

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY
2nd OCTOBER 2002 AT 7 PM IN THE BOARD ROOM
AT CITY AVIATION HOUSE, LONDON CITY AIRPORT**



PRESENT:

John Adshead	Chair
Bill Dunlop	Deputy Chair
Stuart Innes	Secretary
Cllr Pat Holland	London Borough of Newham
Cllr Chris Seddon	London Borough of Newham
Alan Medlock	London City Airport
Howard Sheppard	Docklands Business Club
David Kent	ABTA
Samantha Weaver	Gallions Housing Association
Glynis Webb	North Woolwich TRAs
Gertie Duffy	North Woolwich and Silvertown Community Forum
Sid Keys	Silvertown TRAs
Robin Whitehouse	London Borough of Newham

APOLOGIES:

Gary Hodgetts	London City Airport
Cllr Maureen O'Mara	London Borough of Greenwich
Paul Sweeney	Airline Operators Committee
Hamish Stewart	RODMA
Henry Philp	Custom House and Canning Tow Community Forum
Alan Robinson	West Silvertown Village Community Foundation
Inspector Sam Faulkner	Metropolitan Police (Observer)
Peter Mendham	Beckton Community Forum
David Atkins	Cyprus TRAs

IN ATTENDANCE:

Richard Gooding	London City Airport
Rob Grafton	London City Airport
Lorraine Bell	London City Airport
Jonathan Smith	London City Airport
Janet Goulton	London City Airport
Alison Charlton	London City Airport
Iain McDermott-Paine	London City Airport
Mark Burgess	Bickerdike Allen Partners
Mrs Pat Kent	ABTA

1. MEMBERSHIP

The Secretary reported that Henry Philp had been appointed to represent the Custom House and Canning Town Forum in succession to Cllr Alan Taylor and that Samantha Weaver had replaced Claire Irvine as the representative of the Gallions Housing Association.

2. PRESENTATION – SOUTH-EAST REGIONAL AIR STUDY (SERAS)

Richard Gooding outlined the key issues flowing from this study about which the Government, in common with similar studies in relation to other regions of the UK, was consulting with a view to an Aviation Policy for the next 30 years.

The Government's forecasts indicated that unless demand was constrained there would be a requirement by the end of 30 years for 3 additional runways in the South-East. SERAS examined in some detail where these might, or might not, be located. In relation to the more significant ideas the Airport's views were as follows:

- *An additional 2000 metre runway at Heathrow* – this was where the demand was focused and the concept was broadly supported.
- *Up to three additional runways at Stansted* – there was no objection to this providing there are no airspace implications for LCY but it raised the question whether the airlines and passengers using Heathrow would be prepared to move. This seemed unlikely but the continued growth in low cost air travel meant that Stansted would probably end up with at least one additional runway.
- *A new airport at Cliffe, North Kent* - this was opposed as it was clear that the arrival and departure routes for aircraft using such an airport would have a deleterious effect on air traffic to and from London City and other London airports. It was felt, moreover, that such an airport would only be commercially viable if Heathrow were to be closed
- *No new Runway at Gatwick* – while it was important to preserve the integrity of the agreement with the West Sussex County Council prohibiting further runways at Gatwick until 2019, there seemed to be no reason why a 30-year policy could not contemplate a further runway after that time.

London City Airport – The Government foresees that LCY will continue to play an important niche role as a mainly business airport serving the local market. The Airport would agree with this comment. There were no suggestions for growth at LCY beyond that already permitted within the present limit of 73,000 air transport movements (ATMs) which the Government had calculated, would mean a passenger throughput of circa 5 mppa by the end of the 30 year period. The rate at which this growth occurred would depend on what capacity is provided elsewhere. SERAS envisaged that the provision of runways elsewhere mid-term might produce a temporary fall in the demand for travel from LCY although the Airport thought a temporary levelling-out in demand was more likely.

Although SERAS envisaged growth at LCY within 73,000 ATMs currently permitted, the consultation process, together with discussions about Crossrail, the London Plan and the future growth of the Thames Gateway, had nonetheless given rise to the question whether the Airport should plan for growth beyond 5mppa? The London Plan indicates there will be substantial growth in the population of the eastern part of London and the Thames Gateway. A large proportion of all new jobs expected to be created over the next 15 years in London will occur in the finance and business service sectors, concentrated in the City of London and Canary Wharf, LCY's catchment area. In the light of these factors, the Airport was beginning to think there may be more growth in the market for business air travel than had previously been assumed, growth in which LCY and the local area might share. Any such growth at LCY would need to be environmentally sustainable and would require, for example, the extra surface access capacity offered by the routing of the Ebbsfleet branch of Crossrail through the Royal Docks with a single station in the vicinity of the Connaught Crossing. It would also require a rising in due course of the present 73,000 limit on the permitted number of ATMs.

