

EDINBURGH AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of Fifteenth Meeting held on Wednesday 7 November 2018

At the Marriott Hotel, 111 Glasgow Road, Edinburgh

Commencing at 6.30pm

PRESENT: Lindsay Cole (LC) (Chair)

Louise Gunstensen (LG), Dalgety Bay & 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; Andrew Watt (AW), Dalkeith & District CC & Midlothian Federation CC; Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC; Vic Garrad (VG); Kirknewton CC; Stefan Slater, Cramond & Barnton CC; Gary Allanach (GA), Winchburgh CC; Bruce Finlayson (BF), North Queensferry CC.

In Attendance: Gordon Robertson (GR), EAL
Anna Light (AL), Head of Community Engagement, EAL
June McClung (JMcC), Environmental Noise Advisor, EAL
Louise McIntyre (LMcI), Community Engagement Manager, EAL
David Gray (DG), Falkirk Council
Elaine Hill (Minutes)

Apologies: Adam Cumming (AC)

		ACTION
1.	Introductions: The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2.	Approval of Previous Minutes Subject to the initials RG being replaced with RF throughout Item 7 of the minutes, RF proposed and VG seconded that the Minutes of Meeting No 14 held on 3 October 2018 be approved.	
3. 3.1	Matters Arising CAA Seminar with EANAB A date is still awaited from the CAA. HP would continue to chase.	HP
4.	Update and Future Plans from EAL – including Noise Monitors ACP: Before handing over to EAL, the Chair, on behalf of everyone at the meeting, expressed the view that the rejection by the CAA of the ACP now gives all parties the opportunity to work together and to learn from	

mistakes made during the previous ACP. He asked EAL to engage in meaningful discussions with EANAB and communities from the start of the process and prior to further published consultations.

GR, on behalf of EAL, echoed this sentiment and confirmed that he would like to give the Board an update on the current position with the ACP, night flights and noise monitors.

GR confirmed that the Secretary of State did not intend to call in the ACP and therefore the CAA will now formally reject the submission. GR stated that EAL was disappointed by the decision as they believed they had put forward the best proposal but they understood the decision. The decision to reject was based on usage rather than routes. Although EAL had re-consulted in Fife, the CAA believed that they should also have re-consulted in the Livingston area. There were also concerns with the consultations over Routes E & G.

EAL are unable to start the process of re-submission (under CAP 1616) until the current submission is formally rejected. Then they will put a Statement of Intent into the CAA.

The next process will have "toll gates", i.e. EAL will meet with the CAA at various stages of the process to discuss and sign off each stage. All stages need to be signed off by the CAA prior to going to consultation. The process is clearly outlined in the CAP 1616 booklet

With regard to timescales for the re-submission, this would be subject to negotiation between the CAA and EAL.

GR expressed his agreement that good communication with the Board at the start of and throughout the process was essential. He asked how the Board would like to be involved, how do they wish to advise EAL as they go through the process. He suggested that perhaps a sub-group could be formed to work closely with EAL and report back to the full Board at each meeting or more regularly if required.

GR also asked how best to describe and explain to communities the impact and noise implications of any proposed changes to help them understand and make decisions.

GR confirmed that the Stakeholder Reference Group chaired by Dame Sue Bruce would be reconvened.

GR stated EAL was starting the process with a blank sheet of paper and stressed EAL's wish to understand how best the Board can help them going forward.

The Board welcomed GR's comments confirming that EAL wanted to work closely with EANAB. They asked for clarification whether their views could influence routes and thereby reduce noise for

