

## Minutes

### Meeting of Noise & Track Sub Committee via Teams 8<sup>th</sup> June 2022

Attendees			
Mr Martin Routledge		LLACC Chairman	
Mr Gordon Breeze		PAIN	
Mr David Charles		Bickerdike Allen Partners	
Cllr N Green		Buckinghamshire Council	
Mr Gavin Jones		Buckinghamshire Council	
Mr Paul Donavon		Hertfordshire County Council	
Mr Nigel Green		STAQS	
Mr David Healey		NATS	
Mr Andrew Lambourne		LADACAN	
Mrs Rachel Webb		Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Association of Parish Councils	
Mr Neil Thompson		LLAOL – Operations Director	
Mr Alex Wong		LLAOL - Airspace Performance Assessor	
Mrs Alice May		LLAOL (Community Noise Executive)	
Mr Neil Bradford		LLAOL - Head of Marketing & Communications	
Mr Paul Gilbert		LLAOL (Communications Manager)	
Mr David Gurtler		Luton Borough Council	
1.0	Apologies for absence and substitution		Action
1.1	Cllr Annie Brewster – Hertfordshire County Council Mr Paul Donavan - Hertfordshire County Council Cllr David Bowater - Central Bedfordshire David Godfrey – PAIN (substituted by Gordon Breeze) Capt Dougie Naismith – easyJet Ms Nicole Prior - LLAOL - Noise and Airspace Performance Manager Ms Laura Leech – Buckinghamshire Council (substituted by Gavin Jones) Cllrs Jane Timmis – Dacorum Borough Council		
1.2	The Chairman welcomed members to the June meeting and reminded members on the protocols for the virtual meeting.		
2.0	<b>Minutes and Matters Arising from 16<sup>th</sup> March Meeting</b>		
2.1	The minutes of the meeting of 16 <sup>th</sup> March 2022 were approved subject a few typo's that had been passed to the Chairman.		

