

Minutes

Meeting of Noise & Track Sub Committee via Teams 10th June 2020

	Attendees		
	Mr Martin Routledge	LLACC Chairman	
	Mr Jeff Charles	Bickerdike Allen Partners	
	Mr Andrew Lambourne	LADACAN	
	Mr Michael Nidd	LLATVCC	
	Neil Thompson	LLAOL – Operations Director	
	Nicole Morris	LLAOL - Noise and Airspace Performance Manager	
	Mr David Gurtler	Luton Borough Council	
	Gemma Davis	Luton Borough Council	
	Mr David Godfrey	PAIN	
	Cllr Jane Timmus	Dacorum Borough Council	
	Mr Neil Bradford	LLAOL - Stakeholder Communications Manager,	
	Alex Wong	Airspace Performance Assessor	
	Cllr Annie Brewster JP	Hertfordshire County Council	
	Cllr Anne Wight	Buckinghamshire County Council	
	David Healey	NATS	
	Mr Neil Green	Buckinghamshire County Council	
1.0	Apologies for absence and substitution		Action
	Paul Donovan – Herts County Council Cllr David Bowater – Central Bedfordshire Council Stephen Shearer – DHL		
1.1	The Chairman welcomed members to the meeting and ran through the protocols for the virtual meeting.		
2.0	Minutes and Matters Arising from 18th December 2019		
2.1	<p>The minutes from the of the meeting were agreed following 2 slight changes.</p> <p>Item 3.2/3.4 replacement of ‘Members noted the increase in night noise contour area’ with ‘some Members expressed concern over the increase in...’</p> <p>Item 3.7 – A member referred to the statement regarding passenger caps being a disincentive for airlines to switch to larger but quieter, more modern aircraft stating changing their fleet to the slightly larger NEOs would still make economic sense even with fewer passengers because of the improved fuel consumption.</p> <p>LLAOL – responded by stating that the current slots are allocated on an aircraft seat basis, the issue being that the current slot rule would have to be changed to accommodate the larger quieter aircraft. (it is a world slot guideline issue not just local to Luton) slots are allocated based on a number of seats not the load factors of the aircraft.</p>		

	<p>LLAOL advised that the issue with passenger cap was that Luton were very close to their limit (although this has now changed following the current Covid 19 situation). Luton could not allocate more seats as they could potentially breach their limit and the industry system worked on seats per aircraft type therefore to ensure the cap wasn't breached the Airport had to insist on smaller (often noisier) aircraft being allocated to slots. The Chairman enquired that if Luton needed to stay within the passenger limit an airline could be persuaded to use a 320 NEO rather than a 321 NEO. LLAOL confirm this could be the case in order to meeting the slot declaration requirements.</p> <p>Item 4.3 – Members enquired if the Section 73 application had gone to the Development Control Committee at the end of February. LBC advised that it did not go to Committee and that they had extended the time period because some of the other Councils needed to get their reports to LBC. Because of the pandemic lockdown the head of development management at Luton has advised the application would not be going to Committee until the lockdown period finishes.</p>	
3.0	LLAOL Quarterly Monitoring Report	
3.1	<p>The Chairman stated that due to the short notice cancellation of the last meeting, he would like to give members the chance to raise any comments on the headline statistics from the fourth quarter 2019.</p> <p>No items were raised and the fourth quarter report for 2019 was taken as read.</p>	
3.2	<p>For Quarter 1, Members were advised that there had been a decrease in passenger numbers; aircraft movements; night movements and shoulder movements, this was due to the impact of COVID towards the end of March. There was a decrease noted in CDA again mainly in March; the reason for this was that when skies are quieter aircraft are often given direct routing but while helpful this can sometimes disrupt planned descent distances to final approach. As a consequence, some on-route levelling out can take place and thus the descent is no longer continuous. This effect dropped the CDA rate to around 88-89% in March and a further drop is expected in April. The decrease in CDA has been seen across all airports during COVID and ATC are now trying to assist pilots by advising on how many track miles they have left which has already been seen to generate a slight improvement.</p>	
3.3	<p>Track violations were down, there were only 2, a further 65 aircraft were investigated, most of these were off track due to strong winds during the quarter.</p>	
3.4	<p>1368 complaints were received from 117 people, this was a decrease of 51% of complaints, and complainants decreased by 3%, however this was still quite high when compared to the low traffic numbers (81% of complaints were received from 10 people (these were mainly due to Westerly departures and coincided with the main runway in use being the Westerly runway).</p>	
3.5	<p>LLAOL referred to 4 new graphs which showed the noise levels by aircraft type from each of the noise monitors beneath the departure or arrival routes. The graphs show Runway 26 (now RWY 25) arrivals from noise monitor 1 and then the other three cover the departures (Runway 08 departures on NMT1 and Runway 26 departures on MNT2 and NMT3). The main things noted from these graphs was that the A320 NEOs were always the quietest over all of the noise monitors; the A321NEO aircraft were lower than the A321 at NMT2 and MT3 on Westerly</p>	

