

Minutes

Meeting of Noise & Track Sub Committee via Teams 8th September 2021

Attendees			
Mr Martin Routledge		LLACC Chairman	
Mr Jeff Charles		Bickerdike Allen Partners	
Mr Andrew Lambourne		LADACAN	
Ms Nicole Prior		LLAOL - Noise and Airspace Performance Manager	
Mr David Gurtler		Luton Borough Council	
Cllr Jane Timmis		Dacorum Borough Council	
Mr Neil Bradford		LLAOL - Stakeholder Communications Manager,	
Mr Neil Green		Buckinghamshire Council	
Laura Morris			
Cllr Annie Brewster		Hertfordshire County Council	
Mr Nigel Green		STAQS	
Mr Paul Donavan		Buckinghamshire County Council	
John Wilkinson		PAIN	
David Healey		NATS	
Cheryl Monk			
Alex Wong		LLAOL - Airspace Performance Assessor	
Richard Crooks			
Neil Thompson		LLAOL- Operations Director	
1.0	Apologies for absence and substitution		Action
	Conner Sheffield – Buckinghamshire County Council David Godfrey – PAIN Cllr David Bowater – Central Bedfordshire Mr Dougie Naismith - easyJet Cllr Paul Clark – North Herts District Council Cllr Curthroys – St Albans City and District Council		
1.1	The Chairman welcomed members to the September meeting and briefed on the protocols for the virtual meeting.		
2.0	Minutes and Matters Arising from 9th June Meeting		
2.1	The minutes of the meeting of 9 th June 2021 were approved.		
2.2	Actions: Item 4.4 NADP trial, some members reiterated their request that Wizz be asked to take part in the NADP trial because their aircraft mix was among the noisiest at Luton. LLAOL undertook to consider this as arrangements for the trial (which was currently on hold) developed.		LLAOL

	<p>Item 6.3 - Future Aircraft the minute did not truly reflect the comment by LLAOL that they would not operate airships from Luton in the near future. LLAOL advised that they were at the forefront of looking at hybrid fuels for current aircraft. It was noted that Airships had been operating for around 100 years, but it was hard to see them dominating the airline world of the future. However, in terms of new fuel technology (hybrid fuels; hydrogen fuels etc.) Luton were in the forefront and were working closely with JetZero and FlyZero for a more sustainable future. It was agreed the previous minutes should contain an acknowledgment and to state that airships were unlikely to be used in the near future.</p>	Admin
3.0	ACOG Update	
3.1	<p>Cheryl Monk (CM) briefed members on ACOG (Airspace Change Organising Group) and outlined the huge task of improving airspace and ACOG's involvement in the Airspace Management Strategy.</p> <p>ACOG were overseen by CAA and DfT were to co-ordinate the delivery of two major National Airspace Change programmes, FASI-S and FASI-N. It was noted that ACOG were not an executive authority and were not responsible for designing the new flight paths and new routes nor would they make any decisions; this responsibility fell to the CAA, NATS, the airports and the airlines. ACOG had been set up to coordinate and facilitate the program and their role had been welcomed by the various stakeholders involved.</p> <p>The Airspace Change Masterplan was to be developed in an iterative way over the next 2 to 3 years as information contained within it will become more refined as each design team at the separate Airports delivered their conceptual designs and Airspace Change Programmes. CM briefed further on the various iterations of the Master Plan.</p> <p>Iteration 2 was currently being progressed and would be produced in collaboration with aviation stakeholders and over time would include information of the airspace design options under development; the areas of overlap between the individual changes; and the compromises and trade-offs that needed to be made to integrate them effectively.</p> <p>It was noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite the inevitable COVID delay, all airports were now working on their designs for the airspace up to 7000 ft. and although flight numbers were low at the moment it was important that the program continued so that the infrastructure was in place for when flight numbers returned. It was important to improve resilience and environmental issues to ensure that airspace factors did not unduly constrain growth in the future or hinder the industry's efforts to meet their environmental targets or reduce the noise impact. • The final delivery for London's eleven airports was not envisaged for several years, perhaps early 2030's, • Initial work would be at high level, it would be necessary for Airports to consult publicly. 	