The Airport had not yet examined these ideas in any detail and it was unwilling to incur the substantial expense involved in doing so unless the local authority and the Airport's neighbours in the community were prepared in principle to contemplate further growth.

The Airport would be talking similarly to the London Borough of Newham and it was happy if asked to repeat the presentation to the Community Forums and other local bodies.

In response to questions Richard said:

- Any growth of the kind described would *not* require a longer runway or aircraft larger than those already permitted to use the Airport. The obstacle clearance requirements for the Airport ruled out any question of a longer runway, as does the siting of two bridges at either end of the runway. It could be expected over time that the use currently made of the smaller permitted types (e.g. 30 seats) would diminish in favour of those at the higher end of the list (e.g. those offering 80-100 seats) and that more of

the seats would be filled. For example, the present throughput of passengers of 1.6 mppa, involved 200 atms per day. When passengers numbers rose to 4-5 mppa it was expected (under SERAS assumptions) that the number of atms would rise to only about 240-250 per day.

- The present facilities at the Airport, with improvements already implemented or planned, were thought to be adequate for 3.5-4 mppa. Beyond that there would need to be more investment.
- LCY is not recognised as a hub airport; most of the passengers are point-to-point travellers and at present there is very little interlining.
- There is a rough correlation of 1000:1 between the number of passengers using an airport and the number of people employed to provide the service. Thus, the present number employed at the Airport (approximately 1400) would have grown to 5000 by the time the Government's forecast of growth to 5 mppa is reached. If further growth were decided upon the number of jobs would grow in proportion.
- The Airport had not yet explored the cost of further growth but it would be substantial.

After discussion the Committee decided:

- (a) it was broadly in agreement with the Airport on the key issues raised in SERAS and that the Secretary, in consultation with the Chairman, should respond accordingly
 - (b) it was prepared in principal to contemplate and discuss growth at the Airport in excess of that already permitted but on the understanding that no such increase would involve any increase in the present length of the runway or any significant variation of the current rules as to the permitted types of aircraft.
3. The **MINUTES** of the meeting held on July 2002 were approved as a correct record of the discussions at that meeting.

4. **MATTER ARISING**

(a) Item 3(a) – Docklands Light Railway – Extension to Airport and North Woolwich

The DLR had announced on 27th August 2002 that its preferred bidder for the £300m concession to design, build, finance and maintain the extension over a 30 year period is *City Airport Rail Enterprise* (CARE), a consortium of AMEC and the *Royal Bank of Scotland*. It was expected that work will begin in January 2003 with completion in the autumn of 2005.

In a leaflet distributed to residents the DLR had indicated that the works would inevitably cause a degree of disruption and road users might experience delays during temporary road and footway closures and diversions. In order to minimise the impact of the works a mandatory *Code of Construction Practice* would be drawn up in liaison with Newham Council and there would be a telephone hotline in working hours to provide information and deal with complaints. The hotline number would be displayed prominently at all work sites

(b) Item 3(c) – Noise Insulation Programme

Jonathan Smith updated the Committee on this programme – a copy of his report is attached to these minutes.

The Committee noted it was intended soon to provide insulation for 140 homes which had been identified as being affected by noise from the forthcoming construction of the new holding point at the eastern end of the runway. Gertie Duffy and Glynis Webb asked for maps showing these properties so that the residents concerned could be advised.

(d) Item 3(d) – Airport Fun Day 2002

This event had been held on Saturday, 6th July 2002. Attracting more than 12,000 visitors it had been very successful and enjoyable. The proceeds, which were still coming in, would be combined with the proceeds of the Airport's Christmas Business Party and would be donated to the Richard House Trust and CYANA (Cancer You Are Not Alone). Photographs of Fun Day had been posted on Committee's web site at www.lcacc.org

(c) Item 3(e) – Runway Reconfiguration Project

These works had been successfully completed. The Airport acknowledged that the Wet Bike Club had suffered problems during these works. While it was not yet clear where the responsibility lay it was the Airport's intention that the Club should be compensated. Cllr Holland said that compensation offered to the Club on a previous occasion had not materialised.