	<p>departures; and the A300 Cargo aircraft was typically the noisiest at each monitor. LLAOL asked for feedback regarding these graphs.</p> <p>Members thanked LLAOL for the graphs and agreed that this type of presentation was very useful, and it was agreed that seeing the relative benefit of the A321 NEO at other airports would be useful.</p> <p>Further discussion ensued regarding the difference in noise levels between A321 and the A321 NEO and a member asked as the A321 NEO had been flying since last July whether the same data for Quarter 3 and Quarter 4 in 2019 could also be made available.</p> <p>The Chairman questioned why that analysis would be useful moving forward and it was felt that there would be no real benefit going back over last year. LLAOL stated that at that stage the A321 had been introduced only on one of the heavier routes and this was not representative across the entire network; it was suggested that as and when the aircraft was rolled out across the whole network it would be something that could be looked at.</p> <p>The Chairman noted that unless all of these flights were doing the same routing and were the same weight we would not be comparing like with like; however, the data so far shows that whereas the A320 NEO is significantly quieter than its non NEO, the A321 NEO as currently tasked and used is producing results very similar to the older A321. It was agreed that this should be reflected in the noise forecast modelling.</p> <p>The Noise Adviser agreed that the graphs were useful and should continue to be produced for future meetings. He commented the findings from the graphs conflicted with what was happening at other airports on departure and the reason needed to be established.</p> <p>Members agreed that it was a very important issue moving forward and were keen to support LLAOL in what was seen as a key area for the future.</p>	
3.6	<p>Noise insulation scheme – The scheme had been paused due to COVID 19 as access to people's homes was not possible at this time. No date had been set to restart the scheme as it would depend on when people were more confident in letting work progress in their homes.</p>	
3.7	<p>There had been an increase in positioning aircraft during March, this was due to COVID 19 with airlines looking for somewhere to park their aircraft and thus were positioning to other local airfields using off airways routing.</p>	
3.8	<p>Concern was raised by some members that they felt that virtually nothing was going to be achieved with airspace changes to the Westerly departures felt that more effort had to be made to look at the diversification of the impact that the westerly departures had on the communities affected.</p> <p>LLAOL reassured Members that much of the airspace change initiative was designed to achieve relief to those affected by westerly departures and they were as engaged as anyone in the FASI(South) and associated proposals. The frustration with the pace of change was felt by all including the Airport, the operators and the communities.</p>	

