

THE NOISE & TRACK MONITORING ADVISORY GROUP (NaTMAG) 21st September 2017

In attendance:

Lee Howes (Chair)	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Airspace & Environmental Performance Manager
Brendan Sheil	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Flight Performance Team Manager
Jessica Patel	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Flight Performance Team
Kimberley Heather	Gatwick Airport Ltd - Flight Performance Team
Harry Mallows	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Flight Performance Team
Tara Whittaker	Gatwick Airport Ltd – Flight Performance Team
Brian Cox	Independent Technical Advisor to GATCOM
Ian Greene	Department for Transport
Mike George	GATCOM
Ken Harwood	GATCOM
Peter Barclay	GATCOM
Alan Jones	GATCOM
Charles Yarwood	GATCOM
Adam Dracott	Horsham District Council

Item	Action
<p>1. Apologies</p> <p>Leon Hibbs – Reigate and Banstead Borough Council</p> <p>Michael Payne – GATCOM</p> <p>Andy Sinclair – Gatwick Airport Ltd – Head of Airspace, Strategy and Engagement</p> <p>Vicki Hughes – Gatwick Airport Ltd – Community & Industry Noise Engagement Manager</p> <p>Andrew Burke – NATS Swanwick</p> <p>Liz Kitchen - GATCOM</p> <p>Douglas Moule – Airline Operators Committee</p>	
<p>2. Previous Minutes</p> <p>1. Brian Cox referred to item 9 on ground noise monitoring in the May 2017 minutes and asked whether the ground noise report from Ian Flindell was available. Brendan Sheil advised that the Gatwick Airport’s Master Planning Team had prepared a data sheet which was sent to Brian Cox. There are no plans to publish the whole report at the present time. Mike George noted that the report was referred to in a planning application to Crawley Borough Council, therefore it is to be treated as a supporting document, hence the need for this document to be made public. Brendan Sheil asked if the whole document was referenced in the Crawley planning application and the content verified. Brian Cox confirmed that the document was referred to in the application but he was only sent some of the data but not the whole report. He also made the point that it should be an available document to Crawley Borough Council as the Local Planning Authority, as a source of reference for the figures quoted in the planning application. The spreadsheet he received itself was not sufficient. The last ground noise report was published in 2010 so the 2016 version is due for release. He noted that the Crawley planning application was being held up by the lack of supporting evidence from the report. Brendan Sheil advised that he will bring this matter to the attention of the Master Planning Team.</p>	<p>BS 14/2017</p>

