

Edinburgh Airport Noise Advisory Board

Minutes of Eleventh Meeting held on Tuesday 19 June 2018
at the Marriott Hotel, 111 Glasgow Road, Edinburgh
Commencing at 6.30pm

Present: Lindsay Cole (LC) (Chair)

Louise Gunstensen, (LG), Dalgety Bay and Hillend CC; Helena Paul (HP), Blackness Area CC / Edinburgh Airport Watch; Christophe Miremont (CM), Ecclesmachan resident; Pippa Plevin (PP), Uphall CC; Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC; Merv Archibald (MA), Blackness Area CC; Tom Leatherland (TL), Limekilns and Charleston CC; Ray Godfree (RG), Ratho & District CC; Ray Flint (RF), Kinghorn CC; Cramond CC; Vic Garrad (VG), Kirknewton CC; Bob Brough (BB), Cramond CC; Adam Cumming (AC), Cramond Association; Ronnie McLeod (RMcL), Bathgate CC; Billy Johnston (BJ), Bathgate CC; Mari Finlayson (MF), North Queensferry CC

Apologies: Angela Wallace, Broxburn CC; Andrew Watt, Dalkeith CC

These minutes were prepared by Elaine Hill from an electronic recording made during the meeting as Elaine unfortunately could not attend this meeting which was convened at short notice as an additional meeting instead of the usual July date.

ACTION:

1. Introductions:

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. As this meeting was primarily to discuss the Board's response to the ACP, there was no formal agenda. However, it was agreed that the following three items would be discussed at this evening's meeting:

EANAB response to ACP – due by 28 June 2018

Matters arising from the previous meetings

EANAB website – in particular contact details.

It was noted that there was no representative from EAL present at the meeting which would allow the Board to freely discuss a response to the ACP.

2. Approval of previous minutes:

It was noted that reference was made to a copy of GR's presentation being attached to the minutes. This was still to be obtained from GR

LG

for circulation.

It was agreed to add mention of a targeted campaign by area to Item 4 of the minutes which limited the number of people consulted.

Subject to the above points, approval of the minutes of the tenth meeting held on 6 June 2018 was proposed by MA and seconded by GA.

3. Airspace Change Programme

It was suggested that the Board's response be framed around the ToR – minimise noise in communities and to communicate and engage effectively with communities, and concerns that the consultation does not allow the EANAB to do this.

It was noted that the proposed changes could mean an expected marginal improvement in noise levels over Cramond due to the narrowing of the swathe. However, noise levels over Dalgety Bay and other areas would increase significantly.

But the documents do not appear to show what the actual quantified improvement might actually be, as all the flight paths off runway 06 will follow the same track.

Cramond were told by EAL that the narrowing of the swathe will reduce noise, but agreed not as good a solution as might have been possible.

Discussion ensued regarding practical solutions, e.g. heading out slightly more than 20 degrees and continuing past Dunfermline, flying up the middle of the Forth and turning back over Fife east of Dalgety Bay but short of Leven thus avoiding densely populated areas of Fife.

It was unclear why EAL had not proposed that.

Issue is that both Cramond and Dalgety Bay could be avoided but have not been in this design. But the design being consulted on is the one we need to comment on as a Board. EAL has refused to listen to communities who have made alternative design suggestions.

It was noted that at the Inverkeithing public meeting, MP Douglas Chapman had asked why aircraft could not go up the Forth east of Edinburgh but had not received an answer to date. He had mentioned that aircraft using London City Airport had to fly 80 miles down the Thames to avoid densely populated areas in London. People who had responded to previous consultations to fly over the Forth meant the wider part of the Forth which would avoid the most densely populated areas.

It was noted that such suggestions had been made in the past by

various community groups and at public meetings but had not been investigated by EAL. One reason given in the past for not being able to use the Forth was that it was military airspace which D Chapman MP has been asked to look into.

It was noted that individual community groups would be submitting their own responses to the consultation and that EANAB would be responding as a Board and not highlighting individual communities. It was agreed that the response should be as realistic and strategic as possible and copied to various other parties such as CAA, NATS, MPs, etc., as well as the Chairman and Chief Executive of EAL. The response should include alternative designs that do not impact as badly on any community.

It was noted that while EAL would benefit from the proposed plans in the consultation, it was NATS are also driving the airspace change and the CAA are the ultimate decision maker. Therefore, the Board should be discussing technical issues with them rather than GR who is Director of Communications at EAL. It was noted that GR is the named project sponsor for the ACP process and that NATS had not been able to answer questions from the public adequately.

