

Edinburgh Airport Noise Advisory Board
Minutes of Extraordinary Meeting
Tuesday 21st August 2019, 6.30 pm
The Marriott Hotel, 111 Glasgow Road, Edinburgh

Present:

Edinburgh Airport Ltd.:

Gordon Robertson, Communications Director EAL
Anna Light
Louise MacIntyre
June McClung

EANAB:

Lindsay Cole, The independent chair of the EANAB

Elected Members:

Merv Archibald, Blackness Area Community Council
Adam Cunningham, Cramond Association & Vice Chair
Bruce Finlayson, North Queensferry Community Council
Ray Flint, Kinghorn Community Council
Tom Leatherland, Limekilns & Charleston Community Council
Bernard McIntosh stand-in for Louise Gunstensen, Dalgety Bay and Hillend Community Council
Christophe Miremont, Ecclesmachan resident
Helena Paul, Blackness Community Council and Edinburgh Airport Watch
Pippa Plevin, Uphall Community Council
Liz Scobie, Uphall Community Council
Kate Watt, Ratho & District Community Council
Andrew Watt, Vice Chair of Dalkeith and District Community Council
Tom Wylie, Cramond and Barnton Community Council

In Attendance: Lynne Hainsworth (Minute Secretary)

Apologies:

Ray Godfree, Ratho & District CC

		ACTION:
	The Chair welcomed all attendees.	
	GR gave an introduction to AL's presentation. Explaining the focus on the process of CAP1616, the difference from previous processes and therefore how EANAB fits into this.	
	CAP 1616 is a new government consultation procedure	
	AL gave a presentation, (Appendix A) explaining safe separation times of aircraft landings and take offs. This alters dependant on the aircraft type, larger craft create airwaves which affect smaller craft. There are typically 2 minutes between departures this can be shortened to 1 minute if smaller aircraft are first. There are 28 movements per hour. Arrivals every 1minute 45 seconds to 38 aircraft arrivals per hour. The combined movement is 42 per hour.	
	It was confirmed that a Statement of Need was submitted on the 14 th of April 2019 and thanked EANAB for their input. The proposal was to modernise the air space away from ground beacons.	
	NERL are major stakeholders in air space and they influence the space AE uses. The entire system for the UK is being assessed. The use of the space over the Forth is being encouraged and assessed. EAL would not deliver this a sits over 7000ft nut they could work in parallel on it. It would potentially take a lot of traffic away from Fife. Any plans that are made have to have East to West mirroring.	
	To70 are assessing this route change for EAL and the full scrutiny and assessment will be made available. As yet it has not passed its Statement of Need.	
	It was raised that this was a contravention of rules.	
	A full consultation with all community groups would take place at the appropriate time.	
	EAL asked NERL to look at using the Forth.	
	It was pointed out that runway 06 not 24's use of the Forth was asked for by EANAB.	
	It was clarified that all stages in CAP1616 must be passed before the stage can be progressed. It is all transparent and public.	
	Step 1A was passed on 1 st July 2019. Stage 1B is process focussing on Design Principles which must be very detailed and definitions clear. These principals in action should be easily identifiable in the consultation.	
	The process of defining gateways is being defined hopefully by January 2020.	
	Discussions: It was clarified that all communities will be involved not just those who are impacted currently by noise contours but those who may be in the future. There are 14 areas that represent people who will/are or may be impacted, this covers a 15 mile circle on the map for 7000 ft.	
	EAL were asked to provide a map for 4000 ft.	EAL
	Community groups will be contacted to engage on the Design Principles from all from all catchments.	
	The methodology from how to recruit Progressive Partnerships is being set out currently.	

	Cap 1616 Stakeholders. Communities are key. These are listed in the graph such a Scottish Airspace etc. These groups find specific representatives. EAL have no influence over recruitment or the debate but do receive the recommendations and feedback.	
	Local authorities and community councils should be on the list.	EAL
	Progressive are creating the list which is to be shared with EANAB and reported on.	
	There will be 10-20 discussion groups but this may change once the recruitment process is completed. All reasonable ideas will be recovered and it will be transparent and anonymised.	
	It should take 3-4 years to get to Stage 7.	
	It is hoped stakeholders come on board early so they may be educated by the process by Stage 2A.	
	CAP1616 gives guidance on timelines.	
	Stage 2 – consultations An impact map might be useful instead of flight path maps. This could then be broken down into different impact groups on the maps. Involving passengers is also being considered.	
	The presentation Appendixed is in confidence.	
	It was noted that there is no opportunity to challenge or query the Statement of Need. The predictive growth is likely overstated. Proximity of MoD controlled airspace is unrepresented.	
	The reduction of peak impacts and delays had been the focus not growth.	
	ACP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS. A paper to discuss EAL's response to EANAB's initial list of 41 questions relating to EAL's current ACP was tabled. The summary of the discussion of each question is highlighted, where appropriate, in red text in this minute. To avoid the meeting over-running some of the questions were intentionally not addressed at the meeting. They will be discussed at the next routine EANAB monthly meeting on 4 September.	