<p>2. Ken Harwood referenced recent personal aircraft observations (aircraft appeared unusually close to each other) and noted that he has been in contact with Lee Howes and Harry Mallows to analyse the cause of these disturbances. Harry Mallows explained that there are aircraft from Heathrow Airport which are heading south-east and these are, on occasion, mistaken for Gatwick Route 4 or 5 departures. The Flight Performance Team (FPT) have received complaints from individual's claims these aircraft have been vectored from Route 4. Lee Howes assured Ken Harwood that this flow of Heathrow traffic is common and that there are separation requirements of 1,000ft for aircraft flying in close proximity to one another regardless of the airport of origin. He advised NaTMAG members that there are many types of flight tracking software available online to track flights such as Gatwick's Casper NoiseLab, Flightradar 24 and the NATS flight tracker 'Airspace Explorer'. <u>Post-note:</u> The public version of Casper Noise Lab only shows Gatwick related traffic. The FPT records a number of complaints and complainants have commented that some aircraft are not shown on Casper.</p>	
<p>3. Action Tracker</p> <p><u>15/2015 – Invite FLOPSC member to attend NaTMAG</u></p> <p>Kan Ni was invited to attend NaTMAG at the last FLOPSC but declined. Lee Howes advised that there has been a recent change over of senior Gatwick staff and that Kan Ni has now become Head of Airfield and that he may find NaTMAG difficult to attend with his other duties. Lee Howes suggested that Kan Ni, or a senior member of his team, would be able to attend on an ad hoc basis if there were specific topics that would require input from an airfield perspective. Alan Jones was concerned as he assumed there would be someone from airfield operations that would attend. Brendan Sheil mentioned that originally Gary Cobb was invited but has since moved departments within Gatwick Airport. Alan Jones mentioned that NaTMAG members find attending FLOPSC useful and that someone from FLOPSC should be attending NaTMAG to avoid the same topics overlapping.</p> <p><u>51/2015 – Develop a timeline showing all planned initiatives of GAL, NATS and the CAA between now and 2025</u></p> <p>Brendan Sheil mentioned that the timeline had been updated and this has been circulated. Alan Jones noted that the date for the November GATCOM is incorrect. Brendan Sheil agreed to amend and mentioned that he will liaise with Andy Sinclair to include more updates on future airspace plans and that this will be an agenda item for the next NaTMAG. Mike George suggested that there should be a cut-off date for the historic dates and it was agreed to limit this to two years. It was agreed that the timeline will remain a standing item and removed as an action – CLOSED.</p> <p><u>21/2016 – Investigate whether it is possible to show 'Real time data' on Casper</u></p> <p>Brendan Sheil confirmed that updates to Casper to allow real time data and compatibility with mobile devices has been completed and the link was circulated in September 2017. He added that there was a time delay of around 20 seconds and that the weblink has been tested and works with all mobile and tablet devices. The group was asked to test the site and feedback was welcomed – CLOSED.</p> <p><u>02/2017 – Horley overflight stats to be provided monthly to NATS and NaTMAG</u></p> <p>It was mentioned that Norwegian have been overflying Horley more than any other airline and it was discussed at the last FLOPSC meeting the reasons for this. It was noted that since the meeting, Norwegian has significantly reduced overflying the town. The FPT will continue to provide Horley</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">FPT 15/2015</p> <p style="text-align: right;">AS 17/2017</p>

overflight data on a monthly basis and this will remain a standing item and removed as an action – CLOSED.

07/2017 – FPT to update NaTMAG members with the progress of Medview Airlines

Lee Howes mentioned that Andy Sinclair had circulated a paper with an update on the progress of Medview Airlines. He noted that recently the airline has been using a Boeing 777-200 Series as opposed to a Boeing 747-412 Series which has previously caused three night noise infringements. The paper detailed the improvements that had been made by the airline including payment of all outstanding fines which will be paid to the Gatwick Airport Community Trust (GACT). The FPT will continue to monitor Medview Airlines and will update again at the next meeting. Ken Harwood noted that the paper refers to Medview night time arrivals but that the issues are currently regarding departures at night. Lee Howes mentioned that there are restrictions on the scheduling of aircraft movements and aircraft of a certain type cannot operate. Gatwick Airport cannot ban certain aircraft from operating at night if they are scheduled earlier and are subsequently delayed. It is for Airport Coordination Limited (ACL) to allocate slots and where airlines abuse their slot allowance, ACL can take appropriate action. Brian Cox suggested that aircraft which are classed as having a Quota Count (QC) value of 4 should be banned at night and believes that this would solve the issue by introducing a voluntary ban. Lee Howes advised that this may be a good point to be raised at the next GATCOM for feedback into the Environmental Noise Directive (END) Noise Action Plan. Mike George added that airlines are more likely to focus on keeping to their schedules if they are banned from operating in the night period. Alan Jones mentioned that this issue has been raised before at a previous NaTMAG meeting and supports a voluntary ban being introduced. Mike George added that this was recommended in the DfT night noise consultation but was rejected by Gatwick. Brian Cox suggested that the noise penalty for night noise infringements should be significantly increased as an incentive for airlines to use quieter aircraft. Lee Howes mentioned that he will seek to include this in the draft version of the END Noise Action Plan and that this will be put through two cycles of GATCOM meetings for feedback. The group agreed to support the inclusion of this into the END Noise Action Plan.