It was stressed that despite three years of EAL being asked to engage and communicate in a meaningful way with communities, this was still not happening despite the formation of EANAB. The Board was not consulted strategically at all about the consultation, which was not acceptable.

GR* had previously said that he felt unable to share information with us prior to it being released publicly. We cannot build a mutually respectful relationship under these circumstances.

At the EANAB meeting in April, the Board had specifically raised the issue of further consultation on Route E with GR, and while, at the time he would have known about the advance plans for consultation 3, his response to the Board was less than candid about the intentions of EAL.

Our previous NAP response which took a lot of time to prepare has been ignored.

We are the ready-made conduit for relations between the communities and the airport and they would not even tell us that they were going to do a third consultation, which is an insult to the Board. Communities have been asking for genuine engagement with the airport which has not happened over the last three years. Chair expressed concerns that the EANAB is missing out on the opportunity to improve matters for communities.

It was noted that information contained in the consultation was incorrect, e.g. the mention of 47 planes per day on average when the actual figure is 81 planes per day. Technical terms aren't explained

sufficiently for non-technical people. It was strongly felt that the consultation wasn't fit for purpose. Absence of noise information from the main consultation document means that people cannot understand the impact for them. The ERCD noise contour information appeared on the website after the consultation opened so people may not have seen it. Overall the document is misleading.

It was suggested that the Board needed to be far tougher with the airport and a good PR person to highlight the issues the Board is trying to tackle and the difficulties it faces in engaging with EAL, NATS, CAA, etc. It was suggested that HP could take on this role. The Chair agreed that he would be prepared to be the contact for the media in relation to the letter and press release that the Board intends to issue.

| | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| | <p>In order to formalise the Board's response to the consultation, it was agreed to decide on the key points to be contained in the letter and demand a review of the consultation with the main parties (EAL, CAA, NATS) around the table with EANAB. The key points captured at the meeting included:</p> <p>Process not fit for purpose Misleading document Additional changes proposed that are not referred to in the consultation book No opportunity given to Board to participate prior to consultation Gulf between airport's rhetoric and reality Lack of meaningful information to allow ordinary person to make decision and contradictions in information Not presented in a format understood by laypeople Not all communities affected were consulted with by EAL.</p> <p>It was noted that the response is to the Supplementary Airspace Change Consultation May 2018.</p> <p>MA and AC to pull together a draft response based on the key items above. This draft to be circulated to the Board for comment by the end of the week to allow time for the final response to be signed by the Chair and submitted by 28 June 2018.</p> <p>It was agreed that the response should be focused on the points above and invite representatives of EAL/NATS/CAA to a joint meeting for a round table discussion on the Consultation and suggested alternatives – a deadline date to be given for the meeting to take place. It was agreed to stress that the Board wants to engage in meaningful dialogue with these organisations to help reduce aircraft noise for all communities.</p> <p>It was further agreed that the response should also be circulated to all those who received copy of the NAP response, i.e. UK Aviation Minister, Transport Minister and Environment Minister as well as to wider MPs/MSPs and the Press who should receive a covering email explaining the Board's remit of representing all communities.</p> <p>*GR asked that it be recorded that he believed the minute did not fairly reflect the level of his input and responses given at the meeting.</p> | MA/AC |
| 4. | Matters Arising from Previous Meetings | |
| 4.1 | Meeting Held on 6 May 2018 | |
| | Item 9.2 – LG confirmed that the revised minutes of the April meeting had been sent to GR on 20 May 2018. LG confirmed that version 2 of the minutes would be uploaded to the website. | Complete |
| | Item 9.3.2 – Complete | |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | | |
| | Item 9.3.3 – This item is still outstanding as are a number of actions against GR, e.g. complaints data, list of noise monitors, etc. | GR |
| | <p>9.3.4 – It was agreed that Cramond would have two representatives on the Board – one from Cramond & Barnton CC and one from Cramond Association as they were different organisations which cover distinct geographical areas.</p> <p>It was further agreed that organisations would have one vote only and that they should inform the Board of their formal representative who would have voting rights. In addition, organisations could nominate a deputy to attend when their normal representative is unable to. It is up to the organisation to fully brief the deputy prior to attendance at the meetings. In addition, in line with the ToR, the Board should be notified in advance of a deputy attending meetings.</p> <p>It was agreed that at a future meeting it would be useful for each organisation to outline the issues affecting their community, e.g. departures, arrivals, etc.</p> <p>The Bathgate CC representative reported that they had noticed an increase in noise levels over the last few weeks in particular relating to departures.</p> <p>It was also noted that Broxburn CC had reported an increase in noise with aircraft flying closer to residential areas.</p> | |
| | 9.3.5 – See 9.3.6 below. | |
| | 9.3.6 – No comments received by HP for questions for ANS when they attend the EANAB meeting in August. Invitation to ANS to attend Board in relation to discussing their role rather than in respect of the ACP consultation. | LC |
| | 9.3.8 – No update available. | GR |
| | 9.3.9 – Complete. Good feedback received from EACC to EANAB report. | |
| | 9.3.10 – No complaints data received – outstanding since December 2017 | GR |
| | 9.3.11 – Ongoing – next meeting in August | |
| | 9.3.12 – Ongoing | BF |
| | 9.3.13 – Ongoing | LC/GR |

