

Noise and Track Sub-Committee

Meeting minutes from Wednesday 7th September 2022 at 2pm
Meeting held virtually on Microsoft Teams

	Attendees		
	Mr Martin Routledge		LLACC Chairman
	Mr Gordon Breeze		PAIN
	Mr David Charles		Bickerdike Allen Partners
	Ms Laura Leech		Buckinghamshire Council
	Mr John Wilkinson		BMKLC
	Mr M Lee		NATS
	Mr Paul Donavon		Hertfordshire County Council
	Mr Nigel Green		STAQS
	Cllr Jane Timmis		Dacorum Borough Council
	Cllr Sam Colins		North Herts District Council
	Ms W Frost		St Albans City and District Council
	Mr Andrew Lambourne		LADACAN
	Cllr Annie Brewster		Hertfordshire County Council
	Mr David Gurtler		Luton Borough Council
	Mr Neil Thompson		LLAOL – Operations Director
	Mr Alex Wong		LLAOL - Airspace Performance Assessor
	Mrs Nicole Prior		LLAOL – Noise and Airspace Performance Manager
	Mr Neil Bradford		LLAOL - Head of Marketing & Communications
	Capt Dougie Naismith		easyJet
	Mr Paul Gilbert		LLAOL (Communications Manager)

1.0	Apologies for absence and substitution	Action
1.1	Mr Paul Healey – NATS Cllr David Bowater - Central Bedfordshire David Godfrey – PAIN (substituted by Gordon Breeze) Alice Green – LLAOL Community Noise Executive Mr Antony Lavendar – DHL Rachel Webb – BMKLC (substituted by John Wilkinson)	
1.2	The Chairman welcomed members to the September meeting and reminded members on the protocols for the virtual meeting.	
2.0	Minutes and Matters Arising from 8th June 2022	
2.1	The minutes of the meeting of 8 th June 2022 were approved subject to a few typos and the addition of a clarification over the LADACAN concern regarding the full length departures trial and the 'control set'.	
2.2	<p>Matters arising that were not being discussed under agenda items included:</p> <p>Airbus A321NEO: It was questioned if there had been any response from Airbus. LLAOL advised that they had not received anything but were continuing to engage with Airbus in conjunction with Gatwick Airport.</p> <p>Further discussed ensued and it was queried that given the less than expected performance from the Airbus A321NEO whether the type should be considered in the proportion of new generation movements. It was however clarified that it was performing better than the aircraft type it replaces (the Airbus A321CEO). However, the issue remained that the improvement measured at Luton Airport was much smaller than expected, and not generally noticeable to someone on the ground.</p> <p>It was added that the specific engines fitted to the aircraft were also raised as a potential factor. In the case of the Airbus NEO types the airline could choose an engine from one of two manufacturers, and those manufacturers also develop their engines over time so different variants of them exist. It was stressed that each individual aircraft has its own noise certificate which relates to its specific configuration including engine type. It was further stressed that the A321NEO is quieter on departure than the A321CEO on a like for like basis but not quite as quiet as the certificate suggested. It was advised that comparison data was also included in every QMR from the fixed monitors.</p> <p>Item 3.2. Positioning Flights - LLAOL advised they had looked into the number of positioning flights and had not found anything unusual.</p> <p>Item 3.4. Regular Complainants - LLAOL stated that they had reviewed the issue but were not able to remove the effect of regular complainants from the analysis.</p> <p>Item 3.5. NMT2 Data - LLAOL advised that they had not removed the NMT2 data from the period of concern but would do so.</p>	

	Item 4.2. Full Length Departures Trial - LLAOL advised that they would report further on the trial results by the end of the year.	LLAOL
3.0	Quarterly Monitoring Report Q2 2022 (April to July 2022)	
3.1	Total passenger numbers had increased by 586% and total traffic movements increased by 236%. The total movements in the night period, 23.00-06.59, increased by 350% from those for the second quarter last year. The early morning, 06.00-06.59, movements were more by 337% than those in the second quarter last year. The airlines Continuous Descent Approaches, CDA, for 93% of all arrivals, up on the same quarter in 2021 (86%).	
3.2	<p>The noise monitor results showed the majority of departures still produced noise levels in the range 70-76 dB L_{Amax}. In this period (2022 Q2) no daytime departures and no night-time departures were registered at greater than 80 dB. When comparing with the same period last year the comparable counts were 0 and 0. There were no noise violations during the daytime or night-time.</p> <p>The night-time noise contour area had increased by 145% and the Airport had ten track violations in this quarter due to poor track keeping.</p> <p>The number of complaints decreased from 2,213 last second quarter to 1,293 in the same period in 2022. The number of complainants was 230 in the second quarter of 2022, up from 81 in 2021. The number of new complainants was 114, up from 19 in the same quarter in 2021 and complaints about westerly arrivals formed the largest % of complaints. Most of the complaints occurred in June. For this quarter, runway usage was 64% westerly operations.</p>	
3.3	<p>Regarding the limit on early morning shoulder activity (12 month movements), total for preceding 12 months was 4,206 (limit 7,000).</p> <p>With respect to the limit on night quota activity (23.30-06.00) (12 month movements), total for preceding 12 months was 6,205 (limit 9,650).</p>	
3.4	<p>Members discussed the QMR further and noted that compared to 2019 passenger numbers were down by a greater proportion than movement numbers. LLAOL advised this was believed to be due to reduced load factors.</p> <p>Discussion ensued regarding Track violations, with input from both the airline and ATC representatives. It was noted that from an airline perspective when they received a fine for a track violation it was communicated internally to highlight what went wrong to avoid repeat occurrences.</p> <p>The proportion of CDA achieved was reviewed. It was noted that the airlines operating most frequently, generally had the best performance, and that overall usage was up from last year which was attributed to the airspace being busier.</p> <p>Further discussion ensued on the complaints data and the possible provision of a map showing the location of complaint. LLAOL advised that in the QMR information is given on the number of complaints by settlement, but not by nature of complaint. LLAOL advised they would look to see what further information could be provided, although it was thought utilising the type of complaint would be challenging.</p>	LLAOL