	<p>Members thanked ACOG for their presentation and the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACOG clarified that if there were any disputes between airports over the use of shared airspace, these would be resolved by DfT/CAA not ACOG. • ACOG stated that there were many challenges but there were a lot of talented people involved in the process. It was hoped that between them they would be able work out the technical aspects that were needed for the lower levels. • Stakeholder Engagement – the main influence would be through the airports as this was where stakeholders could influence change. The CAP1616 Airspace Change Process was being reviewed but local engagement was where communities were likely to have the most influence. • Because of Heathrow flight paths there was excessive overflying of communities in Hertfordshire at comparatively low levels and it had been hoped, within the last expansion at Luton, that aircraft could be routed higher. Who did communities need to address to progress change more quickly and what could they do to help the process? CM advised Heathrow had restarted their process and were trying to catch up because they accepted they had an impact on other airports; all needed to work together. It was noted that Heathrow was currently working on the basis of being a two-runway airport. • With the demise of ICCAN what was ACOG's view? All airports within scope would be looking at the policies around noise which would need to be followed as part of their ACPs. ACOG's interest would be in how to demonstrate the cumulative impacts of airspace change where there were two or more airport having an impact on the same communities. Therefore, the demise of ICCAN would not change anything ACOG were doing. It was noted that ICCAN were a body ACOG had been engaging with through the Master Plan and they would continue to engage through other stakeholders and with the CAA and DfT who were picking up ICCAN's work and who would continue to be responsible for Noise Policy. 	
4.0	Airspace Change Updates	
4.1	<p>NATS-Swanwick: Compton SID Truncation – NATS presented their London Airspace Modernisation Programme - NATS was proposing two changes which, subject to approval, would be implemented simultaneously in Spring 2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAMP Deployment 1.1 - Changes to the ATS route network (systemisation) as part of the UK's Airspace Modernisation Strategy (AMS). <i>ACP-2017-70</i> • FRA Deployment 2 - The introduction of Free Route Airspace (FRA) above ~FL245. <i>ACP-2019-12</i> <p>NATS advised that separate from FASI-S, they were seeking, where appropriate, to reduce the length of SIDs and obtain 'flight plan enabled fuel benefit' without change to the existing track over the ground or SID vertical profiles. This should alleviate aircraft operators' flight planning for unnecessary fuel uplift when departing airports with current lengthy SIDs. To meet CAA policy the SID truncation should have a saving of at least 10nm. Such truncations had been</p>	

	<p>undertaken at other London area airports, e.g. London Heathrow, WOBAN and BUZAD SIDs.</p> <p>NATS were in the process of seeking to truncate the Luton westerly departure SID to Compton, by terminating the SID earlier at RODNI. Once completed departure route usage statistics would be reported about RODNI not Compton. No noise detrimental noise change was forecast.</p> <p>There would be consultation by 29th November this year on these changes, and any implementation would not be before March 2023. If FASI-S required further changes they would be made.</p> <p>(NATS Presentation attached).</p> <p>Questions were taken and NATS advised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a section within CAP 1616 which is specifically references SID Truncations and these had been done for several years. • The on-route part of NATS were driving these changes because of the other changes that were happening above 7000ft. Therefore, although connected to a SID at an airport, this was more of a network change rather than an airport one as there would be no impact on airport operations or communities near the airport. • Because the changes were likely to be implemented before the airports had completed their detailed changes as part of the FASI programme it may well be necessary to change these again in the future. 	
4.2	<p>AD6, New Arrival Arrangements – LLAOL advised that they had submitted the AD6 proposal on the 25th June and that the full proposal document was available on the Airspace Change Portal and it had moved to Stage 5 of the Cap 1616 process which is the CAA decision. The CAA had initially replied by publishing CAP 2233, which advised that due to the proposed increase in Class G airspace the decision may be called-in by the Secretary of State. The CAA had set up a Public Evidence Session to seek views on whether the final decision should be taken by the CAA or DfT on 22nd September 2021. Members were advised that anyone could apply for a slot to participate and give their views on the proposal.</p> <p><i>Chairman's note: The AD6 change was subsequently approved by the CAA and will come in to force in 2022.</i></p>	
4.3	<p>FASI-S: Stage 2A Option Development - LLAOL advised they were working on Option Development and planned to reach the Stage 2 Gateway by March 2022.</p>	
5.0	<p>LLAOL Quarterly Monitoring Report Q2 for April to June 2021 (Q2)</p>	
5.1	<p>LLAOL briefed members on the changes to the AMR Q1 pages 17/18 report which has been republished. The changes related to Noise Graphs by aircraft type. Of note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A threshold had now been set at 100 events. To try and avoid misinterpretation of results. • An appendix had been created which would have all of the aircraft types regardless of the number of events and the comparison of 2019 data for NTSC members. • It was expected the need for the Appendix would be short-lived and the document would be produced for the next few quarters for NTSC members only. 	LLAOL

