

**Minutes of Twenty Sixth Meeting held on Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2019**

**At the Marriott Hotel, 111 Glasgow Road, Edinburgh**

**Commencing at 6.30pm**

Lindsay Cole, (LC); Merv Archibald (MA), Blackness Area CC; Adam Cumming (AC), Cramond Association; John Duffy (JD) Broxburn CC; Steve Egan (SE) Eliburn cc; Mairi Finlayson (MF) North Queensferry CC; Ray Flint (RF), Uphall County Council; Vic Garrard (VG), Kirknewton CC; Ray Godfree (RG), Ratho & District CC; Louise Gunstensen (LG), Dalgety Bay & Hillend CC; Tom Leatherland (TL), Limekilns and Charleston CC; Neil Lovett (NL), East Calder CC; Helena Paul (HP), Blackness Area CC / Edinburgh Airport Watch; Pippa Plevin (PP), Uphall CC; Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC; Andrew Watt (AW), Dalkeith & District CC & Midlothian Federation CC; Tom Wylie (TM) Cramond and Barnton CC

**In Attendance:** Louise McIntyre (LMcI) EAL  
Lynne Hainsworth (Minutes)

**Apologies:** Bruce Finlayson (BF), North Queensferry CC; Christophe Miremont (CM), Ecclesmachan resident; June McClung (JMcC) EAL; Sharon Gibson (SG), Pumpherston CC

ITEM		ACTION
	<p><b>Introductions:</b></p> <p>LC welcomed Steve Egan of Eliburn Community Council as a member of the Board.</p> <p>MA queried the absence of key representatives from EAL and asked for EAL to answer the ACP Q&amp;As urgently. LMcI responded that it is known by the Board that Gordon/Anna don't attend every meeting, should the Board feel the need for them to come to a meeting they should let EAL know well in advance.</p> <p>LMcI requested that she have previous minutes sooner to allow review before the meetings. RG explained there had been some delay with the September minutes due to computer problems, now resolved and the target issues of future draft minutes should be within two weeks of a meeting.</p> <p>MA requested that another meeting be held to address this key stage of the ACP. MA also noted that he felt EAL were treating EANAB disrespectfully by not sending replies or staff able to answer EANAB's questions.</p>	

	LC advised that a letter requesting answers to the ACP Q&As will be sent as they are urgently required.	
<b>1.</b>	<b>Approval of previous minutes:</b>	
1.1	Subject to inclusion of a note from HP covering missing item, approval of the minutes was proposed by MA and seconded by AW.	HP/RG
<b>2</b>	<b>Matters Arising from previous meetings</b>	
2.1	<b>25.1a</b> The Terms of Reference and Code of Conduct are to be sent to JD.	CLOSED
2.2	<b>25.1b</b> <i>An Introductory pack with Terms of Reference, Code of Conduct and a list of abbreviations is to be composed. A pack has been compiled noting abbreviations are included in a Glossary to be found on the EANAB website under "Reports"</i>	CLOSED
2.3	<b>25.2</b> The minute from the extraordinary meeting will be an Agenda item in the October meeting to allow questions	CLOSED
	<b>Noise complaints report</b> <b>17.8.1</b> <i>Volunteers were requested to form the sub-group fronted by TL to analyse reports. It was noted that EAL had requested all suggested amendments to the reports be submitted together. Meeting to be arranged to discuss potential amendments to the reports.</i> The meeting with June was held, and proposals agreed. TL circulated the draft on 30/7/19. <i>No-one else has expressed any interest in the proposed Complaints/fines sub-group and TL would welcome support.</i> <a href="#">AW assisting.</a>	CLOSED
2.4	<b>20.4.9</b> <i>It was noted that sub-groups were still required for noise complaints and noise fines</i> <i>Nothing to report.</i>	CLOSED
2.5	<b>(Noise &amp; Proposed Residential Developments)</b> <b>21.3.16</b> <i>It was agreed that to draw up a list of bullet points on the different routes the Board could take to become a consultee on planning applications where residential developments could be affected by aircraft noise.</i> <i>LG to resend email. Email sent and awaiting feedback from members.</i> <a href="#">LG will take this forward.</a>	ONGOING LG
2.6	<b>21.4.2</b> <i>Notes of the Noise Monitoring meeting on 16 April had been circulated to the Board. It was noted that the Board had concerns about how the meeting went. The Chair stressed that a further meeting should be arranged as soon as possible and a list of issues to</i>	