FPT
07/2017

08/2017 – Lee Howes to liaise with Graham Lake regarding NADP Parameters

Lee Howes gave an update on the work carried out by the Noise Management Board (NMB) regarding which airlines use either Noise Abatement Departure Procedures (NADP) 1 or 2 at Gatwick Airport. He noted that 29 responses from airlines had been received and that 77% of airlines use NADP2 at Gatwick, which interestingly is in contrast to Heathrow Airport which mainly use NADP1. Mike George asked if the same NADP practice is used by individual airlines at each airport or whether it is different depending on the airport. Lee Howes advised that the NMB will be able to share their results at the next NaTMAG. Alan Jones referred to Heathrow Airport's Detling departure route and the 30 noise monitors which are used on the route and mentioned that it would be useful to look at the results and whether this could be replicated at other airports. Ken Harwood raised a concern that the data collection and analysis on NADP could be duplicated in the NMB as Peter Barclay mentioned that the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) have already completed work on the use of NADP1 and 2.

LH/AS
08/2017

09/2017 – Jessica Patel to circulate and provide links to the Airspace Blog entries

Jessica Patel circulated links to members on 14th September 2017 – CLOSED.

<p><u>10/2017 – Vicki Hughes to circulate NMB minutes and agenda and technical discussion papers from Helios and To70</u></p> <p>Brendan Sheil explained that Vicki Hughes was on leave so will circulate the papers upon her return. Peter Barclay was concerned that the papers from the NMB meetings needed to be uploaded sooner and that papers referred to in the agenda items also need to be made available. Brendan Sheil advised these are all available on the NMB website (http://www.gatwickairport.com/business-community/aircraft-noise-airspace/noise-management-board/)</p> <p><u>11/2017 – Brendan Sheil to look into including an odour complaint option into the Casper web form</u></p> <p>Brendan Sheil advised that although this is a feasible option, there is concern that noise complainants may use this option as a new proxy to complain about air quality which is separate from noise. Peter Barclay suggested that a link could be provided on the Gatwick website to refer air quality enquiries to local authorities’ Environmental Health Officers (EHO). Brendan Sheil explained that the FPT receives so few odour complaints and that he personally responds to odour complaints forwarded from EHO’s directly. It was agreed that this is not viable at the present time – CLOSED.</p> <p><u>16/2017 – Jessica Patel to reschedule future NaTMAG dates to move closer to quarter period for discussion</u></p> <p>Mike George suggested that the future 2018 dates need to be changed as the NaTMAG meetings are looking at reports which are too historic and that either they should be rescheduled closer to the quarter being studied or change the months reported on in each quarter. Alan Jones agreed and stated that it is not appropriate to be discussing data for June in September. Jessica Patel explained that she has set the 2018 dates taking into account the time it takes to prepare and circulate the reports in time for the NaTMAG pre-meets and to avoid clashes with other meetings such as GATCOM, GATCOM Steering Group and the NMB. The new dates will be circulated in due course – CLOSED.</p>	<p>VH 10/2017</p>
<p>4. Horley Overflight</p> <p>1. Mike George referred to the Horley overflight data provided to the group on a monthly basis and mentioned that one of the weeks (16th - 22nd June 2017) had a spike in the number of overflights. It was agreed at the previous meeting that commentary would be added to the data to explain any anomalies, such as weather avoidance, however there was nothing included for this week. Mike George explained that he had spoken to Robin Clarke of NATS about this and it was confirmed that the spike was due to a controller error. He added that he still receives a number of complaints from Horley residents regarding overflight of the town, despite statistics to the contrary.</p> <p>2. Alan Jones suggested that aircraft should not be vectored until they are at least at an altitude of 5,000ft. Lee Howes advised that aircraft are vectored so that they do not have altitude restrictions due to the Biggin Heathrow stack. This is being discussed in the future airspace designs with Andy Sinclair.</p> <p>3. The general consensus among the group was that Horley overflight has significantly improved.</p>	
<p>5. Departure Routes 3, 4 and 5</p> <p>1. Lee Howes presented an update regarding the progress of departure routes 3 and 4 and referred to the NaTMAG update document on these routes. He mentioned that GAL has commissioned TRAX (an external consultancy) to undertake feasibility and options reports on issues on both Route 3 and Route 4 Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs). This work on Routes 3 and 4 is broken down into two</p>	

