

## Edinburgh Airport Noise Advisory Board

Minutes of Thirteenth Meeting held on Wednesday 5 September 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; Merv Archibald (MA), Blackness Area CC; Tom Leatherland (TL), Limekilns and Charleston CC; Ray Godfree (RG), Ratho & District CC; Ray Flint (RF), Kinghorn CC; Adam Cumming (AC), Cramond Association; Bruce Finlayson (BF), North Queensferry CC; Andrew Watt (AW), Dalkeith & District CC & Midlothian Federation CC; Angela Wallace, Broxburn CC; Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC; Vic Garrad (VG), Kirknewton CC; Stefan Slater, Cramond & Barnton CC

**In Attendance:** Gordon Robertson (GR), EAL  
Mari Finlayson (MF), North Queensferry CC  
David Gray (DG), Falkirk Council  
Elaine Hill (Minutes)

**Apologies:** Gary Allanach (GA) Winchburgh CC;

### ACTION:

<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Introductions:</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced DG and MF.</p>	
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Approval of previous minutes:</b></p> <p>It was noted that the minutes from the extraordinary meeting held on 14 August with EAL and CAA had just been circulated by email and it was agreed that these would be reviewed and approved by the Board, if appropriate, by email before being circulated outwith the Board.</p> <p>GR requested that the minutes of the meeting held on 1 August be amended to remove reference to the perceived seniority of the role of Community Engagement Officer.</p> <p>Subject to the following amendments approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 1 August 2018 was proposed by MA and seconded by TL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Minutes were of the twelfth not eleventh meeting</li> <li>● Lindsay not Lindsey Cole</li> <li>● (minutes) removed after HP's name in the list of those present.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p>	

	<p>Complaints Data: GR tabled a draft report based on information provided by GA. He asked the Board to review the report and forward comments to GA which would be incorporated in reports going forward.</p> <p>Information regarding complaints resolutions was requested, i.e. what happens when a complaint is logged, escalation, etc. AW confirmed that he had complained and received a response.</p> <p>It was noted that the July Complaints Report contained inaccuracies and needed to be discussed. It was agreed that HP's email to the Board should be forwarded to EAL together with any additional comments from Board members which should be forwarded to HP &amp; LG for inclusion.</p>	<p><b>All GA/GR</b></p> <p><b>All HP/LG</b></p>
	<p>Noise Monitors: GR still to circulate information regarding the criteria required for suitable locations. GR confirmed that locations in West Lothian were still required. GR also confirmed that the locations are treated as confidential and not made public.</p>	<p><b>GR All</b></p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Discussion of draft letter from sub-group to CAA</b></p> <p>GR confirmed that he had received an initial response from ERDC regarding the noise mapping data information sent to them and they had agreed to a meeting with EAL and EANAB sub-group to discuss this. GR therefore suggested that the draft letter to Richard Moriarty, Chief Executive of CAA, be put on hold until after the meeting when hopefully some of the issues would be resolved.</p> <p>GR confirmed that he could contact ERDC this week and push for a meeting next week, perhaps by Skype.</p> <p>Discussion ensued regarding whether to send the draft letter or send an alternative letter confirming the meeting date (when known) and setting out the points the sub-group wish to discuss at the meeting.</p> <p>Some members of the Board felt that the tone of the letter was confrontational and that it would be better to either tone the letter down or hold off from sending the letter until after a meeting with ERDC. Other members of the Board felt that it was important to send the letter in its current form in advance of a meeting as formalisation of the Board's position.</p> <p>It was noted that the issue is not with ANCON but with the data that is input which is LGW data and not data from Edinburgh.</p> <p>A review of the data by a peer group was suggested and while this was considered good practice, it was also felt that this could take some time and should not hold up discussions with the CAA.</p> <p>It was also noted that it was important for the Board to formalise their own relationship direct with the CAA and it was felt that this letter was the first step.</p>	

	<p>At this point Mari Finlayson requested that her item on the agenda be discussed as she felt it was relevant to the discussion.</p> <p>MF reported that under legislation there was an opportunity within 4 weeks of submission of EAL's application to the CAA to request the submission be reviewed by the Secretary of State of Transport. NQCC had consulted a QC and felt that there are sufficient grounds for a judicial review based on the criteria that there were concerns regarding the technical information used to support the submission and that it was important to establish whether or not the data used was correct.</p> <p>NQCC and other CCs rely on EANAB to take actions on their behalf but expressed concern that the Board was not aware of this legislation. NQCC called on EANAB to investigate legislation for opportunities now and in the future to challenge EAL/CAA decisions.</p> <p>MF confirmed that there was a time limit of 4 weeks from the date of the submission to CAA to request the review and that the deadline was Monday 10 September 2018. NQCC have not had time to contact all Community Councils affected by the EAL proposals but 3 CCs have agreed to support NQCC in calling for the review. NQCC were very pleased that EAL had encouraged CAA to come up to Edinburgh to discuss the concerns regarding the data but still felt it was important to apply for the review.</p> <p>It was noted that NQCC had also decided to write to Roseanne Cunningham MSP as the Scottish Government also have an obligation under legislation. In addition NQCC would also be sending a similar letter to CAA.</p> <p>MF stressed that NQCC is not a pressure group and wants to work with CAA and EAL.</p> <p>It was agreed to put to a vote whether to send the draft letter to the CAA in its current format. The vote was 8 for and 8 against therefore it was agreed that the letter would be sent in its current format in advance of the meeting. A copy of the final letter to be circulated to the Board and GR.</p> <p>It was also agreed that GR would contact the CAA to arrange a meeting as soon as possible.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the letter to the CAA would not be made public until a reply had been received.</p>	<p><b>BF/LG</b></p> <p><b>GR</b></p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>To70 Work Update</b></p> <p>It was noted that the sub-group had met with To70 through a series of skype sessions over the summer to clarify the objectives. It had been agreed in the first instance due to the amount of work required to concentrate on departures only.</p>	