	<p>communities. GR stated that EAL hoped to reduce noise and design routes that reduced the number of people that were flown over. However, there would always be winners and losers. But through the upcoming process, it was intended to identify the best recommendation from everyone which will provide a balance.</p>	
	<p>It was noted that Dalgety Bay CC had not received information requested on figures to support Route E from EAL. AL confirmed she would look into this.</p> <p>With regard to routing aircraft further down the Forth, EAL had been told that looking at this option was outwith the scope of the current consultation as they would need to make changes to controlled airspace. Any changes to routes above 7000ft need to be discussed with NATS to identify impact on the wider airspace usage.</p> <p>Discussions regarding changing air corridors and holding areas would need to be held with FASI which is run by NATS. GR understood that such changes would require another ACP and would involve discussions with the military, commercial airlines, NATS, etc.</p> <p>It was suggested that this topic could be discussed at one of the workshops the CAA had agreed to run for the Board.</p> <p>GR agreed to seek EAL's opinion on whether it would sponsor an ACP as he thought it was a good idea to look at in the future. GR also offered to speak to the CAA and FASI.</p> <p>GR also agreed that EAL would consider the letter from Kinghorn CC tabled at the meeting (and to be discussed under AOB) to see if they would be able to formally support the suggestion. He also agreed that Kinghorn CC should send the letter to the CAA.</p> <p>Concern was raised regarding levels of CO2 emissions and the numbers of people affected. GR to get the Sustainable Aviation Group to audit EAL.</p> <p>GR confirmed that he is still waiting for a response from ERCD regarding the baseline information used for the ANCON model. The Board stressed that the issue is not with the model itself but with the information input to the model. GR confirmed that EAL wanted to ensure best practice and that EAL and the Board should be in complete agreement on the model used. GR agreed to discuss this with CAA.</p> <p>It was noted that sub-groups would be discussed under Item 5 – MOU. Some members of the Board felt that this item should be discussed initially without the presence of EAL. The Board would then contact EAL with a proposal on the way forward. It was noted that the Board would need to be able to respond quickly in some instances in order for their comments to be incorporated.</p>	<p>AL</p> <p>GR</p> <p>GR</p> <p>RF</p> <p>GR</p> <p>GR</p>

	<p>EAL would take this opportunity to look at flight paths, time banding, etc.</p> <p>EAL were asked to provide access to the data that was used to form decisions incorporated in the ACP. Members of the Board expressed concern that the data provided had been incorrect and did not come from the source claimed by EAL.</p>	
	<p>GR apologised for this and confirmed that lessons had been learnt regarding the control of sub-contractors and data and that this matter had been dealt with internally by EAL.</p> <p>GR reiterated that EAL want to work with the Board to pull together clear information and data to create consultation documentation to put to communities.</p> <p>The Board noted that this was a 2-way process and that there would need to be compromise on both sides.</p>	
	<p>Night Flights: GR stated that it was apparent from the Noise Action Plan consultation that night flights were an area of concern and complaints were rising.</p> <p>EAL have now completed their consultation with the airlines regarding the introduction of an Environmental Charge and Edinburgh will be the first Scottish airport to introduce an extra charge for night flights. The charge should encourage airlines to fly quieter aircraft and also incentivise them to fly fewer flights at night. GR stated he would come back to the Board with more details regarding the charge including the schedule for implementation, level of charges and confirmation of the definition of night. It was noted that the charges raised would be used to fund community work. It was also noted that this would be a charge and not a fine.</p> <p>GR confirmed that EAL would also be looking at fining airlines in relation to noise and that noise thresholds would be set. Discussions were ongoing with NATS re capping flights.</p> <p>Noise Monitors: JMcC confirmed that EAL was starting to monitor 24 flightpath and a media request for volunteers was planned. Anyone wishing to volunteer to house a noise monitor to contact her.</p> <p>It was noted that due to the weather unfortunately insufficient data had been collected in relation to 06 routes. These noise monitors would be put back out with the same volunteers and therefore in the same locations. This is planned for end January to mid-March 2019.</p> <p>Noise reports based on the information requested by the Board were tabled. Once the Board had considered the reports, any changes required should be collated and fed back to JMcC in one report.</p>	<p>GR</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>LG</p>

	<p>JMcC agreed to look at the coding as some anomalies were evident with regard to locations.</p> <p>It was agreed that in order to review general trends this would be a standing item on the agenda.</p> <p>JMcC confirmed that SEL information would be incorporated into the reports. It was suggested that due to the level of detail, possibly two reports could be prepared – one for internal use and a less detailed one for public use. JMcC offered to produce a mock report containing no data for comment.</p>	<p>JMcC</p> <p>JMcC</p>
--	---	---------------------------------------

	<p>GR confirmed that the Runway 24 Offset Arrivals report had been rejected by EAL. This report had been asked for by Cramond CC prior to the EANAB being set up. It had been a desk exercise and glide paths had also been looked at. GR confirmed that no other projects like this were on the table and that EAL would not work with other groups without involving the Board.</p> <p>JMcC agreed to send some dates for a meeting on noise monitors to MA.</p> <p>On behalf of the Board, the Chair thanked EAL for their input to the meeting.</p>	<p>JMcC</p>
--	---	--------------------

At this point, a discussion ensued regarding the presence of EAL for Items 5 and 6. Therefore it was agreed to discuss Item 7 first.

