

Noise and Track Sub-Committee

Meeting minutes from Wednesday 11th March 2026 at 2pm

Meeting held virtually on Microsoft Teams

Attendees		
Mr Martin Routledge	LLACC Chairman	
Mr David Charles	Bickerdike Allen Partners	
Mrs Nicole Prior	LLAOL Head of Flight Operations	
Mr Alex Carmen	LLAOL Flight Operations Analyst	
Ms Georgie Abbott	LLAOL Flight Ops Community Noise Executive	
Mrs Alice May	LLAOL Flight Ops Flight Operations Manager	
Mr David Gurtler	Luton Borough Council	
Mr Gordon Breeze	PAIN	
Mrs Rachael Webb	BMKALC	
Mr Kevin Collins	Central Bedfordshire Borough Council	
Mr Nigel Green	STAQS	
Mr Antony Hatch	NATS	
Mr Andrew Lambourne	LADACAN	
Cllr Jane Timmis	Dacorum Borough Council	
Mr Ross Whear	Dacorum Borough Council	
1.0	Apologies for absence and substitution	Action
1.1	Mr Neil Bradford - LLAOL Head of Marketing & Communications Cllr Ed Moore – St Albans City and District Council Mr Neil Thompson – LLAOL Chief Operations Officer	
1.2	The Chairman welcomed members to the March meeting and members were reminded of the protocols for a virtual meeting.	
2.0	Minutes and Matters Arising from 10th December Meeting	

2.1	<p>The draft minutes from the December 2025 meeting had been circulated prior to the meeting for comments from members; these had been reviewed by the Chairman, and an updated draft had been issued with the meeting papers for approval by members.</p> <p>The minutes of the 10th December 2025 meeting were approved for upload to the web site.</p>	Admin
2.2	<p>Matters arising that were not being discussed elsewhere under the agenda were:</p> <p>Item 2.2 - Item 5.1 Helicopter Activity</p> <p>LLAOL and LADACAN confirmed that they had discussed the concern from Peter's Green, and LADACAN advised they had messaged the resident. There had been no response so far.</p> <p>Item 4.1 – Community Noise Survey</p> <p>LLAOL advised that they had taken on board the Committee's suggestion and sent notification of the survey to their database of complainants.</p> <p>The survey period was now complete; a mix of responses had been received and were being collated. LLAOL agreed to report back.</p> <p>Item 4.4 – Airline Representation</p> <p>LLAOL advised that they were encouraging airlines to make someone available.</p>	LLAOL
3.0	NAP REVIEW	
3.1	<p>At the previous NTSC meeting it was requested that any points for the NAP review be sent to the Chairman and Secretary. This had been done, with substantive comments from both LADACAN and STAQS. LLAOL had provided responses to both sets of comments with STAQS having nothing further. LADACAN were to review the responses and advise LLAOL if they had anything further.</p>	LADACAN
4.0	A321 NEO UPDATE	
4.1	<p>LADACAN had undertaken analysis of the published measured noise levels in the QMRs (Q1 2024 to Q4 2025) for the Airbus A320 and Airbus A321, both existing (ceo) and new generation (neo) variants. This found that the A320neo departure noise reduction of ~3.5-3.6 dB compared to A320 ceo was materially larger than the ~0.6-1.1 dB reduction vs A321ceo observed for A321neo powered by PW1100G engines. On departure A321neo aircraft powered by CFM were ~1.3-2.0 dB less noisy than those using Pratt and Whitney (P&W) engines.</p>	
4.2	<p>Analysis had separately been undertaken on the noise certificates of Airbus A321neo aircraft operated from Luton Airport. This compared aircraft with P&W (PW1000G) and CFM International (LEAP) engines. The largest difference was found on departure at the flyover location where the CFM engined aircraft were around 1.2 EPNdB quieter. This location was the most comparable with the monitor locations at Luton Airport.</p>	
4.3	<p>The committee welcomed the further information, which it was planned to share with the ANEG.</p>	

<p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p>	<p>LADACAN advised they had been in contact with the CAA who were looking to do more on this issue, but there was no timescale for this; the data the CAA had could not be shared due to copyright.</p> <p>LADACAN stated that what they were trying to do was to identify what the issue was, how generic it was, what the factors that might influence it were and, once understanding that, whether anything could be done about it to create the best noise environment possible.</p> <p>PAIN asked if there was any information about the peak noise generated with the Leap and P&W arrivals even though they sat within the certification levels. LADACAN informed the peak of the NEO noise was greater than the peak of the noise from the CEO engines suggesting that tonality was somewhat different. LADACAN informed that they would share the paper which had previously been shared with PAIN. LADACAN and Bickerdike Allen were happy for their work to be shared.</p>	<p>LADACAN</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p>QUARTERLY REPORT</p>	
<p>5.1</p>	<p>Total passenger numbers had increased by 6% and total traffic movements by 2%. The total movements in the night period, 23.00-06.59, were 16% lower when compared with the same quarter last year. The early morning, 06.00-06.59, movements were 9% higher than those in the same quarter last year.</p>	
<p>5.2</p>	<p>The noise monitor results showed most departures still produced noise levels in the range 70-76 dB L_{Amax}. In this period (2025 Q4), there were 2 daytime and no night time departures that registered at greater than 80 dB. Last year (2024 Q4), the comparable counts were two and zero.</p> <p>Members noted that the airlines had achieved CDA, for 93% of all arrivals.</p> <p>There were no noise violations during the daytime and 2 during the night-time. LLAOL continued to work closely with the airlines to reduce violations.</p> <p>The night-time noise contour area had decreased by 14% compared with the same quarter in 2024. It was noted that there were eight track violations in this quarter due to poor track keeping compared to nineteen in the same period in 2024</p> <p>The number of complaints had decreased from 804 in the last fourth quarter to 610 for the same period in 2025. The number of complainants was 36 down from 61 in 2024. The number of new complainants was 10. Complaints regarding arrivals on westerly operations formed the largest percentage of complaints.</p> <p>For this quarter, runway usage had been 73% westerly operations.</p>	
<p>5.3</p>	<p>Regarding the limit on early morning shoulder activity (12-month movements), the total for the preceding 12 months was 6,456 which was below the limit of 7,000.</p>	