5.2	<p>Members noted the QMR for Q2.</p> <p>Compared with the same period last year, total passengers served had increased by 392%, total traffic movements increased by 155%; the total movements in the night period increased from 622 to 1065; with the early morning (06.00-07.00) movements increasing from 52 to 329.</p> <p>Regarding the limit on early morning shoulder activity (12 month movements), total for preceding 12 months was 2073 (limit 7,000). Regarding the limit on night quota activity (23.30-06.00) (12 month movements), total for preceding 12 months was 3463 (limit 9,650).</p> <p>Airlines had achieved Continuous Descent Approaches (CDA) for 86% of all arrivals for the quarter compared with 81% for the same period in 2020.</p> <p>The noise monitor results had shown that the majority of departures still produced levels in the range 70-76 dB L_{Amax}. There were no daytime departures and no night-time departures registering greater than 80 dB for the quarter this was the same when comparing to last year.</p> <p>There were no noise violations during the daytime or during the night-time. The night-time noise contour area increased by 70%. There were two track violations in this quarter due to poor track keeping</p> <p>The number of complaints had increased from 525 in the last second quarter to 2,213 in the same period in 2021. The number of complainants had been 123 in the second quarter of 2020 compared with 81 for 2021. The number of new complainants 19; in the same quarter in 2020 the number had been 49. Complaints about westerly departures still formed the largest % of complaints.</p> <p>The majority of complaints related to aircraft being too loud and the majority of the complaints came from Harpenden and Wheathampstead areas. 96% of the complaints came from just 10 individuals, and 925 were from just 2 individuals (mostly around westerly departures).</p> <p>As discussed at previous meetings a large number of complaints were received from 1 person (1974 complaints) these have been excluded from the graphs.</p> <p>Members were advised that the airport was aware of a campaign which started in June 2021 to increase the number of complaints which may have impacted the results for the end of Q2. LLAOL advised that they were aware of a letter that was sent to possibly to everyone who objected to 19m application as their name and address would have been visible on the public portal with a template to complain. LLAOL contacted LADACAN and STAQS and between them they drafted a letter to go to the complainants explaining there are better and more constructive ways to complain and directing them to LADACAN and STAQS as Groups that may be able to assist. Several letters have been sent, but numbers have not decreased yet. LLAOL thanked both Groups for their support with the letters.</p> <p>Further reference was made by members regarding the huge proportion of complaints that relate to noise (too loud) and remains the main issue why people complain and does not appear to be reducing in anyway. It was felt that there</p>	