3.5	LLAOL advised that they planned to stop preparing the technical appendix to the QMR which included the comparison to 2019.	
4.0	Noise Action Plan (NAP) and Annual Monitoring Report	
4.1	<p>Noise Action Plan (NAP) - LLAOL advised the next Noise Action Plan (for 2024-2028) would be drafted between Q4 2022 - Q2 2023. Once drafted LLAOL would then engage with LLACC Members. LLAOL advised that the NAP was required to be based on modelling of the noise in 2021 which had already been submitted to DEFRA.</p> <p>The NAP would then be submitted to DEFRA for review and they would decide whether to approve it. This was expected by 1st Jan 2024. Once approved the NAP would then be published on the airport website.</p>	
4.2	It was noted that LLAOL had already circulated the current NAP actions and 2021 AMR updates prior to the meeting in readiness for members to discuss.	
4.3	<p>In relation to several of the actions it was questioned if evidence could be provided of their effects. LLAOL advised that information was provided in the AMR although not specifically against the actions.</p> <p>(Post meeting note: the table of actions includes performance indicators for each.)</p> <p>In relation to Action 1.5 (Review of Noise Abatement Departure Procedures) LLAOL advised that a trial was underway which involved the use of NADP2 in September and that a number of the airlines who between them operate a range of types were involved. Some members expressed their disappointment regarding the lack of involvement of NTSC in the development of the trial.</p> <p>Regarding Action 1.6 - Arrival Code of Practice – it was noted that this should be completed by end of the year but had not yet started</p> <p>LLAOL agreed to provide their charges in relation to Action 2.3 (Incentives for Airlines). Information on the proportion of quieter types was provided quarterly. It was advised that given the low margins that airlines operate to, different charges were considered in their planning.</p> <p>LLAOL advised that they plan to put forward proposals on a reduced Total Annual Quota Count (QC) cap (Action 3.3) next year.</p> <p>Regarding Action 3.4 and 3.5, it was advised that the contours referred to were those regularly reported, and specifically identified in tables and on contour plots.</p> <p>In relation to Action 4.4 and 4.5 LLAOL advised they would provide further details on the status of any quiet areas.</p> <p>The involvement of LLAOL in relation to new developments (Action 4.6) was clarified. In summary the airport responded when they were contacted as a consultee, but did not have the resources to monitor planning applications made in all the surrounding</p>	LLAOL

	<p>authorities. The possibility of a note from LLAOL that could be shared with planning authorities as part of dialogue was raised.</p> <p>LLAOL advised that the community survey (Action 5.1) had been delayed due to the pandemic and was now planned for next year.</p> <p><u>Annual Monitoring Report</u></p> <p>As noted above, it was advised that much of this information was provided in the AMR although not specifically against the NAP actions.</p>	
5.0	<p>Airspace Update (AD6) - LLAOL advised that this change had been successfully implemented on 24th February 2022. The CAA's Post Implementation Review (PIR) started on 1st June 2022 and would run until 31st May 2023.</p> <p>Complaints had increased from newly overflown areas, particularly Pottton, Gamlingay, Croydon and Cambridge. Most complaints were concerning altitude and noise of aircraft when descending. The Pottton Public Surgery held on 12th May was well attended; another surgery had been planned for 29th September in Abbotsley. LLAOL advised that the point of the surgeries was to provide information on what the change was and what led to it occurring. They were not consultation exercises, as the change was permanent subject to the CAA PIR which was primarily interested in operational matters.</p> <p>LLAOL had held meetings with two South Cambridgeshire councillors, Gamlingay Parish Council and a new campaign group RELAS (Reject Luton Airport Stacking).</p>	
6.0	<p>Noise Trial Methodology (LADACAN view) - LADACAN presented their report on a standard approach to experimental design which could be applied to a trials at the airport.</p> <p>Specifically regarding a trial on using the full runway length it was advised that aircraft adjust the thrust they use on departure depending on the length of runway available. This thrust level is then used during the initial part of the climb out. It would be possible to investigate this theoretically using information held by the airlines.</p> <p>It was also noted that a monitor closer to the airport might be needed to measure the effects. LLAOL advised that this was the case during the trial earlier in the year.</p> <p>To assist obtaining the best results, the potential to limit the assessment to specific types, and also use other information available such as weather data and passenger numbers was suggested.</p>	
7.0	Any Other Business	
	Nothing further was raised.	
8.0	<p>Date of forthcoming Meetings in 2022</p> <p>14th December 2022 - Members noted that all meetings for the foreseeable future would be held via Teams</p>	