2.7	<p><i>be discussed would be issued to EAL. It was noted that the informal notes taken by the sub-group would also be circulated to EAL. A report from the further meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> August to be circulated in due course.</i></p> <p><a href="#">Awaiting final comments for the report.</a></p>	Ongoing EAL S-G
2.8	<p><b>21.4.3</b> <i>The Board requested that the data from noise monitors which demonstrates how the mobile unit is used, the level of background noise, etc., be presented by EAL</i></p> <p><i>The information will be ready by the next meeting by JMcC. It was noted that Communities need to know where the monitors are and what they monitor. If there are more monitors it will assist the communities and the airport. A spread will help. EAL indicated the hope to be able to do this. The Board to inform EAL what type of information they are looking for in relation to Noise Monitors prior to EAL being able to present to the Board. A meeting will be convened. A report is in process to enable production of an Action Report for public use. New ownership of this action is required.</i></p>	CLOSED
2.9	<p><b>21.4.4</b> <i>EAL agreed to involve the Aviation Consultancy Sub-Group in discussions with ERDC relating to noise modelling. It was noted that no further progress had been made and that any response received from ERDC would be shared with the sub-group.</i></p> <p><i>EAL confirmed that they had escalated this matter as still no progress had been made due to absence of Darren Rhodes. Another prompt will be made next week EANAB will continue to invite dialogue with the groups.</i></p> <p><i>EAL worked with the sub-group to agree the criteria for the noise modelling, which EAL then commissioned ERCD to carry out; that work is currently ongoing. EANAB are also seeking to speak directly with ERCD but as yet have had no response.</i></p>	Ongoing EAL
2.10	<p><b>22.4.1 Health</b></p> <p><i>The Chair agreed to look at identifying someone who could take on this issue and report back to the next meeting. It was suggested that local GPs or the University of Edinburgh may be interested in becoming involved. It was noted that there were 2 people at the Inverkeithing Public meeting who spoke about health. It was agreed to approach them to see if they would be interested in helping with scoping a study.</i></p> <p><i>A business case is to be compiled in order to recruit a Consultant. As noted on the Issues Log AC has identified a doctor from Midlothian - an appointment meeting will be arranged. <a href="#">Meeting arranged for 3<sup>rd</sup> October</a></i></p> <p><b>22.6.1 EACC CEO report</b></p> <p><i>EAL agreed to check if the EACC CEO report could be made available to EANAB and/or if it was available on the EAL website. It was noted that the EACC CEO report is issued in confidence to the Chair of EANAB who sits on the EACC. It was agreed that the Chair</i></p>	CLOSED

2.11	<p>and AC would speak to Robert Carr to discuss the possibility of circulating the report to EANAB members. It was further noted that the report does not appear on the EACC website.</p> <p>The Report is to include an agreed EANAB position, with a brief before and after the meeting as EANAB are represented. LC to make the strategy and the CEO Report available. PP to place it on Google Drive. Next meeting is 11/11/19 at 10 am.</p> <p>All reports are available on publication but a copy will be sent to LC in time for review before the November meeting. The full report is requested and responses.</p>	LC/AC/PP Ongoing
2.12	<p><b>22.6.2</b> It was agreed to invite Robert Carr (RC) to a meeting to forge good links between the two groups.</p> <p>An invitation to the October meeting will be extended.</p> <p>RC will be invited to the November meeting as he was not available in October.</p>	Ongoing LC
2.13	<p><b>23:4.1 Aviation Consultancy Sub-Group</b></p> <p>It was noted that a response was still awaited from ERCD. It was agreed that the sub-group would write to ERDC to push for a response as soon as possible. A draft letter would be circulated to Board members for comments as quickly as possible to enable the letter to be sent.</p> <p>Concern was raised regarding how progress could be made in relation to the ACP without a full understanding of the noise contours. EAL confirmed that they also needed a response as soon as possible from ERCD as they were now at the point of tendering.</p> <p>Three sites are in the process of being approved for noise monitors. Two sites are agreed. See Section 4 Updates.</p>	CLOSED
2.14	<p><b>23:5.1</b> It was suggested that the To70 findings report could assist in the positioning of noise monitors and it was agreed to include this in the discussions with EAL.</p>	CLOSED
2.15	<p><b>24:4.8 Aviation 2050 Consultation</b></p> <p>It was noted that the EANAB response had still to be uploaded to the website. EAL requested a copy from LG.</p> <p><b>Updates from Sub-Groups:</b>  <u>Aviation</u> – to be discussed in Section 5.</p>	CLOSED
2.16	<p><b>25.4.1</b> The report is to be circulated by TL; it was discussed in a meeting between JMcC and TK. The next report will be to the new template.</p> <p><b>25.4.2</b> Aviation Sub sub Group Report</p> <p>A presentation was made by AW and RF demonstrating current flight paths and feasible alterations that could be made to avoid densely populated areas. This presentation is still a work in progress but will be circulated upon completion.</p> <p>Can ENAB take these suggestions to ANS?</p>	TL Ongoing