4.0	Airport Updates	
4.1	COVID 19 / LLA reduced Traffic - LLAOL advised there had been a 86-90% reduction in total activity, and there was uncertainty over short term traffic forecasts for the rest of the year and in to 2021.	
4.2	Summer 2020 Operating Restrictions - LLAOL advised that they were lifting some of the self-imposed restrictions, designed to control the night noise contour area, to accommodate COVID 19 supporting cargo aircraft (not all QC1) and to allow a small number of ad-hoc movements per week(15 from the 1 st June) these relaxations would be reviewed monthly and would also include GA and maintenance flights. They had also removed the restriction on non-emergency diversions during the night-time (these happen very rarely). In advising these changes, LLAOL explained that in May there had been a reduction of 90% of total movements and 89% during the night period, the numbers for June were expected to be very similar, and they needed to provide operators with some flexibility whilst this was possible.	
4.3	<p>CAA`s Post Implementation Review (PIR) of Luton`s Airspace Change – Runway 26 Brookmans Park RNAV-1 S.I.D. Procedure [CAP1882] - LLAOL advised that CAA had published their PIR for the Westerly Match departure route in January /February as Stage 7 of the Airspace Change proposal. LLAOL provided the data to CAA in 2017 based on the requirements they gave and the CAA drew their own conclusions. Overall, they were happy with what the route looked like and their summary was separated into operational and environmental conclusions but overall stated that there did not need to be any modifications. There were 2 recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engage with the airlines and work collaboratively to identify if track keeping improvements can be achieved. Note from LLAOL: this was already being done on a regular basis through different forums. 2. To talk to NATS Operations to determine whether any improvements to vectoring and track keeping could be made. Note from LLAOL: vectoring was also monitored on a daily basis; and there was also another airspace change proposal in place for a permanent change to the Match Departure Route looking at RNP to see what might be possible. <p>The committee commented that as airspace was currently underutilised as a result of the COVID-19 turndown, whether Luton traffic might be allowed to fly higher due to lack of conflicts, and this could be accompanied by noise monitoring to demonstrate the benefit which could be subsequently delivered by FASI(South). LLAOL felt that it would be very challenging to set up a trial at the moment but that more continuous climbs should be a feature and the benefit could be modelled.</p>	
	<p>London Luton Airport Departures and Arrivals Future Airspace Strategy Implementation South (FASI-S) - Luton Airport was involved in the process to change the entire airspace across the South East of England (original target date for implementation was 2024) but the project was delayed because the CAA had not been able to resolve the NATS Master Plan.</p> <p>Consequently, Luton's Stage 2 Gateway in July 2020 has had to be postponed until July 2021 subject to the CAA approval of the timescales. The CAA have yet to accept a Master Plan which should sit alongside their Airspace Modernisation Strategy – this was a requirement before allowing any Airport to pass through Stage 2. There was also a need for Luton to engage and coordinate with other</p>	

	airports, however due to COVID 19 this had not been possible and some airports had been unable to develop their designs due to financial losses and the furloughing or removal of their own airspace change teams..	
	AD6 Update - This initiative related to safety by separating the arrival traffic which currently had shared routes and holding points for Luton and Stansted airports. The CAA had raised some questions over the Stage 3 submission and it was intended that LLAOL and NATS as joint sponsors would submit again in August 2020. If approved, this would lead to public consultation in late 2020. Likely implementation was currently expected by Feb/March 2022.	
5.0	Any Other Business	
	LLAOL gave an overview of the current situation with the Airport and how COVID 19 had affected the industry as a whole. The outlook in the short to medium term, and possibly in the long term, was very bleak for aviation.	
5.1	The committee were advised of the LLAOL/LADACAN work over the 2018 AMR modifications and the community noise reports. LLAOL were considering whether the old community noise reports should be retained on the website, concern was expressed that their role in recording trends in noise for local areas would be lost.	
5.2	Re-designation of the runway - Due to the migration of the magnetic north pole from Canada towards Siberia magnetic declination (the angle between magnetic north and true north) is changing. As a result, the runways previously designated 08 and 26 were now 07 and 25; a YouTube video showing the changes in signage required was completed recently by LLAOL.	
5.3	Support for the Airport - The committee indicated their willingness to support the Airport through the difficult circumstances created by COVID-19.	
6.0	Date of Meetings in 2020	
6.1	4 th September 2020 18 th December 2020	