2.2	<p>Matters arising from previous meeting that would not be discussed under normal agenda items:</p> <p>Item 2.2. - NADP Trial “Noise Abatement Departure Procedure.” - LLAOL recirculated the Project Plan in the meeting papers. It was noted that a member of NTSC reiterated their willingness to assist in the design of the trial. This offer was supported by some members who felt that utilising the expertise of members made sense and would show transparency.</p> <p>Item 4.1. Steeper Approach Study - LLAOL advised that their report of the findings had been published on their website.</p> <p>Item 4.2. Noise Monitoring Schedule - LLAOL advised that they had made the change so that South Luton appeared twice, once for routine monitoring and once as part of the NADP trial.</p> <p>Item 4.3.1 AD6 - LLAOL confirmed that they had now added a slide to the presentation, showing actual tracks prior to the change and would recirculate.</p> <p>Item 5.1. Meeting Papers - LLAOL informed that they would provide the papers/slides for all agenda items in advance of meetings.</p> <p>Item 5.2. Airbus A321NEO: Noise – it was questioned if there was anything the NTSC could do to progress this item as it had been outstanding for a period of time. LLAOL advised that it was also an issue at Gatwick Airport and several parties were actively looking into it including Airbus, the CAA and Wizz. It was not thought the committee could greatly assist in the matter; however, LLAOL would see if Airbus were willing to update on any progress.</p> <p>Following concerns raised at a previous meeting regarding whether surface access information could be provided on a quarterly basis, members were advised that this would be picked up by the Passenger Services Sub Committee. The Chairman confirmed that it was work in progress and that the data used were provided by the CAA annually.</p>	<p>LLAOL</p> <p>LLAOL</p> <p>LLAOL</p>
3.0	<b>Quarterly Monitoring Report Q1 2022 (January to March 2022)</b>	
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LLAOL briefed members on the Q1 quarterly monitoring report.</li> <li>• The total number of passengers served by the airport had increased by 509%, total traffic movements increased by 248%, compared to Q1 2021. Whilst the total movements in the night period, 23.00-07.00, increased by 193% from those for the Q1 2021. The early morning, 06.00-07.00, movements increased by 72% when comparing with the Q1 2021.</li> <li>• With respect to the limit on early morning shoulder activity (12 month movements), the total for the preceding 12 months was 3,095 (limit 7,000).</li> <li>• With respect to the limit on night quota activity (23.30-06.00) (12 month movements), the total for the preceding 12 months was 4,027 (limit 9,650).</li> <li>• The Continuous Descent Approach (CDA) compliance for Q1 2022 was 88%, an improvement of 9% when comparing with the same period in 2021.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The noise monitor results showed the majority of departures still produced noise levels in the range 70-76 dB L<sub>A</sub>max. In this period (2022 Q1) one daytime departure and nil night-time departures were registered at greater than 80 dB. Last year (2021 Q1), the comparable counts were nil and nil. There were no noise violations during the night-time and one during the daytime.</li> <li>LLAOL advised there had been 11 track violations in this quarter due to poor track keeping.</li> <li>The night-time noise contour area had increased by 145% and for this quarter, runway usage was 67% westerly operations.</li> <li>The number of complaints had decreased from 1,075 in last first quarter to 839 in the same period in 2022. The number of complainants was 91 in the first quarter of 2022, up from 54 in the same quarter in 2021. The number of new complainants was 21. Complaints about easterly departures formed the largest percentage of complaints this was mainly due to the prolonged period of easterly operations during March.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.2</b>	<p>The NTSC discussed the QMR and considered the CDA achievement which was still below the target of 95% and the difference in performance between the various airlines was noted by members. LLAOL advised that they continued to work with airlines to improve their performance.</p> <p>In terms of the noise contours, it was advised that the shortfall in CDA achievement had a limited effect. Firstly, the noise benefits of CDA are generally distant from the airport, and secondly the airlines with the lowest performance, such as EL AL, were not the most common operators.</p> <p>Members expressed concern regarding the relatively high proportion of positioning flights and LLAOL agreed to investigate any reasons for this.</p>	<b>LLAOL</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<p>Members noted the reduction in the proportion of Airbus A321NEO movements. LLAOL informed that due to the lower number of air transport movements in Q1 2021 operators had utilised their NEO fleets more as the aircraft was more fuel efficient. As a result, there was a slightly larger proportion of NEO movements in that quarter compared with 2022.</p>	
<b>3.4</b>	<p>Members discussed the various complaints received, which included the events which had generated the most interest. LLAOL advised that all flights had remained within the appropriate corridors and were at various heights. It was noted that the majority of complaints were in March which again reflected the unusually high proportion of easterly operations.</p> <p>If was questioned if the effect of the few regular complainants, who make most of the complaints, could be removed to give better sight of new issues or make trends clearer. LLAOL advised that they would investigate this idea.</p> <p>The number of off-track departures was discussed and the reasons why some had been by passenger airlines who are normally much more compliant. It was suggested that some of the pilots from passenger airlines did not operate from Luton regularly and therefore were not so familiar with Luton's operating procedures</p>	<b>LLAOL</b>