Explanation of text in the following section:

Standard black text EAL's response to EANAB's original question
 Bold black text EANAB's response
 Red text Summary of discussion at the meeting

Topic	Item	Question
Capacity	1	The reference to a target maximum runway capacity of 50 movements per hour disappears between v1 and v2 of the Statement of Need. In the minutes of the Assessment Meeting there is no record that this change was requested by the CAA. What is the reason for this change? Noted. When will the target capacity be available?
	2	A Runway Capacity Target is one of the key operational criteria required for a meaningful development of design principles in step1B of the CAP1616 process. What is the target runway capacity target driving the ACP? As Q1
	3	The current declared runway capacity is a maximum of 42 movements per hour. It is essential for affected communities to better understand the runway capacity issue driving the ACP.

		Will EAL provide EANAB with the number of flights per hour data for the last 36 months? Agreed the data will be provided for the next EANAB meeting.
Growth	4	Separate statements have been made by EAL concerning the negative impact on growth that would arise from cancelling the anticipated halving of APD. What were the initial growth projections relevant to the capacity issue (assuming ADP cut) and what are the revised growth projections used for this ACP? EAL were respectfully requested to answer the question as their initial response does not answer it.
	5	Since the recent declaration by the Scottish government of the country being in a “Climate Emergency “and its setting of targets for carbon emissions there have been media reports about the impact on flying in the UK. In particular the possibility of domestic flights being restricted/banned in the UK. This is speculation at the moment and even if it occurs it will be medium to long term before it happens. However can EAL advise how they view this and how they see it impacting future planning for growth? The current data is based on analysis and projections from investors, climate change groups etc. EAL to provide EANAB with this list. GR stated that the current data is "based on past growth"; and on "what we know is going to happen in the next 5 years
Airspace issues and opportunities	6	Can EAL provide more details on the “confined airspace” issue mentioned in slide 5 of EAL’s presentation during the assessment meeting? EAL operate in the airspace they were given. There are conflicting priorities with Gliders group, MOD etc. A diagram of the designated airspace in the Forth will be sought by EAL. GR stated that with regard to the MoD zones/channels from Lossiemouth south, EAL is "looking at it in the context of the NERL opportunities that have now been presented to EAL". (Post meeting note: In the interests of transparency required under CAP 1616 - and as undertaken specifically by AL, could this please be recorded and EAL asked to report back more fully on this - especially as GR indicated that the discussions with NERL re Runway 24 arrivals are relevant to this?
	7	7-10: To be addressed at 4 September EAL/EANAB meeting. How many early turns and flight paths are being planned by EAL on each runway and what determines these targets?
	8	Previous trial and ACP targeted a 1-minute departure interval. Is that the case for this ACP?
	9	Some experience was gained from the previous trial for the old ACP, over the last 4 years, to educate this new ACP. What is the maximum distance and altitude at which the “early turn” can be situated from DER to allow the desired departure interval?
	10	Would a single additional flight path (combined with existing flown flight paths) be sufficient to fix the capacity issue?
	11	11 and 13 Can EAL expand further on this? EAL have been working with NATS looking at ways in which the upper airspace around EDI might be better used, in particular the area out over the Firth of Forth. What ideas are emerging from these meetings?