<p>sequential elements, in line with the recommendations of the CAA Route 4 Post Implementation Review. It will consider whether some of the altitude restrictions on Routes 3 and 4 can be amended to allow aircraft to gain an initial higher altitude and whether multiple PBN departure routes could be used for Route 4 westerly departures (note: Route 4 comprises 5 SIDs DVR/ADMAG/CLN/LAM & BIG so each SID would need multiple routes defined, for example, 3 initial routes on Route 4 may be up to 15 new SIDs), thereby permitting respite and/or dispersion for affected residents.</p> <p>2. Under the Tandridge Local Plan which is being prepared, Mike George said that the District Council will be expected to provide in excess of 9,400 homes over 20 years. A 4,000 home village is envisaged as part of this number and could possibly be located on Blindley Heath under Route 3. He expressed concern that this will lead to more people being exposed to aircraft noise. Alan Jones noted that there needs to be improvements in local infrastructure to and from London if new homes are to be built in the local area.</p> <p>3. Lee Howes updated the group on the progress of Route 5 and mentioned that the monitoring period is still ongoing until 30th September 2017 with good track compliance being observed. He mentioned that there are a small number of complaints received by the FPT and a small number of these are from persistent complainants. Alan Jones referred to the 9 complaints quoted in the NaTMAG update document and queried how this compares before the amendment to Route 5 was introduced. Brendan Sheil commented that the difference in the number of complaints was negligible. The complaints are calculated using the RH7 postcode as a reference along with the Casper Noise and Track Keeping system to see if a complaint is linked to Route 5. Alan Jones mentioned that residents in Dormansland near Lingfield used to complain quite frequently regarding aircraft noise and that the amendment to Route 5 should result in a decline in complaints. Brendan Sheil noted that the FPT has not received any recent complaints from Dormansland and suggested that Route 5 may have improved noise levels in the area.</p> <p>4. Lee Howes mentioned that the public were well informed about the amendment to Route 5 and an information pack was available with full details of the changes. Peter Barclay and Mike George agreed that the change to the route was minor, therefore a minimal number of complaints are expected relating to Route 5.</p>	
<p>6. Noise Management Board Update</p> <p>1. Peter Barclay noted that there was no-one present at the meeting who also has a seat on the NMB. He was concerned that there may be some dissent among NMB members between community groups and industry members. Lee Howes attended the sixth meeting on the 14th June 2017 and explained that there are no easy solutions to the issues of noise, otherwise they would have already been acted upon. Some groups want opposite solutions to other groups and there is no 'one size fits all' solution.</p> <p>2. Lee Howes noted that the annual public Airspace Seminar was due to take place on the 7th December 2017 which will be a joint meeting with the NMB to include both an update on airport proceedings and also from the NMB. This meeting will include representatives from NATS and the Airport with interactive stands for the public to ask questions and learn more about operations and noise. NaTMAG members will be invited to the Airspace Seminar. Lee Howes mentioned that this meeting will be in a different format to previous years and there are plans to hold a panel for a Q&A session. Mike George suggested that there should be community groups on the panel that attend the NMB, and be accountable to their communities, so that there is equal representation. Lee Howes agreed with this suggestion. Charles Yarwood mentioned that the views of members of GATCOM was that the NMB did not have elected members from local communities and that it should have more</p>	

equal representation. Peter Barclay agreed that community noise protest groups are not fully representative of local communities. The group expressed concern that members of the NMB who are in disagreement could be pushing back timescales for the completion of certain recommendations. Lee Howes mentioned that the FPT have been receiving complaints from residents indicating that the NMB have not yet delivered on certain recommendations.