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | 9.3.14 – Ongoing | GR |
| | 9.3.16 – Ongoing | AW/GR |
| | 9.3.17 – Ongoing | GR |
| | 9.3.18 – Ongoing | LC/GR |
| | 9.3.20 – Web Presence – discussed under Item 5 below | |
| | 9.4 – Ongoing | LG/LC |
| | 9.6 – Ongoing | RG |
| | 9.6.7 – Ongoing | GR |
| | 9.7.5 – Chair invited NATS to attend meeting. May be superceded by response letter to Consultation. | |
| | 9.7.6 – Complete | |
| | 9.9.1 – To be discussed below | |
| | 9.10.1 – Ongoing | GR |
| | 9.10.3 – Ongoing | GR |
| | 9.10.4 – Complete | |
| | 9.10.5 – HP reported that she had invited CAA to meet with EANAB in relation to the “Beyond the horizon – the future of the UK aviation”. However, she had received a response to say that they would not attend a meeting as they did not engage with individual stakeholders. HP had written back to explain that the Board was not an individual stakeholder and that as they already engaged with other Noise Boards, EANAB would like parity. Also asked DfT to meet with EANAB. They have offered to set up a meeting in London rather than come up to Edinburgh. HP suggested that the next communication come from the Chair. Again the Board needs to be clear on what it wants. HP agreed to forward emails to the Board. There is a lot of engagement happening in London over the next month. Does EANAB wish to participate in this engagement and if so, do DfT have to come up to Edinburgh or does the Board go to London? | HP |
| 4.2 | Meeting held on 6 June 2018 | |
| | 2.0 – Complete | |
| | 3.1 – Complete | |

| | | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| | | |
| | 4.1 – Complete | |
| | 4.2 – Ongoing | GR |
| | 5.0 – Ongoing | GR |
| | 6.0 – Ongoing – discussed at Item 5 below | GR |
| | 7A – Ongoing | CM/GR |
| | 7.0 – Complete | |
| | 8.0 – Ongoing | GR |
| | 10.1 – Ongoing | AC |
| | 10.2 – As 9.3.5 and 9.3.6 above | GR |
| | 10.3 – As 9.10.5 above | |
| | RG to send individuals a note of their outstanding actions following the meeting. The Board expressed concern that there were so many outstanding actions against GR including the website, noise monitor locations and proposed locations, MoU feedback, Complaints data report etc. It was agreed that the Chair write to GR enclosing the list of outstanding items and stressing the importance of completing the actions to allow the Board to progress the various items timeously. | RG LC |
| 5. | <p>Website</p> <p>There had been a request from EAL for individual email addresses for the website. However, GR had now apologised and confirmed that this information should not have been requested.</p> <p>Despite being given assurances at last meeting that the website would be available by 19 June for the Board to review, PP reported that it was still not live as EAL had promised.</p> <p>Concern was raised regarding the security of emails sent and received. It was confirmed that emails would not be able to be accessed via the website by EAL – www.EANAB.org.uk</p> <p>It was proposed to have one central email – info@eanab.org.uk. Other generic email addresses, eg Chair@, Secretary@, could also be set up. There would be no personal email addresses on the website.</p> <p>Homepage would include the aims for the Board, membership, etc. Community councils involved on Board would be listed on website</p> | |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| | <p>but no individuals. However this information will become apparent when minutes are posted.</p> <p>Tabs include minutes and documents, Consultations, Reports, Sub Groups with paragraph explaining what they do, Links to key information</p> <p>It would be for information only, not an interactive website.</p> | |
| | <p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Wednesday 1 August 2018 at 6.30pm in the Marriott Hotel</p> | |

There being no further business the meeting closed.