

**EDINBURGH AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY BOARD**

**Minutes of Thirty first Meeting held on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020**

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

**Commencing at 6.30pm**

**Present:** Lindsay Cole, (LC); (Chair)

Merv Archibald (MA), Blackness Area CC; Adam Cumming (AC), Cramond Association; John Duffy (JD), Broxburn CC; Louise Gunstensen (LG), Dalgety Bay & Hillend CC; Ray Godfree (RG), Ratho & District CC; Tom Leatherland (TL), Limekilns and Charleston CC; Neil Lovett (NL), East Calder CC, Christophe Miremont (CM), Ecclesmachan resident; Pippa Plevin (PP), Uphall CC; Helena Paul (HP), Blackness Area CC/EAW; Liz Scobie (LS), Uphall CC; Karen Walker (KW), Blackness Area CC; Andrew Watt (AW), Dalkeith & District CC & Midlothian Federation CC; Tom Wylie (TM) Cramond and Barnton CC

**In Attendance:** Janice Hogarth (JH), EACC;  
June McClung (JM), EAL;  
Louise McIntyre (LMcl) EAL;  
Karen Easterbrook (Minutes)

**Apologies:** Bruce Finlayson (BF), North Queensferry CC; Sharon Gibson (SG), Pumpherston CC; Ray Flint (RF), Kinghorn CC;

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Janice Hogarth who is attending as an observer of behalf of the Edinburgh Airport Consultative Committee (EACC). Janice is the Secretary of the EACC and also Secretary of the Scottish Passenger Agent's Association.

<b>ITEM</b>		<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Approval of previous minutes</b>  The minutes of the meeting held on 5 <sup>th</sup> February 2020 were proposed by AW and seconded by TL.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Matters Arising from previous meetings</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	<b>21.4.4</b> 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. 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. This crucial piece of work has been commissioned by EAL but no progress has been made. EAL worked with the sub-group to agree the	

	<p>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.</p> <p>To be covered under Noise Map Updates.</p> <p>Maps received. Ongoing action for all to look at maps</p> <p><b>Updates from Sub-Groups:</b></p> <p><b>25.4.2 Aviation Sub sub Group Report</b>  <i>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.</i>  <i>Can EANAB take these suggestions to ANS?</i>  <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.</i>  <i>There is a gap between the MoD restricted areas which is not published. They are to be approached regarding this.</i>  <i>RF tabled his key design principals for discussion at the October meeting. Meeting to be set up with ANS regarding flight paths over Midlothian and Fife.</i></p> <p><b>2.2</b></p> <p><b>30.2.5.1</b> AW reported no progress has been made, needs to be escalated.</p> <p><b>2.3</b></p> <p>Setting up meeting with ANS still proving difficult, AW will email LMcl to assist.</p> <p><b>30.2.5.2</b> Further to noting that ICCAN had published a survey of attitudes to noise at all airports in December 2019 and would be publishing best practice guidance in 2020 as well as a report on noise matrix in April 2020, the Chair has spoken with Rupert Basham of ICCAN to invite ICCAN to February meeting or arrange telephone call between ICCAN and some member of the Board if appropriate. ICCAN who are looking for input from a professional flying perspective and not noise, although nothing has yet been finalised. The Chair should have more information on 9<sup>th</sup> February (application deadline). The Chair has discussed with ICCAN a representative coming to a future Board meeting, possibly April 2020, and will follow up on this is upcoming discussions.</p> <p>The Chair has spoken with ICCAN again who confirmed they require Aviation specialists rather than noise specialists. Ongoing, but unlikely that a meeting will happen until May.</p> <p>It was mentioned that ICCAN confirmed keen to attend EANAB board and Sam Hartley had advised that Rob Light (Chief Commissioner) is available to attend April Board.</p> <p><b>2.4</b></p> <p><b>ACP Up-date</b>  <b>25.5.1</b> MA's Questions:</p>	<p>Ongoing All</p> <p>Ongoing AW/RF</p> <p>Ongoing Chair</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------