3. Lee Howes advised that there was a study being conducted on behalf of the NMB for recommendation Imm-15 which is to research aircraft height perceptions. This study was being conducted with Sussex University and three of Gatwick's noise monitors have been provided for the purposes of the survey which have been placed in Penshurst, Tunbridge Wells and Crowborough. Lee Howes noted that he has received an email from the Chair of Chiddingstone Parish Council who has enquired about the addition of a new noise monitor in Chiddingstone which was claimed to have been disregarded by members of GATCOM. Peter Barclay commented that the reason for this was because the process for the application for a noise monitor was not followed correctly. Alan Jones enquired why this request was not addressed at the Gatwick Noise Monitoring Group (GNMG). Brendan Sheil confirmed that this will be considered at the next GNMG in November 2017. Alan Jones added that Warnham have also made a request for a noise monitor in addition to Cranleigh and Charlwood. Ken Harwood believes that NaTMAG is effective at discussing the location of noise monitors as if a certain location is rejected then it is often not revisited.

4. It was mentioned by members that there may be a lack of public trust surrounding the work of the NMB and that the benefits of external consultancies to analyse and present publicly the available data is not well understood. There is also concern among NaTMAG members that work is being duplicated, or previous issues are being revisited by the NMB, for example. Alan Jones is a member of the CAA Technical Working Group of the Airport Noise Management Advisory Committee (ANMAC) and he referred to the work this group is doing on analysing NADP1 and 2. Much data has already been gathered by the CAA Environmental Research and Consultancy Department (ERCD) and he was concerned about the overlap of this and the work having been undertaken by the NMB. Ian Greene commented that there may be a lack of trust and that it takes time for the public to establish trust and the NMB needs to independently look at the issues. Lee Howes advised that the NMB workplan of 2017/18 must be followed through fully to provide the results expected. Peter Barclay referred to the Independent Review of Arrivals recommendation on the Landing Direction Protocol (Imm-11), itself a matter previously rejected by NaTMAG but revisited by the Independent Review of Arrivals, rejected and revisited again. He expressed concern that the work was inconclusive and that this was not accepted by certain members of the local community. Mike George added that the NMB is under pressure to deliver all the work streams within a limited timescale rather than focussing its attention on one project at a time. He also expressed concern that this may affect the successes of the NMB to deliver its objectives. Lee Howes noted that although there may be some public opposition to the NMB, it can work well with NaTMAG to deliver workable solutions to the issues surrounding aircraft noise. Charles Yarwood agrees that the NMB should be focussed on community issues and that NaTMAG remains a monitoring group however, the two groups can work in conjunction with one another. The group raised concerns that the NMB have members on the Board which are only concerned with topics related to the areas in which they live. Mike George noted that this will remain an issue as some community noise groups have a desire to sit on the NMB due to a lack of representatives from their locality. Peter Barclay added that the public may rely on a lot of information which is being shared on social media and this may be driving negative attitudes towards the Airport. Lee Howes agreed as there is a large amount of 'fake news' being shared on social media with no