	<p>To70 had submitted their final proposals at the end of July and a final Skype meeting is due to take place on 14 September. This meeting would be attended by EANAB sub-group/EAL/To70.</p> <p>MA &amp; CM then presented some of the findings to the Board. It was noted that the increases shown in the presentation were percentage increases.</p> <p>These included the traffic statistics which showed a noticeable increase in departures over the last 3 years both in the Summer and Winter months. There was also an increase in nightflights (2300-0700).</p> <p>There was an increase in both jet and non-jet flights but the largest increase was in non-jet.</p> <p>There was an increase in the use of Runway 24 with a more steady use of Runway 06.</p> <p>The data collected included both commercial and freight flights but not military.</p> <p>It was noted that due to the level of detail contained within the feedback from To70, the project had taken longer than anticipated. However, any future work with To70 should be more cost effective and take less time.</p> <p>GR confirmed that EAL would be prepared to support future analysis work with the sub-group and To70.</p> <p>The Board thanked the sub-group for their work on this project.</p> <p>It was noted that some of the findings were difficult to fully understand and 3 dimensional mapping would be beneficial, eg effects of lateral sound.</p> <p>It was noted that EAL would shortly be releasing the ASC document in its entirety (subject to redaction).</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Flight Profiles</b></p> <p>It was noted that while Edinburgh and Glasgow flight profile data is based on Gatwick profiling, Heathrow, Stansted, Manchester and Birmingham all use locally measured vertical profiles.</p> <p>All of the above airports with the exception of Edinburgh &amp; Glasgow also use locally measured mean track and lateral dispersion.</p> <p>Validation is acquired via local noise monitors with the exception of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Manchester &amp; Birmingham.</p> <p>Discussion ensued regarding levels of thrust when aircraft climbing or banking. It was noted that the thrust levels were modelled on speed and</p>	

	<p>height information rather than actual thrust measurements. It was therefore felt that this required further investigation.</p> <p>It was noted that more investigation was also required into the effect of noise coverage from higher aircraft which is not detected by noise monitors.</p> <p>GR confirmed that EAL is keen to have the best noise maps possible and quickly passed on the information received from EANAB to the CAA who have now come back offering to meet. GR stressed that EAL followed due process regarding the consultation which had been independently reviewed.</p> <p>GR agreed to come back to the Board regarding who decided which profiles to use in the Consultation.</p> <p>It was agreed that it would be beneficial to look at the impact of arrivals but it was noted that the current budget only allowed for departures to be looked at.</p> <p>It was suggested that a more fundamental review of air corridors was required, including a higher air corridor down the east coast.</p> <p>It was noted that the airspace that EAL can use is set and that any changes to this may require another ASC. It was noted that there were still military restrictions along parts of the east coast.</p> <p>MF confirmed she had a letter from David Chapman confirming that the military would be happy to have discussions regarding the use of their airspace.</p> <p>It was suggested that a technical meeting was required with both NATS and ANS with a view to increasing the controlled airspace that EAL could use. GR re-issued his invitation to arrange a tour of the tower at Edinburgh to be followed by a technical meeting.</p>	<p><b>GR</b></p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Board Governance/Review/Elections</b></p> <p>It was agreed to hold elections in November which would be a year after the formation of the Board.</p> <p>An annual review questionnaire was circulated to members for completion and return to the Secretary</p> <p>With regard to the MoU, it was noted that fee proposal was still awaiting from the lawyers regarding the independent review of the document. The deadline of Friday 28 September for the signing of the document would not now be met and it was agreed to put this item on the Agenda for the October meeting. It was noted that the MoU would need to be ratified by the Board prior to signing.</p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>BF</b></p> <p><b>LG/BF</b></p>

8.	<p><b>Management of External Communication</b></p> <p>It was agreed to discuss this at the next meeting.</p>	LG
9.	<p><b>WHO Noise Guidelines/Thresholds</b></p> <p>The above document states that safe noise levels for sleeping are 45dcb lmax and not 90dcbs as stated in the ACP. In addition the document quotes 35dcb laq should be the level for inside classrooms.</p> <p>Concern was raised at this point that some communities in West Lothian, including Broxburn, were not consulted regarding the current ACP. GR confirmed that consultations had taken place from 2017 involving engagement with the public through community councils, press, social media, public meetings, etc. The correct process had been followed and the guidelines and criteria set by the CAA had been met.</p> <p>GR re-confirmed that the rationale document would be re-issued. All options put forward during the consultation had been considered and if they met the requirements EAL had to meet, they would be implemented.</p>	
10.	<p><b>M Finlayson: North Queensferry CC Presentation:</b> This item was discussed earlier in the meeting under Item 4.</p>	
11.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>11.1 <b>Economic Impact Assessment:</b> It was felt that this document contained some errors. It was agreed that these should be emailed to GR for investigation.</p>	GR
12	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Wednesday 3 October 2018 at 6.30pm in the Marriott Hotel</b></p>	

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.25pm