2.5	<p>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. JM to email AL as this information request was agreed in the Statement of Need.</p> <p>JM advised that emailing AL and GR would be the most effective way to progress this.</p> <p>Q5.: Email AL/GR</p> <p>The Questions and Answers can be shared via the website.</p> <p>EAL analysts are compiling the data. A firm date for the answers was requested as it is crucial information and essential to EANAB. This item to be discussed under Item 3 below.</p> <p>Closed as covered in 2.7 – 2.11 below</p>	CLOSED
2.6	<p><b>26.6.2</b> 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>JM offered to follow this up</p> <p>Information resent.</p>	CLOSED
2.7	<p><b>26.6.3</b> A list of the needs of the Communities should be compiled in good time for the November meeting. Noted that members who had responded should do so as soon as possible. EAL email to be circulated to members again who should acknowledge receipt and confirm if any comments.</p> <p>Members were thanked for the many responses and it was confirmed that members are happy for the comments to be forwarded to LMcl at EAL</p> <p>Information sent.</p>	CLOSED
2.8	<p><b>28.3.1</b></p> <p>Should APD be reduced/removed, the forecast would be much greater - possibly 1m passengers per year (EAL agreed to check this figure). Response received from EAL (LMcl) – TBC</p> <p>It was advised that this has been answered. LMcl will check and resend.</p>	CLOSED
2.9	<p><b>28.3.2</b></p> <p>With regard to arrivals, EAL agreed to confirm the maximum number that could be handled.</p> <p>Response received from LMcl – TBC</p> <p>It was confirmed that there is no maximum because maximum capacity will be determined by final designs in the design stage. LMcl will put that in writing.</p> <p><b>28.3.3</b></p> <p>It was reported that the EACC minutes dated 16 August stated that the Runway 6 trial had been successful and allowed 1 minute separation without additional flight path. EAL agreed to look into this and report back to the Board with details of the trial and its outcomes</p>	Ongoing MA

2.10	<p>After discussion it was concluded that the minute was not for 16 August, but from the meeting that took place in August 2016. The response from LMCI (EAL) confirms the August 2016 minutes reference Andrew Mather “talking about an increase in 06 departures and the airport advising that no changes had been made to the flight paths, but the frequency of departures had increased. A trial was carried out in early 2016, however, NATS were unable to collect sufficient data and a report with outcomes was not produced.” It was discussed why the trial may not have been repeated and why the trial was reported as successful. It was suggested that perhaps it did not transfer from NATS to ANS. JM to investigate what happened and request it to be repeated.</p> <p>There remains an option to put the question to the EACC via the representatives from EANAB)</p> <p><b>It was clarified that a trial was carried out in 2016, but that not enough data was collected and no report was produced. The statement relating to a successful trial was in relation to an unrelated trial. There is no intention for a repeat trial.</b></p>	Ongoing MA
2.11	<p><b>28.3.5</b></p> <p>A request was made for the split of aircraft and the times they use the airport, i.e. freight, passenger, empty passenger repositioning, private, etc. EAL agreed to provide this.</p> <p>Response received from LMCI – To be confirmed</p> <p><b>Information provided.</b></p>	CLOSED
2.12	<p><b>28.3.7</b></p> <p>EAL agreed to let the Board know when they could submit comments to the CAA on the submission. It was thought there might be a 2 week consultation period prior to 31 January but EAL would seek clarification on this and inform the Board.</p> <p>Response received from EAL (LMCI). EAL did not agree to EANAB submitting comments on the Submission to the CAA. There may have been some interpretation issues when speaking about EAL Governance structure including the EAL Board.</p>	CLOSED  CLOSED
2.13	<p><b>28.4.1</b></p> <p>It was agreed that EAL would respond by email to the list of submitted questions.</p>	CLOSED
2.14	<p><b>28.4.2</b></p> <p>The question of noise monitoring reports was raised and EAL agreed to respond separately to this.</p> <p><b>Report received and reports will be issued on a regular basis in future.</b></p>	
	<p><b>Health</b></p> <p><b>29.4.4.1</b></p> <p>Meeting arranged with NHS for Thursday 23 January 2020. CAA published in October 2019 a 6 month update on CAP1841 aircraft noise and health effects.</p>	Ongoing AC