<p>2.17</p> <p>2.18</p> <p>2.19</p> <p>2.20</p> <p>2.21</p>	<p><i>A set of principals are to be drawn up within the next month as most flights could be cut by fifteen minutes saving fuel and disruption. There is a gap between the MoD restricted areas which is not published. They are to be approached regarding this. RF tabled his key design principals for discussion at the October meeting.</i></p> <p><b>25.4.3</b> <i>EAL are to be asked to clarify which Stakeholders have been contacted by Progressive to the Design Principals Meeting. LC will write requesting direct answers from EAL within the week.</i></p> <p><b>25.4.4</b> <b>MOU</b> <i>A copy of the report is to be provided. A signed copy was shared with LC in September.</i></p> <p><b>25.4.5</b> <b>Health</b> <i>As soon as an appointment has been confirmed it will be announced. LG to draft a letter to MSPs. Pending meeting arranged for 3<sup>rd</sup> October</i></p> <p><b>ACP Up-date</b> <b>25.5.1</b> <b>MA's Questions:</b> <i>Q3.: No, There is no raw data in case of misinterpretation but not in this instance. The data is in the public domain and is specific and factual. JMcC to email AL as this information request was agreed in the Statement of Need. JMcC advised that emailing AL and GR would be the most effective way to progress this. Q5.: Email AL/GR The Questions and Answers can be shared via the website. EAL analysts are compiling the data. A firm date for the answers was requested as it is crucial information and essential to EANAB. LMcl requested that Minutes be issued to EAL sooner to allow time for response.</i></p> <p><b>AOB</b> <i>LC to give LG a notification proposal for planning for the new housing development Newbridge. LC scanned and sent the proposal to LG but has not received a response. No further action on this particular issue but agreed EANAB will continue to monitor potential planning developments as appropriate.</i></p>	<p><b>Ongoing AW/RF</b></p> <p><b>Ongoing LC</b></p> <p><b>CLOSED</b></p> <p><b>Ongoing LG/LC</b></p> <p><b>JMcC/RG Ongoing</b></p> <p><b>CLOSED</b></p>
<p><b>3</b></p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.1.1</p>	<p><b>Up Dates from Sub Groups</b></p> <p><u>Aviation</u> MA, CM, BW, AL and GR met on 18 September to discuss EANAB's role in the workshops, whether it be advisory and/or participatory. A letter is to be sent to GR expressing concern in the process and transparency. CCs expressed concerns about the Statement of Need. The lack of a set format for the workshops means the outcomes will be very diverse and imprecise.</p>	<p><b>LC</b></p>

<p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p>	<p><u>Aviation (sub-sub) Group Report.</u> A master list of principles is to be compiled. It was noted that some workshop attendees felt this stage of the ACP process be restarted for consistency. The new name of the group is to be: Outer Airways Group.</p> <p><u>MOU</u> See Matters Arising</p> <p><u>Health</u> See Matters Arising</p> <p><u>Review of Issues Log</u> The Issues Log updated to this day, 2<sup>nd</sup> October had been circulated to EANAB members. It was suggested that the Issues Log should be distributed for information to members of the EACC in order to show what EANAB, a group of volunteers, are achieving. This was agreed.</p>	<p>RG/LC</p>
<p>4</p> <p>4.1</p>	<p><b>Statement of Need</b> Noted that in the Statement of Need the altitude range from 7,000 to 20,000ft was not included in the tick box so it would appear that the ACP will not consider potential use of the Forth estuary for new flight paths. In addition the Statement of Need excluded any reference to evidence supporting the premise that there was a lack of runway capacity, and similarly there was no evidence supporting the stated economic benefit of EDI to the Scottish economy.</p> <p>These queries, particularly the 7,000ft limit on altitude, need addressing to progress the process. LC to include these concerns in his letter to GR. Parallel timelines are necessary.</p>	<p>LC</p>
<p>5</p>	<p><b>ACP - Consultation Method</b> Concerns were expressed on the method of consultation and the width of its sphere. It is not a true consultation in terms of CAP 1616. The lack of discussion in the workshops was highlighted and queries raised about the re-invitation selection process as weaknesses will be created if they are cherry picked. LC asked to attend another workshop but LMcl was unsure if this was possible. Concerns over delays in information share were stated. A list of people invited was requested.</p>	<p>LMcl</p>
<p>6</p>	<p><b>AOB</b> An article from the Daily Mail was tabled by an EANAB member who thought it suggested there had been a huge increase in traffic over the past year. LMcl read the article and clarified there had been a</p>	

<p><b>6.1</b></p> <p><b>6.2</b></p> <p><b>6.3</b></p> <p><b>6.4</b></p> <p><b>6.5</b></p>	<p>misunderstanding and it referred to growth over the past 10 years, not the past year</p> <p>Committee for Climate Change The focus of the Board was questioned. Should environmental concerns be admitted into the remit? Demand for flights will have to be managed and this will impact on EANAB via health issues not the inconvenience of the noise which is the current focus. It was questioned whether the ACP application is conflicting with current societal views. Should EANAB be advising on this and feeding emissions concerns into the process as well as noise.</p> <p>Flight Radar 24: A member of EANAB was unsure of some freight carrier names. To save them time finding out the information, LMcl offered to do this and send a list of names and their codes to the member.</p> <p>A list of the needs of the Communities should be compiled in good time for the November meeting.</p> <p>Rob Light of ICAN will be invited to a meeting or skyped in.</p> <p>Board members were asked for feedback on the website in order to update it, keeping to EANAB principles.</p>	<p><b>LMcl</b></p> <p><b>LMcl</b></p> <p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>LC</b></p> <p><b>ALL</b></p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS:</b></p> <p><b>Wednesday 6 November 2019 at 6.30pm in the Marriott Hotel</b></p>	
	<p>There being no further business LC thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.</p>	