	With respect to the limit on night quota activity (23.30-06.00) (12-month movements), the total for the preceding 12 months was 7,680 which was also below the limit of 9,650.	
5.4	<p>The sub-committee discussed the QMR.</p> <p>LLAOL questioned whether in the comparison of distribution of noise levels from individual events they should continue with comparing back to 2015 levels. It was agreed to revise this in future and instead compare back to data for 2019.</p> <p>In relation to dispensations, it was noted that none of the examples given in the QMR related to passenger hardship, which was the third most common reason. LLAOL agreed to look to include an example(s) in future reports.</p> <p>Concern was expressed over the number of movements at night approaching the limit. LLAOL advised that they were monitoring this daily to avoid any exceedance. It was also noted that in the last quarter night movements were noticeably down due to the periods of closure for the runway resurfacing.</p> <p>In relation to the aircraft types generating the most specific complaints it was noted the A320Neo/A321 Neo stood out with approaching 65% of the complaints but just under 40% of the movements. LLAOL advised that they were not aware of a specific correlation, with the circumstances prompting a complaint being variable, and not all of the complaints being submitted through Travis.</p> <p>In relation to the measured noise levels by the individual aircraft types at the different noise monitoring terminals, it was noted that the relative differences were not wholly consistent between NMT02 and NMT03. In the quarter the results at NMT03 were still compromised by the monitor being relatively close to the M1 for around half the period. It was therefore proposed to look at this in future once unaffected data was available.</p>	<p>LLAOL</p> <p>LLAOL</p> <p>LLAOL</p>
6.0	Airport Updates	
6.1	<p>Low Noise Arrival Metric (LNAM) - LLAOL advised that a trial of a LNAM, a new measure of continuous descent approach, was underway at another airport. LLAOL had considered conducting a similar trial but had concluded implementation was not possible. It was agreed to discuss this further, including the supporting report, at the next meeting.</p>	LLAOL
6.2	<p>Vectoring Release Altitude (NPR review) - LLAOL advised they had conducted a review of the vectoring release altitude on LLA's Noise Preferential Routes (NPR's). This was the altitude that an aircraft could be vectored off the route by Air Traffic Control. The review was to investigate increasing the vector release altitude to 4,000ft during the 24-hour period on all routes. After considering various factors, and engagement with NATS and airlines, LLAOL did not believe it was feasible to make the change within the current airspace setup.</p> <p>It was, however, agreed that there was a desire to make improved use of both continuous decent approaches and continuous climb operations. LLAOL agreed to highlight this message to UKADS.</p>	LLAOL

6.3	<p>Noise Insulation Scheme update - LLAOL provided an update on the Noise Insulation Scheme. This noted that 148 properties had been treated in 2025, and that in response to a feedback survey, 91% of residents were 'Extremely Likely' or 'Very Likely' to recommend the scheme.</p>		
6.4	<p>The noise insulation subcommittee had also met and provided direction on the next properties to be contacted.</p>		
<p>7.0 Any Other Business</p>			
7.1	<p>It was requested that the papers for the meeting be issued earlier. LLAOL agreed to see what could be accomplished.</p>	<p>LLAOL</p>	
7.2	<p>Analysis had been undertaken by PAIN on the size of the night noise contours based on the historic numbers of passengers and proportions of next generation aircraft. This found that if activity at night under the DCO grew in line with the overall growth, even with increasing numbers of next generation aircraft it did not appear the contour limits could be complied with.</p>		
7.3	<p>During the discussion that followed it was noted that the night contour limits were restrictive, and that during the work of the Noise Envelope Design Group a key feature of the DCO proposal was limited growth at night. It was also noted that the DCO required the creation of technical panels, one of which would be focussed on noise. They would ensure the limits were not exceeded.</p>		
7.4	<p>A member mentioned the contract that a resident is asked to sign for a mobile monitor to be placed at their property was seen as having some onerous requirements. LLAOL advised that they would seek advice from their legal department on the current wording.</p>		<p>LLAOL</p>
7.5	<p>The progress of the runway resurfacing was questioned. LLAOL advised that subject to weather the resurfacing was due to conclude on 27th March. Once complete the new Alpha taxiway would open and reduce the time taken for back-tracking by westerly departures. The extent that this might be used would remain an airline decision. It was planned to raise the use of the new taxiway at the next FLOPSC meeting.</p>		
8.0	<p>Dates of forthcoming Meetings in 2026</p> <p>10th June - 14.00hrs via Teams 16th September - 14.00hrs via Teams</p>		