	12	<p>What is the opportunity for a change to the “designated end of runway”?</p> <p>Is EAL’s intention seeking an early turn before current DER position?</p> <p>To be addressed at 4 September EAL/EANAB meeting.</p>
	13	<p>Can specific details be provided of discussions with NATS and/or other stakeholders regarding FASI-N and the relationship with EAL’s ACP? What are the ‘opportunities’ as outlined in the minutes of the Stage 1a assessment meeting and what is the likelihood of any integration of the EAL ACP with the FASI-N project?</p>
	14	<p>Will the sponsors contemplate a simpler RNAV replication exercise, as opposed to the creation of additional flight paths? Could EAL please now respond to this matter?</p>
Environmental impact assessment	15	<p>As baseline noise maps and footprints are crucial to the development of Design Principles at step1B, when is the target date for producing these?</p>
	16	<p>Some significant changes are to be made to the way ANCON noise modelling is carried out at EDI, notably the use of radar data to define where the aircraft are flown.</p> <p>Will radar data analysis be used to define both the vertical profile and track position of aircraft?</p>
	17	<p>Previous independent analysis of radar data revealed that the vertical profile varied significantly over the various SIDs.</p> <p>Will the radar data used to define the vertical profile of aircraft be SID specific in an effort to make the noise modelling as representative as possible of operations at EDI?</p>
	18	<p>What period will be used for establishing the baseline of the environmental impact assessment both in terms of radar analysis and traffic analysis?</p>
	19	<p>Can EAL confirm that population impact analysis will be carried within the LOAEL of 51db LAeq16h and 45dB LAeq8h for daytime and night time respectively?</p>
	20	<p>Can EAL confirm that SEL/Lmax footprint maps for B738, EA33, EA319C, and EA320C will be provided to EANAB to allow a meaningful engagement from and beyond step1B of the CAP1616 process? Can EAL confirm the footprint maps will be provided for the planes specified in our question?</p>
Design principles	21	<p>What environmental criteria are used by the sponsors as part of the development of the design principles in step 1B of the CAP1616 process? EAL will confirm when the environmental criteria will be available at our 4 September meeting.</p>
	22	<p>22 - 25 EAL confirmed engagement on these matters will be towards the end of Step 1b, which is likely to be in early 2020.</p> <p>Will the ACP be developed to avoid the overflying of new people (i.e. people not currently overflown by existing flight paths)?</p>
	23	<p>Will the ACP be developed to minimise the overall number of people exposed to aircraft noise (within LOAEL limits)?</p>
	24	<p>Will the ACP be designed to keep the overall population within LOAEL levels equal or lower to the current baseline situation?</p>
	25	<p>Given two areas, A and B, with different baseline aircraft noise levels; area A is exposed to higher levels than area B. The previous ACP had</p>

		proposals that allowed area A's exposure to aircraft noise to increase and to balance that by reducing area B's exposure to aircraft noise. Will the same rationale be contemplated as an environmental criterion for the development of design principles in step 1B of the CAP1616 process?
	26	Can EAL provide EANAB with details of the Noise Preferential Routes and noise abatement procedures relevant to the development of design principles? To be addressed later
	27	Can EAL clarify what, in its view, will constitute overflying in terms of height and distance?
	28	How will the altitude-based-priorities (as defined in the Air Navigation Guidance 2017) be taken into account during the development of design principles and in particular in the context of creating an early turn below 7000ft? It was pointed out on a number of occasions at the meeting EAL must take account of the Air Navigation Guidance 2017. In response, GR stated first that " a Version A and Version B may be necessary"
	29	Can EAL provide EANAB with the up-to-date local plans in area affected by the proposals which are used to inform the development of design principles?
	30	Will EAL consider night time flight restriction as part of development of design principles? It was noted that CAP1616 Appendix B, para B51 defines Day as 07:00 - 23:00 and Night as 23:00 - 07:00.
Engagement	31	EAL are abandoning public meetings in favour of focus groups and drop-in sessions. While these activities can be very useful, from the perspective of our communities, it lays EAL open to the following concerns: 1) It is wrong to abandon public meetings. Yes, maybe only a few folk get to speak, but everyone hears the points they are making and can indicate their support or otherwise. 2) Using only focus groups and drop in sessions could be seen as a divide and rule strategy. 3) They are open to abuse as the focus groups can be carefully selected to get the required result. 4) Most groups in our communities don't have a full command of all the issues involved, making it easy for EAL to bamboozle them with lots of figures and aviation abbreviations, and produce facts that the participants are not equipped to challenge. Will EAL reconsider carrying out community engagement via public meetings? EANAB recorded its disappointment with the response, suggesting perhaps individual Community Councils could request and organise specific public meetings attended by EAL.
Additional	32	Supplementary question to Q.28 of our list of 29 July... How will EAL's desire to create an early turn, increasing, or introducing, noise at a particularly sensitive time (6-7am) in many communities be reconciled with current Government policy on aviation noise? There are currently no proposals for new flights. We are right at the early stages of CAP1616 which involve stakeholder engagement to develop design principles.

