

Minutes of Eighteenth Meeting held on Wednesday 6 February 2019

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; Pippa Plevin (PP), Uphall CC; Merv Archibald (MA) Blackness Area CC; Ray Godfree (RG), Ratho & District CC; Andrew Watt (AW), Dalkeith & District CC & Midlothian Federation CC; Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC; Vic Garrard (VG); Kirknewton CC;. Adam Cumming (AC), Cramond Association; Tom Leatherland (TL), Limekilns and Charleston CC; Ray Flint (RF) Kinghorn CC; Neil Lovett (NL), East Calder & District CC.

In Attendance: Louise McIntyre (LMcl), Community Engagement Manager, EAL
June McClung (JMCC), Environmental Noise Advisor, EAL
Elaine Hill (Minutes)

Apologies: Christophe Miremont (CM), Ecclesmachan resident; Stefan Slater, Cramond & Barnton CC; Bruce Finlayson (BF), North Queensferry CC; Gordon Robertson (GR), EAL

1.	<p>Introductions:</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting including Neil Lovett who was attending his first meeting representing East Calder & District CC.</p> <p>It was agreed to take Item 6, Scottish Government Consultation EU Regulation 594, after approval of the previous minutes.</p>
2.	<p>Approval of Previous Minutes</p> <p>Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 December 2018 was proposed by MA and seconded by RG.</p> <p>Approval of the minutes of the Housekeeping meeting held on Tuesday 15 January was proposed by RF and seconded by AW.</p>
3	<p>Matters Arising from the Meeting 17 held on 15 January 2019</p> <p>It was noted that going forward matters arising would be on the agenda and discussed at this point in the meeting.</p> <p>Aviation Sub-Group</p>
3.1	

3.2	<p>17.3.1 <i>The sub-group will present a summary of the findings to the Board following the meeting with EAL</i> Reported that following a January meeting with EAL further analysis from To70 was being pursued to allow completion of the report</p> <p>17.3.2 Additional Flightpaths Sub-Group to be defined and added to the EANAB Issues.</p> <p>17.3.3 HP offered to send a copy of the CAA IPO document to AW.</p> <p>17.3.4 EANAB consider being involved in sponsoring possible future air space changes</p>
3.3	<p>Governance Sub-Group</p> <p>17.3.5 MoU: Progress is being made with comments back to EANAB lawyer. There had been a delay in getting confirmation from EAL that they would cover the costs involved.</p> <p>17.3.6 Code of Conduct: Governance Sub-Group to circulate updated Code of Conduct and upload to the EANAB website.</p> <p>17.3.7 Noted that the updated version should be uploaded to the EANAB website.</p> <p>Health Sub-Group</p> <p>17.3.8 It was agreed to forward information regarding this (Comment on Ratho Station Development) to SS and to the Board in general.</p>
3.4	<p>Edinburgh University</p> <p>17.4.1 A proposal including costings was awaited from the Engineering & Mathematics Schools which would be circulated to the Board.</p>
3.5	<p>CAA Seminar</p> <p>17.5.1 Ref. cancelled CAA seminar it was agreed that the Chair would write to the CAA by 08/02/19 to request a revised date for the seminar. He would also write to EAL with a copy of the agenda inviting them to attend if they wished to.</p>
3.6	<p>17.5.2 Ref. current a major Airspace Policy consultation – Aviation 2050 – which closes on 11 April 2019. It was suggested that EANAB should submit a response. It was noted that the Aviation Environment Federation would be holding 2 seminars in London – 28 February and 5 March - and it was felt that attendance at these seminars could assist with informing the Board’s response to the Aviation 2050 consultation which closes on 11 April 2019. It was agreed that HP/LG should attend these seminars. The Chair agreed that reasonable travel expenses would be reimbursed.</p>

