. The FPT will again contact ATC to seek an explanation. <b>ACTION 24/2013</b>  Page 25 Noise complaints -Tom Denton gave an insight into the possible reasons for the increase in noise complaints. These were the publicity surrounding the Airports Commission, the 2<sup>nd</sup> runway announcement and the better weather, which made aircraft</p>	<p>GAL 22/2013  GAL 23/2013  GAL 26/2013  GAL 24/2013</p>

<p>more noticeable.  Mathew Balfour noted that residents seemed to have singled out a particular aircraft type and engine for the cause of a particular pitch that caused disturbance.  Page 27 – Ground Noise complaints - There was one complaint from north Crawley</p>	
<p><b>6. Horley overflight</b>  Tom Denton advised that neither ATC nor the airport had been able to provide a reason for the increase in Horley overflight. See previous notes from FPT reporting, page 12. Peter Long and Roz Howell suggested that in the light of current practice and the reasons for it, should this AIP rule be referred to the Department for Transport for review.  <b>ACTION</b> 25/2013  In order to ensure consistency NATS will check the Horley town outline on the radar screen with the analysis zone displayed on the airport’s Noise and Track system. <b>ACTION</b> 27/2013</p>	<p>DfT  25/2013   NATS  27/2013</p>
<p><b>7. Steeper Approaches</b>  Andy Taylor described the current ICAO regulations regarding the standard 3 degree angle of approach. These regulations only permit a steeper angle if there are obstacles on the approach path and in such cases the runway can only be used in good visibility. Some airports such as LONDON CITY have higher approach angles because of such obstacles. However they are limited to just two certified types of jet aircraft, and cannot operate in poor visibility. He went on to describe a trial that had taken place at Frankfurt airport using a 3.2 degree angle of approach, which could only be used in conditions of good visibility.  He also confirmed that the regulations specifically outlaw the adoption of a steeper angle for noise mitigation purposes.  Under the ICAO regulations aircraft could not operate a steeper approach angle in instances of poor visibility therefore effectively closing the airport using the steeper approach angle. The complexity of switching between two ILS angles of approach would present extreme operational difficulties with a potential impact on safety.  In order to operate a steeper angle of approach the procedure would need to be certified by the regulatory authority,( i.e the Civil Aviation Authority) and approved by ICAO.  The UK position is not to file ICAO differences.</p>	
<p><b>9. Mobile Noise monitor update</b>  Brendan Sheil advised that following agreement from the last meeting of NATMAG, we have installed two new monitors during the summer, one located just outside Billingshurst and another which has only recently been installed at a site near Bidborough, which is to the west of Tunbridge Wells. From an aircraft noise monitoring perspective both of these sites should generate interesting data as they both sit under the turns for final approach at opposite ends of the airport.  Community noise reports for Leigh and Haywards Heath are now available on the website. The consultant from Applied Acoustic Design is currently working on reports for Rudgwick and Blindley Heath which should be available later this year.  Liz Kitchen passed on a request for a monitor in Slinfold which will be discussed at the next meeting of the Gatwick Noise Monitoring Group. Tom Denton also passed on a request for Cowden. Both requests will be considered at the next meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> November. <b>ACTION</b> 28/2013</p>	<p>GAL  28/2013</p>

<p><b>10. Night Noise respite</b></p> <p>Andy Taylor gave a brief synopsis of the respite trial, which denotes two zones to the west of the airfield for rotating respite, and an increase in altitude for the east. Full details of the trial are available using the link from the GATCOM website home page at: <a href="http://www.ukaccs.info/gatwick/">http://www.ukaccs.info/gatwick/</a></p> <p>Cambridge University have expressed an interest in discussing possible options for a social study, although no specific agreement has yet to be made. Andy Taylor will give further feedback at the next meeting. <b>ACTION 29/2013</b></p> <p>John Byng reiterated his opinion that a study should have been in place before any trial commenced. The night time respite trial at Heathrow was discussed and Ros Howell mentioned that, from reading the report, the consultants used by Heathrow appeared not to have made any input to the trial but rather were commissioned to analyse the results in terms of impacts on the tracks flown and comments provided by the communities affected. It was noteworthy that the summary conclusion of the Heathrow trial was that the benefits for some communities were outweighed by disbenefits for others and therefore it had not achieved its objective and would not be repeated.</p>	<p>NATS 29/2013</p>
<p><b>11. Noise Conference Agenda November 22<sup>nd</sup> 2013</b></p> <p>Tom Denton produced some initial thoughts on agenda and guest speakers. The agenda would include an item on the 2<sup>nd</sup> runway, an update of the Fly Quiet, Fly Clean programme and the work of ANMAC.</p> <p>As well as representatives from the Department for Transport, and an airline, Tom Denton formally offered a slot to the Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign.</p> <p>The venue, date and timing were discussed and although the venue is set, Tom would consider any alternate suggestions.</p>	
<p><b>12. Airports Commission update</b></p> <p>Tom Denton gave an update on the position of the airports submission, which now includes more precise detailed information on positions of runway, access options etc. Gatwick will choose a preferred option to submit to the commission before the end of 2013.. If the airport chooses to consult on this preferred option it would occur early in 2014.</p>	
<p><b>13. Pre Conditioned Air (PCA)</b></p> <p>Following a recent review by the airport's development team it was agreed that the potential costs far outweighed any benefits that might be expected. The mild climate meant there would be very few occasions when PCA would be utilised.</p>	
<p><b>14 WSP Noise Benchmarking review</b></p> <p>Tom Denton confirmed that in the latest version dated April 2012, Gatwick had been moved from 6<sup>th</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> position. Another benchmarking review will start this year. John Byng pointed out the importance of choosing a contractor that can be relied upon to produce an accurate report and suggested that GAL should consult the Aviation Environment Federation.</p>	
<p><b>15 AOB</b></p> <p>LAMP (London Airspace Management Programme) – Andy Taylor gave an overview of LAMP, and how changes to the management of lower airspace could provide noise benefits for local communities. The full airspace change would involve a consultation process where people were given a number of options for future departing and arriving flight paths.</p> <p>Mike George asked if consideration would be made for future residential housing. Local</p>	

<p>authorities and developers would be asked to submit details of proposed developments. After raising concerns about ambient noise, John Byng was advised that tranquillity will be a consideration in planning.</p> <p>Alan Jones presented a letter from a Tunbridge Wells resident to the GATCOM chairman, Dr Godfrey. A number of issues were raised in this letter that were best answered by GAL. Tom Denton agreed that this letter would be answered by GAL.</p> <p><b>ACTION 30/2013</b></p>	<p>GAL 30/2013</p>
<p><b>16 Key Messages</b></p> <p>GATCOM- Low number of engine runs, and the success of the APU audit process.</p> <p>GATCOM- Increase in noise complaints.</p> <p>FLOPSC - How many airlines intend to use PRNAV from 14 Nov 2013</p>	
<p>17. Review of actions – John Byng asked that the presentations should be circulated.</p> <p>Meeting closed</p>	