34	<p>What account, if any, has EAL taken of the significant decrease in the rate of growth demonstrated on the graph recently produced by Christophe [graph to be attached??? The graph wasn't attached – please resend. As Q4. Note, EANAB to send EAL the graph referred to on the question</p>
35	<p>What account has EAL taken of the recent declaration by the Scottish Government of a climate emergency which involves Scotland's target of reducing greenhouse gases to "net-zero" by 2045 - given that transport - including aviation - accounts for the largest share - 36.8% of emissions in Scotland? Duplication of Q5 – see Q5's answer.</p>
36	<p>What account has EAL taken of the recent decision of the Scottish Government not to reduce Air Passenger Duty? Duplication of Q4 – see Q4's answer.</p>
37	<p>What account has EAL taken of the general population, but in particular, younger people, being influenced by the Extinction Rebellion movement and its aims to reduce emissions by inter alia travelling less by air in future? We are watching this with interest. At the moment all of our growth plans are based on current data – this is currently speculation.</p>
38	<p>Why has EAL referred to "runways" in its stated purpose above when it has recently sacrificed its second runway? We have one strip but two runways 24 and 06</p>
39	<p>What account has EAL taken of UK Government Guidance - as set out in ANG 2017 sections:</p> <p>3.3 - that "when considering requests to change the airspace design, the CAA should apply the following altitude-based priorities of the government: a. in the airspace from the ground to below 4,000 feet the government's environmental priority is to limit and, where possible, reduce the total adverse effects on people; b. where options for route design from the ground to below 4,000 feet are similar in terms of the number of people affected by total adverse noise effects, preference should be given to that option which is most consistent with existing published airspace arrangements"?</p> <p>3.7 - Below 4,000 feet, there is a strong likelihood that aircraft could create levels of noise exposure above the LOAELs identified above, which is reflected in the Altitude Based Priorities.</p> <p>3.8 - There may however be options which perform comparatively better in terms of minimising more serious impacts as opposed to annoyance, or certain options may be better for day noise than night noise, or vice versa. In these instances, the CAA should verify that sponsors have considered the relative trade-offs and taken into account any community views on what the objectives in terms of noise should be.</p> <p>5.18 - that "In order to provide communities with transparency on the numbers of aircraft flown near them, the designated airports should publish details of where the aircraft are actually flying and the amount</p>

		<p>of noise created. These airports, working with their local communities, can determine the precise information they wish to publish but we [the CAA] anticipate that it may include: a. the average distance of how close to the standard instrument departure route the aircraft have flown up to an altitude of 4,000 feet, or higher if the airport wishes; b. the areas, and the specific number of departing aircraft, where 80%, 90%, 95% and 99% of air traffic has flown up to an altitude of 4,000 feet and the noise level in each of these areas; and c. details on the areas overflown by arriving aircraft from an altitude of below 4,000 feet to when they reach the runway?</p> <p>Our Airspace Change Programme will meet Air Navigation Guidance 2017. At this stage I cannot confirm how it will be taken into account – this will be investigated and applied as part of Stage 2 specifically 2A Options Development.</p>
	40	<p>Given that a substantial number of residents in the Broxburn/Uphall/Winchburgh live within a distance similar to the residents of Barnton/Cramond, will EAL ensure that these residents are not overflown in the airspace from the ground to below 4,000 feet (amsl)?</p> <p>There are currently no proposals for new flights. We are right at the early stages of CAP1616 which involve stakeholder engagement to develop design principles. When will the requested information be available?</p>
	41	<p>Given that the existing SID on Runway 24 follows a route from the point of departure at Edinburgh Airport to the A899 dual carriageway at Livingston over land formally designated as Countryside Belt by West Lothian Council which is almost entirely comprised of agricultural land/industrial estates and is therefore sparsely populated, will EAL retain that route - by replication of the route - and thus avoid the significant adverse effects which would be sustained by residents in Broxburn/Uphall/Winchburgh if they are overflown by jet aircraft in the airspace from the ground to below 4,000 feet (amsl) - contrary to UK Government Guidance?</p> <p>There are currently no proposals for new flights. We are right at the early stages of CAP1616 which involve stakeholder engagement to develop design principles. When will the requested information be available?</p>

Additional notes

GR stated that EAL "must comply with guidance that the CAA give EAL as to what the design must include". This must be clarified. In another statement by GR that he would read paragraph 3d) of the Minutes of the EACC meeting in May 2019 and clarify what was meant by the phrase, "the options will be different this time with the noise levels viewed 4000 feet and climate at 4000 - 7000 feet." GR specifically undertook at the meeting on 21st August to revert back on this point after re-reading paragraph 3d).

Please ensure that EAL's position on public meetings is clarified.

The difficulties in engaging with Darren Rhodes of ERCD must be recorded and an update re GR's discussions with Tim Johnson re expediting a response from ERCD obtained.

	Thanks were given to EAL for their prompt responses to these questions and a vote of thanks to MA for putting the log together.	
	A core representation of EANAB needs to be compiled as the group is too large to attend intact.	
	Concern that air navigation guidance is interpreted differently between EAL and EANAB. The minutes of the CAA meeting in May hold an anomaly. Navigations as noise and co2. GD to respond as an agenda item.	GD/LC
	Thanks were given to all for their contributions.	

There being no further business the meeting closed.