3.7	<p>It was further agreed that a draft consultation response would be circulated to the Board for discussion at the March meeting</p>
	<p>Annual Review</p>
	<p>17.6.1 With regard to expenditure, a breakdown of £40,000 had been requested. It was agreed that this, and any other EAL items, should be sent to the Board in advance of the next meeting.</p>
	<p>17.6.2 It was noted that EAL had still not provided copies of job descriptions for the community facing roles which the Board felt would assist in understanding how the roles interact both within EAL and with the Board and communities.</p>
3.8	<p>17.6.3 Ref. Chair and Vice-Chair would prepare a draft review and circulate to the Board. A final Draft to be tabled at the next meeting in March</p>
	<p>Outstanding Items of Action</p>
3.9	<p>17.7.1 It was agreed to list all outstanding actions from a meeting at the beginning of the minutes and to ensure that these items are discussed and updated at the following meeting.</p>
	<p>17.7.2 Chair to arrange meeting with EAL to go through all the outstanding actions against EAL.</p>
3.10	<p>17.7.3 All members to go through the list and action any items against them to provide an update by the next meeting.</p>
	<p>Any Other Business</p>
3.11	<p>Noise complaints report</p>
	<p>17.8.1 It was agreed that a sub-group should be formed to analyse the reports being provided by EAL. GA to be asked to confirm lead or otherwise for this sub-group.</p> <p>17.8.2 Ref noise complaint from Bathgate – referred to local Community Council</p>
	<p>Admin Support/Board Secretary</p>
	<p>17.8.3 Ref role of the secretary and admin support to be discussed at the February Board meeting and a list of duties to be circulated in advance of the meeting.</p>
3.12	<p>Ratho Community Council</p> <p>17.8.4 Ref request from Ratho and District Community Council having received query for the potential for further compensation payments for the renewals. Noted further information obtained by Ratho CC to be</p>

<p>3.13</p> <p>3.14</p>	<p>forwarded to AC to be considered by the Mitigation and Compensations Sub-Group.</p> <p>Board Member Expenses 17.8.5 The question was raised of requesting from EAL a contribution to out of pocket expenses for members to cover any reasonable admin or travel expenses. It was noted that the SRG were offered expenses. It was agreed that the Chair could raise this with EAL.</p> <p>It was agreed that RG would consolidate the outstanding actions from previous meetings including the EAL list of actions for discussion at the next meeting.</p>
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p>	<p>4. Updates from Subgroups</p> <p>Aviation Consultancy Sub-Group It was reported that a small amount of additional work was required from To70 – a findings report in terminology understandable to the layperson and a more detailed analysis of vertical profiles. To70 have provided quotes for these:</p> <p>Findings Report – 3.5 days work @ E3,500+VAT Analysis – 1.5 days work @ E1,500 + VAT</p> <p>Approval of this quote was awaited from EAL.</p> <p>To70 had proposed some further work in relation to modelling not on ANCON at E20,000. However, the sub-group felt this work was unnecessary and recommended that the Board do not instruct this additional work as they believed it would be of little value at this stage.</p> <p>Once the To70 Findings Report had been completed, the Sub-Group would come back to the Board with an overview on how to move forward.</p> <p>With regard to noise monitoring, it was noted that a meeting was requested with EAL to discuss a number of areas where it was felt the Board could advise EAL. EAL suggested that the sub-group put forward some suggested dates to JMcC so that a meeting can be arranged convenient to those members attending. EAL were then asked to provide suitable dates.</p> <p>Sub Sub-Group Issues Log had been updated to reflect this group’s objective to look at additional flightpaths initially in relation to arrivals. In order to familiarise themselves with the issues involved, the group would like to meet with ANS to understand what they do and why. It was agreed that the group would forward suitable dates for such a meeting to JMcC who offered to arrange this. EAL were then asked to provide suitable dates.</p>

	<p>The group would then like to meet with NATS for the same reasons.</p> <p>It was suggested that To70 could assist with descent profiles for arrivals.</p> <p>The group would look at various possible additional flight paths, including the designated military airspace over the Forth not used since the closure of Leuchars, and come back to the Board with suggestions.</p> <p>MOU - Nothing further to report</p> <p>Health – Nothing further to report</p> <p>University of Edinburgh Involvement AC meeting with UoE on Thursday this week for update and to see if they require any further data.</p> <p>It was noted that Fraser Nash Consultants based in Glasgow now offer noise monitoring consultancy.</p>
5.	<p>CAA Response</p> <p>A response had been received from the CAA in relation to the 4 initial questions submitted to them. This response is being considered by the Aviation Sub-Group. However, it was noted that the To70 Findings Report was required to assist with the response.</p>
6	<p>Scottish Government Consultation EU Regulation 594</p> <p>A copy of the paper “Noise Management at Scottish Airports” produced by Transport Scotland had been circulated prior to the meeting. In addition, a paper produced by the Royal Burgh of Kinghorn Community Council was tabled at the meeting. It was noted that the Transport Scotland paper proposed the City of Edinburgh Council as the “competent authority” in relation to Edinburgh Airport. Although the airport was located within the boundary of CEC, the impact of Edinburgh Airport affected several other communities outwith the remit of CEC. The paper produced by Royal Kinghorn CC proposed that the Transport Scotland consultation be amended to ensure that CEC “must” consult with other local authorities and take account of their views and comments before finalising any planning approvals and associated operating restrictions for developments at or related to Edinburgh Airport.</p> <p>It was noted that this regulation had to be approved and implemented before Brexit – it has already been implemented in the rest of the UK. It was further noted that the regulation required approval by the Scottish Government, Westminster and EU.</p>