(d) Item 13(e) – Crossrail

A copy of the Committee's letter in support of the Royals option, with a single station in the vicinity of the Connaught Crossing, had been circulated to members on 3rd September. An acknowledgement from the Head of Public Affairs at Crossrail indicated that the Committee's views would be reported to Crossrail's Board when it considers recommendations for a preferred scheme in October 2002. More detailed information would be provided in February and March 2003 as the scheme is prepared for the approval process.

5. AIRPORT STATISTICS

The charts were noted – see also the Airport Director's Report (Item 6).

6. AIRPORT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Alan Medlock tabled his report a copy of which is attached to these minutes. He highlighted the following matters:

(a) Airfield Lighting

This was to be replaced/refurbished. The work would be carried out at night and at weekends but it was unlikely that it would give rise to noise or nuisance. Nonetheless a contact number would be established and notified to the local representatives so that residents could report any problems.

(b) Operational Improvements Programme – Runway Holding Point

The Airport's Board had approved the carrying out of these works but the extension of the apron to provide 5 extra stands had been deferred for the time being. The works to build the holding point were expected to commence in January 2003 and last for about 12 months. There would be more information for the Committee once the contractor had been appointed.

Local members referred to the likely nuisance from works lighting and vehicles, especially flashing beacons which were a particular nuisance at night time. Jonathan Smith said that because of the proximity of the runway the works will take place predominantly at night but where possible noisier work would be scheduled into daylight periods such as Saturday afternoons. To the extent that it was necessary to work at night every effort would be made to minimise the impact of the lighting on local residents. There would also be strict management of the works compounds. These were all matters to be discussed with the contractor when he is appointed and there would be a further report to the Committee.

Cllr Holland urged that the Airport should consult with the Wet Bike Club (Mervyn Phillips) which had suffered from dust and other problems during the runway reconfiguration works – see Item 4(c) above.

7. STANDING ITEM ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

(a) Environmental Report

The Report was tabled and noted - a copy is attached to these minutes. It was noted that many complaints were concerned with track-keeping which could now be investigated through the Noise and Track Keeping System (NTK) system. The Airport offered to demonstrate this system in action at the next meeting of the Committee. This was agreed.

(b) NTK Commissioning - Noise Event Validation

Mark Burgess distributed to members a table (copy attached to these minutes) which showed the Mean Departure Noise Level for various types of aircraft using Runway 10 over a recent period of one month. The readings were slightly higher than historical

measurements using the noise monitors over a number of years would suggest. This gave rise to a strong suspicion that noise measurements were now subject to distortion because of construction noise, the reflection of noise from new buildings etc. This would need to be investigated.

The Airport were now very concerned about the positioning of the noise monitors and the impact of new buildings. It had not been possible to take readings for Runway 28 because Monitor NMT1 had been out of operation for nine months because of building work. It was now about to come back into use but NMT 2 would soon be out of service when work starts on another major development. It was increasingly difficult to persuade developers to allow monitors to be positioned on their land and this gave rise to the question whether the local planning authority could help secure suitable sites through the development control system.

Robin Whitehouse said he doubted whether it would be possible for his planning colleagues to help in this way, but he would pose the question to his planning colleagues. He was concerned about the continued delay in getting the system – including noise penalties and credits - fully operational. He accepted that there were problems with noise monitoring but it should be possible quickly to validate the radar links in the track-keeping system and bring it fully into operation.

8. EU DIRECTIVE 2002/30/EC - PROPOSALS FOR RULES AND PROCEDURES FOR INTRODUCING RESTRICTIONS AT COMMUNITY AIRPORTS

The Secretary said that while the Government's proposals for the implementation of this Directive seemed to be sensible there was a need to define/clarify how the new rules and procedures would apply in a case where it was proposed to impose or modify operating restrictions through the planning system. At London City, for example, the operating restrictions are enshrined in conditions attaching to the 1998 planning permission and in an associated agreement under s. 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Under the proposed new arrangements these restrictions would remain in force. But if it were to be decided to vary them, or impose new ones, it would need to be clear how the procedures applicable under the Town and Country Planning Acts should be harmonised with those flowing from the Directive and to clarify in such a case who would be responsible for carrying them out.

The Committee agreed that the Secretary should respond accordingly

9. PUBLIC SAFETY ZONES – REDEFINITION AND NEW GUIDANCE

Copies of the maps showing the new zones, and the guidance attaching to them, had been circulated to members and copies had also been posted on the Committee's website. The Secretary said that while it had taken a long time to settle the new PSZs the impact was much less than it would have been if the Department's 1999 proposals had been adopted and the Airport were to be congratulated for their diligence in the matter.

10. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Committee agreed that henceforth its meetings should be held on Tuesdays and the following dates for meetings in 2003/04 were agreed:

Tuesday, 7th January 2003
Tuesday, 1st April 2003
(End of Committee Year)
Tuesday, 1st July 2003
Tuesday, 7th October 2003
Tuesday, 6th January 2004
Tuesday, 6th April 2004

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(a) Code of Practice - Access To Air Travel For Disabled People

At its meeting in April 2002 the Committee heard that this code, about which there had been no consultation with airport consultative committees, was being finalised for issue in the Spring. Recent inquiries of the Mobility and Inclusion Unit at the Department for Transport indicated that they were now working “to an Autumn launch”

(b) Vacancies for Female Security Officers

Lorraine Bell said that the Airport was anxious to recruit more female Security Officers. It was proposed to hold a recruitment coffee morning on Friday 1st November – see attached leaflet. Local members undertook to do what they could to publicise this event.

(c) Motorcycle Event

In response to a question by Sid Keys the Airport confirmed that the motorcycle event held at the Airport the previous Saturday was the Classic Bike Display which was to have been held in June but which had been postponed. The organisers were permitted to use the Airport for this purpose in recognition of their assistance in running the Airport’s Fun day

(d) Airport Access Road – Street Lighting

Sid Keys said that the street lighting on the Airport access road had not been operational earlier that evening or the previous evening. Alan Medlock said he would make enquiries.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 7th January 2003 at City Aviation House at London City Airport

MINUTE 4(b)
Sound Insulation Scheme
Implementation Project Status Report

Banks Wood, London City Airport's (LCY) quantity surveyors have now completed the recording of all of the surveys carried out to each domestic property within the current scheme. They have about 100 queries under investigation with the contractor (Granville) and hope to process these within the next month. As a result, the majority of grants have been paid to private owners, with the remainder being sent out.

The information for LB Newham on their properties is also being finalized and will be sent out as a package before the end of the month for them to sign off the work carried out. Grants to the housing associations are also being assessed and paid out.

The door is not closed to individual householders who come forward in the future as there is a procedure for these to be surveyed for work or grant assessment as required.

A series of recorded letters has gone out to all of the properties that had not responded to previous letters and visits as well as those that refused access. The letter allows for householders to be included in the scheme if they decide to, but also draws a line under the formal contact made by LCY and its contractor as required by the Section 106 agreement. It must be emphasized that every effort has been made to contact the householders in terms of personal visits (minimum three per property at all times of the day and week) and letters and telephone calls. However the overall percentage of these properties is low.

The next aspect that is being considered are those properties affected by the 'construction work' noise from the Operational Improvements Project (OIP) being undertaken over the next 14 months by LCY. The work centres on approximately 140 specific properties sited in North Woolwich that the Airport's noise consultant Bickerdike Allen have assessed could be affected by noise from the works. The scheme to survey these properties and carry out insulation where necessary will begin at the end of the year when the appointment of a contractor is confirmed. Progress with this project will be notified to the Committee as it develops.

Jonathan Smith
Project Manager

MINUTE 6
Airport Director's Report – July 2002

1. Statistics

As expected, September figures showed a substantial recovery from last year. Passenger numbers were up 22%, and aircraft movements up 16%. However it is more useful to compare the first nine months of 2002 with the same periods in 2001 and 2000. Passenger numbers for January to September are 3% down on last year, but 4% up on 2000. Aircraft movements were unchanged from 2001, but 10% up on 2000.

Corporate aviation has increased by 55% over the first nine months of the year. This growth can largely be attributed to three factors:

- The general increase in corporate aviation following the events of 11 September 2001.
- The provision of additional aircraft parking in March, and the operation of the LCY Jet Centre from July,
- The delivery of a Falcon 900EX to be owned and operated by London City Airport Jet Centre.

2. Routes

VLM now operate 5 times per day to Manchester. With the start of the VLM service on 9th September, the plans by another carrier to begin operating services to Liverpool later in the month failed to materialise.