<p>supporting evidence of the facts which leads people to believe what they read online rather than the information provided by Gatwick Airport or the regulatory bodies and Government.</p>	
<p>7. END Quarterly Report</p> <p>1. Harry Mallows updated the group on the outcomes of the second quarterly END report of 2017. He mentioned that since the introduction of an additional member of the FPT, the complaints backlog has been significantly reduced.</p> <p>2. Harry Mallows indicated that there are 6 actions out of 62 that have been identified as RED (not on track) and that the reason for this is that these actions have been superseded by the NMB. There are 5 actions that have an AMBER status (neither on track nor not on track). Action 33 requires an amendment to the Gatwick Complaints Handling Policy to include details of how freepost letters from persistent complainants will be counted. The FPT have been receiving up to 100 freepost letters a day from three individuals. Lee Howes advised that currently these letters are being counted and added to the total number of complaints received but are not being logged in Casper as this is counterproductive to the work of the FPT. Action 36 regarding sending funds raised from fining airlines causing noise infringements to GACT, the finance department are currently handling the latest fines received from Medview Airlines and will be sending the funds to GACT in due course. Alan Jones asked why this action is identified as AMBER. Lee Howes advised that the last night noise infringement was reported in 2011 and so it may take some time for the finance department to understand the process fully.</p> <p>3. Harry Mallows referred to the Noise Key Performance Statistics on page 2 and stated that Continuous Descent Operations (CDO) compliance was on the increase. Lee Howes added that NATS had mentioned at the last Sustainable Aviation Operations Working Group that Gatwick Airport was the UK's leading airport on CDO. He praised the work of Air Traffic Control in promoting the use of CDO. Mike George asked why there was no feedback regarding the drop in compliance of night time CDO. NATS had looked into this but were unable to conclude why this was, however night time CDO compliance has shown improvement in July and August 2017. Harry Mallows quoted that track keeping compliance remained high at around 98%.</p> <p>4. Lee Howes mentioned that the latest revised noise contours have been reviewed but have yet to be published. The END Noise Action Plan will be reviewed at the next GATCOM and a draft version will be prepared for Defra in August 2018 with an expected publish date of around 2019/2020. The report will be made available at GATCOM for feedback. Alan Jones asked if the report will be available for NaTMAG to provide feedback. Lee Howes confirmed that it will be made available to NaTMAG before GATCOM. Additional feedback will be sourced from the NMB, if appropriate. Alan Jones suggested that a summary report would be useful to give the latest updates. Lee Howes agreed that a summary will be prepared to detail what the plans for the Airport will be over the next year.</p> <p>5. Harry Mallows referred to page 3 of the END quarterly report and noted that there have been two incidences of non-compliant Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) usage.</p> <p>6. Alan Jones referred to Action 52 and asked which airports Gatwick Airport is comparable to. Lee Howes mentioned that this action was last updated in 2011. There is no merit in undertaking this again given the work undertaken in the Independent Review of Arrivals and the current workstream of the NMB. In considering what airports to compare with, Lee Howes commented that all airports have particular issues of concern to local communities and thus a 'one size fits all' approach and to compare Gatwick to other airports would not materially improve the noise climate for local communities therefore it makes sense to focus efforts on the NMB workplan, a workplan that contains issues of</p>	

