

Edinburgh Airport Noise Advisory Board

Minutes of 4th Meeting held on Wednesday 6th Dec 2017
at the Marriott Hotel, 111 Glasgow Road, Edinburgh
Commencing at 6.30pm

Present: Lindsey Cole (Chair), Gordon Allen, John Kelly, Pippa Plevin, Christophe Miremont, Liz Scobie, Louise Gunstensen, Helena Paul, Tom Leatherland, Ray Godfree, Adam Cumming, Vic Garrad

Apologies:

In attendance for first part of meeting: June McClung, Noise Adviser EAL

While notes were made and circulated of the previous meetings, these were not referred to.

The chair proposed that we skip **Item 1: Introductions**, as everyone now knows everybody.

Item 2: Communications from Edinburgh Airport Representative

Update from June McClung (JMc) EAL Noise Adviser:

1. The new Noise and Track-keeping System (NTS) is being installed. This is a real time system with a 15 minute delay, rather than the current system which requires a 24 hour update. The system will allow members of the public to have online access to some flight data. It is similar to the system at Gatwick.

New Noise Monitors will be installed at the three current locations (Cramond Manse, Inveralmond High School in Livingston and Muirend near Broxburn). These locations are 6.5km from start of roll – ie when plane starts moving along runway. This distance is determined by the Dept of Transport and the CAA for legal reasons relating to noise fining of airlines.

Three permanent monitors is deemed to be sufficient. Members asked how many noise monitors there are at Gatwick – JMc did not know.

Additional monitors can be installed “if communities want one”, subject to there being a suitable location in the Community. An additional monitor will be installed at Cramond. There will then be two monitors at either end of the runway. One portable monitor is also available, subject to some additional “all weather kit” being ordered. This monitor should be available for deployment on a temporary basis from the start of 2018.

In discussion, members raised various issues.

- 70% of departing flights go over West Lothian, and 2 monitors does not seem adequate.
- The multiple changes already made to the pattern of use of the flight paths mean that additional monitors should be deployed in those communities not previously affected by noise, but who now are
- The proposals contained in the ACP (Airspace Change Programme) mean that additional monitors should be deployed now ahead of any changes, so that the impact can be properly measured before and after the change, as would be usual practice in assessing the environmental impact for any ground based development
- The background levels of noise make a significant difference to the impact of aircraft noise, eg in a rural area with low ambient noise, aircraft noise can cause significantly more disturbance than in an urban area.

- The question was also asked: What is the regulatory framework for positioning of noise monitors?

In response, JMc advised that she does not comment on the ACP and there are no plans to locate additional monitors as a result of it. The noise modelling for the ACP has been done by ERCD (Environmental Research and Consultancy Department - part of the CAA) and was part of the consultation material. It was pointed out by members that the proposals contained in the actual application are different from those contained in the consultation. Surely that would affect the noise model diagrams?

Action: JMc would find out more about the regulations covering noise monitors and would report back to the Board with further information.

2. 2016 Noise Contour Maps and data

Members asked when this map would be available, as this had been discussed and promised at the October meeting.

JMc explained that this contour map is part of the airport's revised Noise Action Plan and would not be released until the Noise Action Plan is released. The map is not derived from actual sound monitor readings but is modelled by ERCD based on aircraft types. There would actually be fewer households within the 63dB noise contour in the new map than previously.

There was some disagreement with the information given, with members advising that they wished to see what data had been sent to the CAA to enable them to provide this Noise Contour map.

Finally, it became apparent that the reason it had not been shared with the Board, was because EAL was waiting for the Board to sign off on the Code of Conduct, as the information contained in the 2016 noise contour map was "confidential".

It was pointed out that as the Code of Conduct would be discussed later during this meeting, with a view to reaching agreement, then there should be no further issue with the release of the noise contour map. After more discussion, which included a query about the seriousness of EAL's efforts to tackle the noise issue, it was finally agreed that the 2016 Noise Contour map would be provided this week.

A member asked for the data used to compile the 2011 Noise Contour Map. JMc advised this was on the Scottish Government website. While the map is on the website, it is the data that has been used to create the map that is being asked for. JMc advised this is a "huge file" and as she does not have it, it would have to be requested from "Harris".

The member pointed out that a month of data had already been provided to him, and he was unclear why 12 months of data would be too large to provide as an excel spreadsheet. Surely this would have been given to the Scottish Government as the contour map appears on their website?

JMc agreed to provide the data as requested.

Members asked how much data would be available on the new NTS. It was advised that 5 years data would be available but in a different format. It was not clear to members what might be available, and JMc offered the opportunity for members to see the new system and help the airport out with testing it sometime in early January.

A member asked if the system would be live all the time, or would only be triggered if noise over a certain level was recorded?

A further question was asked about whether the system historically has picked up on all flights and if all noise events have been recorded. JMc said that everything that Operations and NATS receive is sent to the CAA. The member responded that in the data set already supplied to him, not all noise events had been recorded.

On the matter of the Noise Board's input into the revised Noise Action Plan, was it correct to assume that the Noise Board would be formally consulted and expected to review this? JMc advised that it would go to a 12 week public consultation and the Noise Board would be allowed to see it a week ahead of the public seeing it.