<p>7.</p>	<p>University of Edinburgh Involvement.</p> <p>It was noted that this matter was progressing and that AC hoped to have a proposal from the University of Edinburgh for consideration at the next Board meeting in December. It was noted that this proposal was in connection with analysing noise data from EAL.</p>	<p>AC</p>
------------------	--	------------------

A further discussion ensued regarding whether EAL should remain for the discussion of Items 5 and 6. GR highlighted that EAL is a member of the Board and that he felt EAL should remain as there should be openness and transparency between the Board and EAL. However, out of respect he and his colleagues would leave the meeting to allow the Board to continue its discussions. GR expressed regret at this decision and hoped it would be the last time this issue arose. However, it was pointed out that EANAB had been set up as an independent board, independent of the airport, and should have the option of discussing in private. EANAB members then voted on whether EAL should remain. The vote was 7 for and 7 against. EAL thanked the Board and left the meeting.

DG also left the meeting at this point.

<p>6.</p>	<p>Governance Sub-Group</p>	
------------------	------------------------------------	--

	<p>ToR – Voting Procedure: The Board agreed that the voting procedure should be changed to:</p> <p>“In the event that a common consensus cannot be reached, a motion will be carried by a simple majority vote by full voting members. The Chair is not considered a full voting member of the Board but in the event of a tied vote will hold a casting vote to determine a result.”</p> <p>Frequency of Meetings It was noted that although some items required a significant amount of time, the frequency of meetings should remain at monthly. It was also noted that sub-groups should be formed to address specific issues.</p> <p>The role of Secretary: It was noted that sub-group meetings should be minuted/action points noted. HP offered to review the job description for a Minutes Secretary and circulate to the Board for comment.</p> <p>It was agreed that members should not email all members of the Board regarding all items and should target the emails as appropriate.</p> <p>Code of Conduct: The Board agreed to adopt the Code of Conduct as circulated as a working draft.</p> <p>Memorandum of Understanding: It was noted that this was now moving forward. This would provide a broad framework on how the Board would work with EAL. It was also noted that the intention was for the document to be signed by the Chair and Chief Executive of EAL.</p> <p>Control and Reporting of Working Sub Groups: The Board were asked to pass comments on the Issues Log to RG. It was noted that in principle when an issue arises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a sub group would be set up and set objectives ● spokesperson nominated ● draft outcomes ● target completion date. <p>It was noted that “growth” is an issue that should be addressed. It was also noted that there could be other avenues open to communities such as through planning routes.</p> <p>It was suggested that a Designated Airport status sub-group should be set up to look at the pros and cons. It was agreed that CM would chair this.</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>CM</p>
--	---	------------------------------------

	It was noted that the Board had an external affairs role and should provide quarterly updates to MPs/MSPs.	
8.	Outstanding Items - This item was not discussed.	
9.	AOB	
9.1	<p>Royal Burgh of Kinghorn Community Council Recommendation</p> <p>RF asked that EANAB formally support the proposals contained in correspondence tabled at the meeting to trial route G5 and a proposal for a new East Coast Air Corridor and Forth Hold Area/Waypoint.</p> <p>It was agreed that if a G5 trial was agreed then it should only be G5 to ascertain the impact on other communities. It was noted that it was important to reduce noise for all and not just move the noise to another area which has less background noise and therefore there would be more impact on communities.</p>	
	It was agreed that the Board would consider the proposals and let Kinghorn CC know whether or not they would support the proposals by the end of the week.	LC/LG
9.2	<p>ACP Sub-Group</p> <p>It was agreed that an ACP Sub-Group would be set up to progress this matter on behalf of the Board. It was noted however that the Board may need additional and/or separate meetings to discuss the ACP in detail.</p>	
11.	Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 5 December 2018 at 6.30pm in the Marriott Hotel	

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.30pm