With the start of the winter schedules at the end of this month, Air France's service between London City Airport and Paris Charles de Gaulle (CDG) Airport will be partly transferred to Paris Orly Airport with 5 weekday frequencies to Orly and one weekday frequency to Paris CDG. Orly offers a shorter journey time to the main business districts of the French capital, and customers will also benefit from faster connections onto the Air France domestic network and excellent connections to the Caribbean. Check-in times for this service will be shorter: 30 minutes at Paris CDG, 20 minutes at Orly and 10 minutes at London City. Air France is the only carrier to serve Orly from the United Kingdom. Air France has announced the withdrawal of services to Clermont Ferand at the end of this month, and has ceased to operate the Rennes/Le Havre route.

Lufthansa has suspended services to Dortmund.

KLM have announced an increase in services to Amsterdam, adding a sixth flight this winter.

Zurich will remain at 7 flights per day during the winter, rather than reducing to 6 as originally planned.

3. Airport Facilities

Bewleys have opened a new coffee shop in the Departure Lounge, replacing Caviar House.

The new Corporate Aviation administration building was officially opened by Dermot Desmond on 18th September. The Managing Director, Richard Gooding, and the Mayor of Newham, Sir Robin Wales, welcomed guests and potential customers, to the new facility.

The runway work has now been completed, although the contractors are dealing with a few items not yet completed to our satisfaction.

We expect to start work later this month to renew the airfield lighting systems, replacing worn out cable, obsolete equipment, and installing improved runway light fittings. Although this work is planned to take place at night, and over the weekends, we do not anticipate any noise or inconvenience to local residents.

The Board has approved the first phase of the programme to improve the operation of the airport. This first phase will involve the construction of a holding point at the eastern end of the runway, over the KGV dock. Work will commence in January 2003, and is expected to take about twelve months to complete. A decision on the construction of the parking area over the dock has been postponed until we see a return to normal growth in the industry.

4. Other

From 11th November, Newham will be assigning police officers to the airport, to provide a permanent uniformed police presence, replacing the officers assigned on an ad-hoc basis. These officers will patrol the airport, and the developments around the KGV and Albert docks. By the end of the year, the Borough will also assign a number of community support officers to the airport. We will be meeting with the police to clarify the role of these uniformed officers, particularly that of the community support officers, how they will interact with our own security officers, and how they will work with the existing Special Branch team at the airport.

Alan Medlock
Operations Director

MINUTE 7
London City Airport Consultative Committee
Environmental Issues – July/September 2002

A total of 21 complaints/enquiries relating to environmental issues were received during the period detailed above. A summary is detailed below:

- 8 of these complaints relate directly to aircraft noise and/or flight paths. Of these 8, 4 came from the same complainant.
- 7 complaints related to the Runway Reconfiguration Project (RRP) works
- 5 complaints related to the Junkers 52 Lufthansa promotional flights from LCY in July
- 1 complaint related to engine runs and airport odour

1. DATE RECEIVED: 13.7.02
TIME OCCURRED: early hours DATE OCCURRED:
AREA: Royal Docks, E16
COMPLAINT: RRP – Nuisance floodlighting
RESPONSE: Telephone call
2. DATE RECEIVED: 13.7.02
TIME OCCURRED: 4 - 5am DATE OCCURRED: Various
AREA: Thamesmead, SE28
COMPLAINT: Alleged landing aircraft out of operational hours
RESPONSE: E-mail/ Not LCY related
3. DATE RECEIVED: 14.7.02
TIME OCCURRED: 18.05 DATE OCCURRED: 14.7.02
AREA: Silvertown, E16
COMPLAINT: Long engine run/airport odour
RESPONSE: Letter/airport visit
4. DATE RECEIVED: 15.7.02
TIME OCCURRED: 17.30 DATE OCCURRED: 15.7.02
AREA: Barnehurst, Kent
COMPLAINT: JU52
RESPONSE: Telephone call
5. DATE RECEIVED: 15.7.02
TIME OCCURRED: 17.45 DATE OCCURRED: 15.7.02
AREA: Blackheath, SE3
COMPLAINT: JU52
RESPONSE: Telephone call
6. DATE RECEIVED: 15.7.02
TIME OCCURRED: Various DATE OCCURRED: 15.7.02
AREA: Tower Bridge area
COMPLAINT: JU52
RESPONSE: Telephone call