3. Provision of information to the Noise Board

A question was asked about what proposals JMc has for the provision of information to the Noise Board. JMc advised that we should make our proposals of what we want to see. JMc was asked what information is already gathered and provided. A quarterly report about complaints received is provided to the EACC (Edinburgh Airport Consultative Committee). This report covers numbers of complaints by areas, the number of complaints and the number of people complaining. If it is 40 different people complaining, this is given more attention than 1 person complaining 40 times. Also broken down into types of complaint.

Does the Board want this or something else?

The new NTS might also provide additional information. Anything that is noise related, JMc can look into it. The Board may also invite other staff such as operations and NATS.

4. Question about changes made to the use of the GOSAM SIDs sometime around 2015.

There have been multiple reports from Communities about a considerable change in the soundscape, what has changed and when?

JMc said she can send the data, but the experts in this area are NATS. Planes can be vectored at 3000ft or 4000ft for jets on GRICE.

5. Do complaints from the public make any difference? If there is a sudden increase in complaints from a community, does that trigger an investigation into why?

JMc responded that during the consultation process there was an increase in complaints from some communities often clustered around the time that drop in sessions were held. The implication is that people were more aware of the airport at that time, so were more likely to complain.

But planes have to fly somewhere, so they go along the flight paths until there is an ACP.

It was pointed out that the airport's own data shows that the majority of responders to the consultation had been negative to new flight paths.

The Chair ended the discussion after an hour and JMc was thanked for her contributions and left the meeting.

Items 3 and 4 Finalisation of Terms of Reference (ToR) and Code of Conduct (CoC)

JK, LS and RG were warmly thanked and complimented for their efforts in redrafting the ToR and CoC. There was some discussion on both documents.

It was agreed that the Code of Conduct was unanimously accepted, subject to one amendment which is to add a reference to compliance with the Data Protection Act. **Action JK, LS, RG**

There was further discussion on the ToR. There was debate on the suggested name of Forum, with most members preferring Board. This would be discussed again at the January meeting.

It was agreed that several amendments would be made and the revised draft document would be circulated via email for approval. **Action JK, LS, RG**

The issue of deciding and prioritising a programme of work for the Noise Board was raised. It was agreed that the Board would set aside some time at the January meeting to bring along the "top issues"

from their Community, in order to isolate the issues, make a prioritised list and allocate members to tasks.

Item 5: Possible Structure, Representation and Appointments

Office Bearers – it was **agreed** to appoint office bearers and a Minutes Secretary, and there was some discussion on terms of office. (Q did we agree a timescale for length of office?)

Office Bearers appointed as follows:

Vice Chair, Adam Cumming, Proposed VG, Seconded HP

Secretary, Louise Gunstensen, Proposed VG, Seconded LC

Treasurer, Tom Leatherland, Proposed VG, Seconded GA

Treasurer role – would be mainly to keep a spreadsheet of income and expenditure and to manage a Board bank account. **Agreed** that TL would investigate what documentation would be required to open a bank account.

Minute Secretary – it was **agreed** that it is essential that Minutes and a list of Action Points should be kept. Some discussion of the paper tabled by HP.

There are several options – a) Members continue to take turns at keeping Minutes, b) appoint a paid Minutes Secretary via an employment agency or c) we find a volunteer from among our Communities who joins the Board for the specific task of Minutes Secretary.

Agreed (Action All) that everyone would try and identify any suitable volunteer candidates in their areas, and that HP (**Action HP**) would contact an employment agency to find out if there were any suitable candidates available.

Agreed that an electronic audio recording would be made of meetings to facilitate minute keeping.

Item 6: Communications:

It was agreed that clear communications and transparency are essential. This includes full transparency in communications between Board members and between the Board and EAL.

Logo and identity for Board. While the name has yet to be finalised, GA was warmly thanked for his ideas for a Logo, and his work on a website.

LC noted that the airport has expected that the Board would have a page on the airport's website. Members wish to emphasise the Independence of the Board, and would prefer to have a separate website that the airport would be free to link to. **Agreed** that GA would act as webmaster.

Item 7. Outside Agency Involvements

LC reminded the Board that we could establish contacts and connections with ATC (Air Traffic Control), CAA, Airlines and other NMBs and airport Consultative Committees. LC reported that he had made some initial contacts with the Noise Boards at Heathrow, Gatwick, Manchester and Stansted. Some airports have formal noise boards, others have a group operating via the Consultative Committee. In due course we may be able to foster closer links with some of these bodies.

The Chair was asked for an update from his recent meeting at the EACC (Edinburgh Airport Consultative Committee.) A new chairman has been appointed (who?)

The EACC had asked about what the Board would do – LC had explained we are still in our infancy and should know more about what is happening by the next meeting (was that next Board meeting or EACC meeting?)

LC was asked for a copy of the papers that had been submitted to the EACC.

Item 8 AOCB

HP had tabled and circulated a paper with a report on the recent Aviation Environment Federation meeting and Noise and Health Seminar. Due to pressure of time, she did not speak to the paper, but asked members to contact her with any questions or comments.

The key point to note at the moment is the impending closing of the CAA consultation on Aviation Noise Impacts on 5th January. All members please ensure information about this is disseminated in their Communities.

Link to consultation: <https://consultations.caa.co.uk/policy-development/aviation-noise-impacts/>

A member asked if there was any progress on the request made at the previous meeting for clarity from the airport on the current status of the ACP. No update.

Date of next meeting: Wednesday 10th January, 1830 – 2100 Marriott Hotel, The Maybury

The Chair closed the meeting at 20.55