<p>importance to local communities. It was suggested by Lee Howes that a method of comparison would be various European Union airports' END Noise Action Plans however, communities have highlighted what they want Gatwick Airport to work on and these could be included in the new END Noise Action Plan.</p>	
<p>8. Ground Noise Report/Ground Noise Monitoring</p> <p>1. Brendan Sheil referred to the Ground Noise Report for quarter 2. He provided more details about the two incidences of APU non-compliance which were both from easyJet aircraft by aircraft ground handling agents Menzies who failed to plug in the Fixed Electrical Ground Power (FEGP) units. These incidents were followed up with Jerry Barkley and Janet Gilroy of the Airfield Operations Team. Brendan Sheil explained that there has been a recent influx of new staff members at Menzies who may not be fully aware of all processes. Mike George queried why this was not quickly rectified as an aircraft will have limited battery capacity without the aid of an FEGP unit and that flight crew would know if the FEGP wasn't attached. Brendan Sheil advised that the Airfield Operations Team were swift to report and rectify these incidents.</p> <p>2. Brendan Sheil noted that the APU and Ground Power Unit (GPU) usage for the quarter was good and that FEGP availability remained high. He also mentioned that out-of-hours turnaround audits were observed and all fully compliant.</p>	
<p>9. Flight Performance Report (including ground noise complaints)</p> <p>1. Brendan Sheil noted the decrease in night-time CDO performance and mentioned that it was discussed at the previous FLOPSC meeting. He stated that there was a slight decrease in winter performance and that the summer trend has improved. August 2017 CDO performance is above 95%. CDO can be affected by varying meteorological conditions which could be the reason for the poor winter performance.</p> <p>2. Alan Jones referred to Horley overflight on page 12 and noted that there appears to be certain Air Traffic Controller shifts that cause peaks in the data. Mike George commended NATS for their work on improving performance.</p> <p>3. Brendan Sheil mentioned that go-arounds continue to be historically high with runway occupancy still being the main causal factor. Runway occupancy reasons now feature in the FPT report. FLOPSC are working on finding out why go-arounds are so high. It was suggested that a key message to FLOPSC would be that a member of Airfield should be invited to feedback to NaTMAG regarding the increase of go-arounds. Brian Cox mentioned that he has noticed that residents of Langley Green in Crawley have begun to complain about the increases in go-arounds.</p> <p>4. Brendan Sheil mentioned that complaints are higher than the previous year. Ken Harwood referred to the complaint map on page 27 and asked why there seem to be fewer complaint locations than previous quarters. He enquired whether a further complaints location presentation could be prepared for the next NaTMAG as it would be interesting to view the reasons for complaints from locations who are not overflown. It was suggested that Horsham, Cranleigh, Littlehampton and East Grinstead could be analysed but that the complaint locations will be decided when the quarter 3 FPT is published.</p> <p>5. Alan Jones referred to the night time joining point graph on page 19 and noted the high percentage of arrivals joining at less than 10nm and enquired as to whether this has had an effect on the number of complaints received. Lee Howes mentioned that there has been one particular complainant who has complained about the extension of the arrivals joining point. He also mentioned that spikes in complaint data can occur and could be a result of local community noise group influence. The FPT</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">FPT 18/2017</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FPT 19/2017</p>

<p>have received a number of recent complaints from East Grinstead, Littlehampton and Cranleigh who claim that Gatwick has altered flight paths over the towns. The FPT does investigate these complaints, however no changes to the flight tracking have been observed.</p> <p>6. Brendan Sheil mentioned the community noise monitoring independent study by Sussex University on behalf of the Independent Review of Arrivals recommendation Imm-15. He noted that the GNMG may be able to review the raw data from the study monitors and may also have sight of the initial findings for comment at the next meeting in November, however the official results will not be published until December 2017.</p> <p>2. The next noise monitoring report currently being drafted will be for the monitor #82 East Grinstead and will be published at the beginning of 2018. The next GMNG meeting will consider which locations are suitable for new noise monitors. There are plans to replace existing mobile noise monitors with 4G monitors which can support live data. Brendan Sheil mentioned that there is currently a test site with a live 4G monitor in Rusper.</p>	
<p>10. AOB</p> <p>1. Alan Jones referred to the CAP15/54 review of arrivals noise controls which was published in July 2017 and mentioned that a copy can be downloaded from the CAA website. There are plans to publish a departures version in December 2017 or early 2018.</p> <p>2. It was suggested that the actions on developing a noise timeline (Action 51/2015) and Horley overflight (Action 02/2017) be closed and kept as standing items on the diary annexe to be updated quarterly to NaTMAG.</p>	
<p><u>Key Message to FLOPSC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A member of Airfield Operations is invited to attend NaTMAG to advise regarding the large number of go-arounds. 	
<p>13. Dates of Next Meetings</p> <p>FLOPSC – Wednesday 27th September 2017, 09:30 – 12:00 in Barcelona, 5th Floor, Destinations Place.</p> <p>NaTMAG - Thursday 30th November 2017, 10:00 – 13:00 in Geneva, 5th Floor, Destinations Place.</p>	<p>For Info Only</p>