	<p>should be more emphasis on trying to reduce noise and it was questioned how hard the airport and airlines were working to reduce noise as it feels like the issue of noise has been argued for many years without no real material outcome reduce or resolve.</p> <p>For this quarter, runway usage was 56% Westerly operations.</p> <p>The most complained about aircraft for Quarter 2 was the departure of the A321NEO aircraft which did remain within the corridor but was around 4,700ft near the railway line.</p>																																							
6.0	Airport Updates																																							
6.1	<p>NADP Trial – members were advised that it had not been possible to start the trial on the 1st July due to difficulties with the portable noise monitors. A decision was made to postpone the trial whilst works were carried out on the monitors. It was hoped that these issues would be resolved so that the trail could commence later in 2021. Whilst waiting for the trial to recommence, as requested by NTSC, LLAOL were in discussion with Wizz Air regarding their involvement; and answer was awaited.</p> <p><u>Airbus A321 NEO Performance.</u></p> <p>The LLACC Noise Advisor informed members that he had retrieved from the G info data base the actual noise certification results for specific Wizz aircraft.</p> <p>Wizz Air were operating the Airbus A321CEO and A321NEO at Luton Airport.</p> <p>The Wizz UK Aircraft Fleet comprised:</p> <p>Airbus A321NEO G-WUKM, G-WUKN, G-WUKO, G-WUKP</p> <p>Airbus A321CEO G-WUKC, G-WUKG, G-WUKH, G-WUKI, G-WUKJ, G-WUKK, G-WUKL</p> <p>The noise certificates for examples of each type show:</p> <table><tr><th rowspan="3">Noise Level (EPNL dB)</th><th colspan="2">Airbus A321NEO (G-WUKO)</th><th colspan="2">Airbus A321CEO (G-WUKK)</th><th rowspan="3">Difference</th></tr><tr><th colspan="2">Engine PW1133GA-JM</th><th colspan="2">Engine V2533-A5</th></tr><tr><th colspan="2">MTOW 89,000 Kgs</th><th colspan="2">MTOW 83,000 Kgs</th></tr><tr><td>FLYOVER</td><td>83.4</td><td></td><td>84.5</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>LATERAL</td><td>88.2</td><td></td><td>95.2</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>APPROACH</td><td>94.8</td><td>QC0.25</td><td>95.5</td><td>QC0.25</td><td>- 0.7</td></tr><tr><td>DEPARTURE (Fly + Lat) / 2</td><td>85.80</td><td>QC0.25</td><td>89.85</td><td>QC0.50</td><td>- 4.05</td></tr></table> <p>Members were advised that Airbus had been studying the Luton measured data and a report was expected soon.</p> <p>The LLACC Noise Advisor and LLAOL presented a summary of study on all measurements on the Airbus A321 aircraft at Luton in the period 2016 to 2020.</p> <p>This indicated, based on averaged results for 2019 and 2020, separately for each fixed Luton noise monitor that the NEO version using the SEL parameter was</p>	Noise Level (EPNL dB)	Airbus A321NEO (G-WUKO)		Airbus A321CEO (G-WUKK)		Difference	Engine PW1133GA-JM		Engine V2533-A5		MTOW 89,000 Kgs		MTOW 83,000 Kgs		FLYOVER	83.4		84.5			LATERAL	88.2		95.2			APPROACH	94.8	QC0.25	95.5	QC0.25	- 0.7	DEPARTURE (Fly + Lat) / 2	85.80	QC0.25	89.85	QC0.50	- 4.05	
Noise Level (EPNL dB)	Airbus A321NEO (G-WUKO)		Airbus A321CEO (G-WUKK)		Difference																																			
	Engine PW1133GA-JM		Engine V2533-A5																																					
	MTOW 89,000 Kgs		MTOW 83,000 Kgs																																					
FLYOVER	83.4		84.5																																					
LATERAL	88.2		95.2																																					
APPROACH	94.8	QC0.25	95.5	QC0.25	- 0.7																																			
DEPARTURE (Fly + Lat) / 2	85.80	QC0.25	89.85	QC0.50	- 4.05																																			

	<p>similar to the CEO version on landing (i.e. no quieter) and slightly quieter on departure. This arose from study of over one thousand results for the NEO aircraft, many thousands for the CEO and considering the slight differences of the aircraft type including variations in weather and load factors operation mechanisms.</p> <p>In summary the Noise Advisor informed that it appeared not to be as bad as they had expected but was still not achieving the 4dB anticipated. It was hoped that the work the Airport Team were carrying out with Airbus and Wizz would find a way of delivering the 4dB improvement that had been expected.</p> <p>It was noted that short term samples were of assistance, and LLAOL confirmed they would continue to provide all results to members even if sample numbers were small.</p> <p>AL from LADACAN reiterated his offer of assistance in the process of designing and executing a correlation analysis for this subject.</p> <p>The Chairman stated that the long-term aim was to understand the correct figures for the experience at Luton which would help with the forecasting of the contours.</p> <p>A further observation was made by a member that for those who are affected more by arrival aircraft noise than departure aircraft noise there was little respite on offer. Even though it appeared a metric had been found which tallied better with the certification data it did not improve the situation for those under the arrivals path. Consequently, even if the better noise reduction were delivered it should not be used as an excuse to increase flights as those on the arrivals path would still be badly impacted.</p>	
6.0	Any Other Business	
6.1	<p>Government's Policy on Aviation: Jet Zero Consultation: July-September 2021 - As advised in the Consultation, the Government believe the aviation sector can achieve Jet Zero without the Government needing to intervene directly to limit aviation growth (para 3.41). The Governments' proposed 'high ambition' scenario (2) indicates benefits of 4% due to use of zero emission aircraft, 8.8% due to the impact of carbon pricing, 14.4% due to use of sustainable aviation fuel (SAF), 36% due to fuel efficiency improvements and 36.7% due to abatement outside the aviation sector. [i.e. offsetting into robust schemes that remove or avoid an equivalent volume of emissions elsewhere, e.g. Greenhouse Gas Removal [GGR]].</p>	
6.2	<p>Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) Demise - The DFT who set up ICCAN in November 2018 have wound it up this month and will ask the CAA to take on some of the tasks undertaken by ICCAN. This followed a review by two people unidentified in the subsequent report who had no connections with the aviation industry or ICCAN.</p>	
7.0	Date of forthcoming Meetings in 2021	
	<p>All meetings for the foreseeable future will be held via Teams</p> <p>15th December 2021</p>	