	and NPR routes which operate slightly differently on certain aircraft Flight Management Systems.	
3.5	The graphs of average noise monitor result by aircraft type (QMR Section 4.3) were discussed. It was queried if the results from NMT2 from the end of January and the first half of February had been included, as there had been an issue with the monitor at that time. LLAOL advised that although the issue with the monitor had been resolved, through recalibration, the graphs included all the data for the quarter. LLAOL agreed to look into the effect of removing the data for the period of concern.	LLAOL
4.0	<b>Airport Updates</b>	
4.1	<b><u>FASI-S “Future Airspace Strategy Implementation South”</u></b> - LLAOL advised that they had successfully passed the Stage 2 Gateway of the CAA assessment at the end of March and had now moved to Stage 3a ‘Consultation preparation’. LLAOL were currently liaising with other airports that had made it through Stage 2 and were preparing consultation material for the route options. As many of Luton’s neighbouring airports had not yet passed the Stage 2 process, there was currently no timeline for the Stage 3 gateway. It was noted that Luton was the first airport to pass into Stage 3 followed by Stansted. It was further noted that the Airspace Change programme had restarted and was being supported by some government funding across all the FASI airports and was regaining the momentum which had been lost during COVID.	
4.2	<p><b><u>Full Length Departures</u></b> - LLAOL presented the initial results from a trial where all departures had been required to use the full length of the runway. The initial results suggested the effect was not straight forward and further analysis would be done with the results to be published in a report later in the year.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the initial results and questioned what period the comparison should be against. It was further suggested that the presence of confidence intervals in the data would be beneficial. LLAOL advised that the trial had been done at relatively short notice and was kept straightforward to minimise additional work for air traffic control. Further discussion ensued and it was concluded the trial was worth doing and had given some interesting, if unexpected, initial results. One member noted that the biggest challenge in the FLRD departure exercise was to decide what to compare the results with and the lack of an experimental design ahead of doing the trial. Further analysis was needed which LLAOL were planning to undertake.</p>	<p>LLAOL</p> <p>LLAOL</p>
4.3	<p><b><u>Noise Complaints Policy</u></b> – LLAOL presented to the NTSC the Noise Complaints Policy. The main effect would be to focus the analysis and replies more on specific complaints relating to individual events, as opposed to submissions which sometimes listed several events. LLAOL advised that all complaints would still be registered and would continue to form part of the quarterly and annual data reporting. It was hoped that the new way of reporting would make the data being received more accurate and could show more genuine trends. LLAOL did advised that information including LLA route maps would be provided to every first time complainant in the first instance.</p> <p>LLAO advised that the new Noise complaint policy would be implemented on the 1<sup>st</sup> July.</p>	

	The committee noted that the change might reduce some of the background noise from the complaints data allowing the easier identification of new issues and trends.	
<b>4.5</b>	<p><b><u>Summer Restrictions</u></b> - LLAOL set out the additional restrictions they were going to apply during the summer period to protect the summer contour area. Noise modelling had been undertaken which found with the restrictions the contour limits would be complied with. This had been done before the recent issues with flight cancellations across the industry. Members were advised that the passenger throughput was expected to be between 13 and 14 mppa this year but there was still much uncertainty around the forecasts and the contours had been modelled on the movements that had already been scheduled for the summer season.</p> <p>The committee questioned why a previous restriction on non-emergency diversions was not being implemented. LLAOL advised that there had been concerns from operators from other airports that this restriction meant aircraft operating to some other airports had to carry additional fuel to reach diversions further away. LLAOL stated that in reality the amount of diverted traffic to Luton was very little and it was felt the negative effect on the environment, of aircraft carry fuel unnecessarily, outweighed concern for the contours.</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>FLOPSC Feedback</b>	
	<p>The Chairman advised that the discussion at FLOPSC had been mainly related to operational matters not relevant to NTSC. However, the issue of operating at to scheduled times was discussed, particularly for flights in the late evening where any delay had the potential to impact on night noise contours and other restrictions.</p> <p>On the full-length departure trial, there had been some dissatisfaction expressed by crews as having to backtrack caused delays on departure. It was also noted that in some cases the availability of more runway had resulted in the flight management system applying less departure thrust being, as the aircraft could still achieve the required climb out parameters, but this in turn had possibly led to being lower over the noise monitors.</p>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
	Nothing further was raised.	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Date of forthcoming Meetings in 2022</b>	
	<p>All meetings for the foreseeable future would be held via Teams</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7<sup>th</sup> September</li> <li>• 14<sup>th</sup> December</li> </ul>	