7. DATE RECEIVED: 16.7.02
 TIME OCCURRED: 11.25 DATE OCCURRED: 16.7.02
 AREA: Belvedere, DA17
 COMPLAINT: JU52
 RESPONSE: Telephone call
8. DATE RECEIVED: 16.7.02
 TIME OCCURRED: Various DATE OCCURRED: 16.7.02
 AREA: Tower Bridge Area, SE1
 COMPLAINT: JU52
 RESPONSE: Telephone call
9. DATE RECEIVED: 17.7.02
 TIME OCCURRED: Various DATE OCCURRED: 17.7.02
 AREA: Silvertown, E16
 COMPLAINT: RRP – Dust plumes from early departures
 RESPONSE: Telephone call/ATKINS
10. DATE RECEIVED: 30.7.02
 TIME OCCURRED: ? DATE OCCURRED: 30.7.02
 AREA: Camel Road, E16
 COMPLAINT: RRP
 RESPONSE: Referred by LBN/Telephone call ATKINS
11. DATE RECEIVED: 31.7.02
 TIME OCCURRED: Early hours DATE OCCURRED: 31.7.02
 AREA: RRP - Britannia Village
 COMPLAINT: Vehicle hazard beepers
 RESPONSE: Telephone call
12. DATE RECEIVED: 26.7.02
 TIME OCCURRED: Various DATE OCCURRED: Various
 AREA: Wood Green
 COMPLAINT: General re-perceived increase in movements
 RESPONSE: Telephone call
13. DATE RECEIVED: 30.7.02
 TIME OCCURRED: Late pm DATE OCCURRED: 30.7.02
 AREA: Silvertown, E16
 COMPLAINT: RRP – Night time construction noise
 RESPONSE: Telephone call/e-mail/ ATKINS/LCY
14. DATE RECEIVED: 31.7.02
 TIME OCCURRED: Night time DATE OCCURRED: 31.7.02
 AREA: Silvertown, E16
 COMPLAINT: RRP – Night time construction noise
 RESPONSE: Telephone call
15. DATE RECEIVED: 11.8.02
 TIME OCCURRED: 16.50 DATE OCCURRED: 11.8.02
 AREA: Canning Town, E16
 COMPLAINT: Aircraft noise & flight paths
 RESPONSE: Telephone call/Operations

16. DATE RECEIVED: 12.8.02
 TIME OCCURRED: 19.36 DATE OCCURRED: 12.8.02
 AREA: Canning Town, E16
 COMPLAINT: Aircraft noise & flight paths
 RESPONSE: Telephone call/Operations
17. DATE RECEIVED: 12.8.02
 TIME OCCURRED: 20.22 DATE OCCURRED: 12.8.02
 AREA: Canning Town, E16
 COMPLAINT: Aircraft noise & flight paths
 RESPONSE: Telephone call/Operations
18. DATE RECEIVED: 16.8.02
 TIME OCCURRED: Various DATE OCCURRED: 16.8.02
 AREA: Canning Town, E16
 COMPLAINT: Aircraft noise and flight path
 RESPONSE: Telephone call/Operations
19. DATE RECEIVED: 16.8.02
 TIME OCCURRED: 20.39 DATE OCCURRED: 16.8.02
 AREA: Canning Town, E16
 COMPLAINT: Aircraft noise and flight path
 RESPONSE: Telephone call/Operations
20. DATE RECEIVED: 3.9.02
 TIME OCCURRED: Night time DATE OCCURRED: 3.9.02
 AREA: Silvertown, E16
 COMPLAINT: RRP – Night time construction noise
 RESPONSE: Telephone call/ATKINS
21. DATE RECEIVED: 7.9.02
 TIME OCCURRED: 18.45 DATE OCCURRED: 7.9.02
 AREA: Grays, Essex.
 COMPLAINT: Aircraft seemed too low
 RESPONSE: Telephone call- Operations

NTK Update

Tabled by Bickerdike Allen Partners – London City Airport Acoustic Consultants – see copy on next page

Bickerdike Allen Partners

LONDON CITY AIRPORT

NOISE AND TRACK KEEPING SYSTEM COMMISSIONING.

NOISE EVENT VALIDATION

Figures shown are the Mean Departure Noise Levels (MDNL)

AIRCRAFT TYPE	00/01 ANNUAL CATEGORISATION REPORT (PNdB)	AUGUST 2002 (PNdB)
ATR43/45	90.3	91.1
BAe146	93.6	94.6
Citation V/II	94.7	91.2
Dornier 328	88.4	90.1
Dash 8-100	88.8	89.7
Dash 8-300	88.4	89.9
Dash 8-400	88.4	90.7
Fokker 50	90.4	91.6
Falcon 50	94.4	94.6
RJ1H/RJ85	93.7	95.2
Saab 2000	89.0	87.9