<p>6.1</p>	<p>It was suggested that the “competent authority” should be the Scottish Government rather than CEC (and Renfrewshire Council for Glasgow Airport). However, it was felt that it was important at this stage to qualify the CEC role as noted above and further amendments could be proposed after implementation due to the tight timescales involved.</p> <p>It was noted that Kinghorn and Dalgety Bay CCs had responded to the consultation – the closing date for which was 1 February 2019.</p> <p>It was agreed that RF would draft a response on behalf of the Board stating its recommendation that an additional paragraph along the lines of the Kinghorn CC paper be added to the proposed regulations. This draft to be forwarded to the Chair on Thursday 7 February to be finalised and sent on Board letterhead to Transport Scotland the same day.</p> <p>It was noted that the consultation paper had only been received by EAL on 21 January 2019 who had forwarded it to the Board on 22 January. The Board Secretary had circulated it to all members the same day.</p> <p>The Board expressed its concern at the lack of notice given to allow sufficient time to consider and respond to the consultation.</p> <p>It was suggested that members should alert their local MPs/MSPs.</p> <p>It was felt that opportunities under this legislation to reduce noise would be limited as ACPs, etc., are not covered by Planning regulations.</p>
<p>6.2</p>	<p>It was noted that LG had prepared some detailed notes on the regulation and agreed to circulate this to those interested.</p> <p>At this point, RF left the meeting.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Outstanding Items and Action List</p> <p>This was discussed under Item 3 above.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>Google Group</p>
<p>8.1</p>	<p>It was noted there was a limit to the amount of data that could be stored with this platform. Therefore consideration was being given to setting up a Google Drive with directories and subfolders. PP agreed to report back to the next meeting.</p> <p>NAP</p> <p>It was noted that the final document was produced and sent to the Scottish Government in June 2018. EAL explained that the document is approved by Scottish Ministers and then goes to Westminster/Defra for approval before final approval by the EU. The NAP should now be</p>

with the EU for approval. It was noted that the NAP had to be with the EU for approval by 31 January 2019.

The document can only be published once it has been approved at all stages.

8.2

The Board requested that they be provided with a copy at this stage on the proviso that it would not be discussed or circulated outwith the Board members.

It was noted that post-Brexit NAPs would still be forwarded to the EU but not for approval.

EAL explained that the information used for NAP modelling was based on data received from the Scottish Government/Jacobs and not the data used on the Gatwick ANCON base model. The data provided by the Scottish Government was used to produce maps on the Scottish noise mapping site and fed into the ANCON model to provide more understandable visuals.

It was noted that EAL are providing radar data which is being fed back to To70 to provide a comparison with the ANCON modelling.

Noise Charging

8.3

EAL agreed to check whether this document could be circulated to the Board due to its commercially sensitive nature. Some Board members felt that they should have been consulted on the document at the outset as it relates to noise which is within the Board's remit.

In response to a question on how many flights had been fined due to breaching noise levels, it was noted that no breaches had occurred in 2017. It was noted that EAL were looking at bringing down the levels at which the fines started and that no other airport in the UK was doing this.

The current levels for breaching noise levels are:

- Up to 3db -£1,000
- Over 3db - £2,000

Temporary Noise Monitors: EAL explained that the batteries powering the temporary noise monitors lasted 2 weeks. Unfortunately, due to illness this had been overlooked and the temporary noise monitors had not been working over the Christmas period. EAL confirmed they had learned from this and that more robust procedures were in place to cover any future absences. EAL confirmed that the temporary noise monitors were back at the airport but would be redeployed in the near future.

9	Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 6 March 2019 at 6.30pm in the Marriott Hotel
----------	---

There being no further business, the meeting closed.