2.15	<p>The meeting took place as arranged. To be discussed later under issues log.</p> <p>Report has been circulated. NHS have offered to provide some data, not yet received. Options being considered.</p>	
2.16	<p><b>29.4.4.2</b></p> <p>Latest noise report had been received mid-December 2019. It was noted that noise levels for arrivals and “go arounds” were very high. It was intended to build a picture of noise levels as more quarterly information becomes available.</p> <p>Quarterly reports being received. Review planned for when full years’ worth of reports has been received (June/July).</p>	CLOSED
2.17	<p><b>29.4.5.1</b></p> <p><b>Review of Issues Log</b></p> <p>Issues Champions are asked to update the history column to make it more relevant and up to date. Sub groups to check issues are captured.</p>	Ongoing ALL
2.18	<p><b>29.4.5.2</b></p> <p>Sub-Groups to check they are captured on the Issues Log.</p> <p>Merged with 2.16 above.</p>	Ongoing AW
2.19	<p><b>30.3.1</b></p> <p>AW agreed to forward report sent by EANAB to the CAA to RC/EACC.</p> <p>AW had not been aware that this was an action, but will send.</p>	
2.20	<p><b>30.4.1</b></p> <p>A request was made for information on total number of households within the 63dB contour and the number who have applied for or have received insulation. HP to email JM with details of request. Email sent and response received. It was confirmed that government regulations relating to noise insulation can be accessed via the noise labs on the website. It was also confirmed that the number of households in the &gt;63dB contour has reduced by two (from 33 to 31).</p>	CLOSED
2.21	<p><b>30.4.2</b></p> <p>CM to confirm request to JM (EAL) by email.</p> <p>Request sent and response received.</p>	CLOSED
2.22	<p><b>30.5.1</b></p> <p><b>Noise sub (sub) group (TL)</b></p> <p>2019 Q3 and Q4 reports now available, TL noted that as expected in section 5, maximum noise levels recorded are higher on landing - close to monitor locations. JM offered to split data for arrivals and departures in future reports. It was agreed that this would be useful information.</p> <p>This will be included in future.</p>	CLOSED
	<p><b>30.5.2</b></p> <p><b>Health (AC)</b></p>	CLOSED

<p>2.23</p> <p>2.24</p> <p>2.25</p> <p>2.26</p> <p>2.27</p>	<p>Meeting held with Richard of NHS Lothian, Richard is unable to continue with this role as part of his normal duties due to workload and other options are being explored. A useful discussion was had and a report will be circulated. <b>Covered in 2.14 above</b></p> <p><b>30.6.1</b> A request was made to RC for a copy of the EACC response to the Aviation Strategy Consultation in 2019. Informal observations were made by EACC to the UK ACC who made a submission to the consultation. There was no separate EACC submission. <b>Email received from RC</b></p> <p><b>30.6.3</b> The Chair noted that the Planning and Noise report was received from RC and suggested this is dealt with by email outside of the meeting. <b>Waiting to hear back.</b></p> <p><b>30.6.4</b> The Chair reminded the Board that the next EANAB annual report is due soon. Members to update their submissions from last year and send (in a table) to the Chair. Suggested target date for report mid-March. <b>Covered below 4/5.</b></p> <p><b>30.6.5</b> JM (EAL) advised that their website was updated over the festive period and now looks quite different. Members to provide JM with any feedback. AW advised of an issue with historical data. <b>JM offered to organise to meet with AW to understand the problem</b></p> <p><b>30.6.6</b> It was confirmed that the next EACC meeting is being held at 10.30 at the Marriott on Monday 10 February. There will be some space for members of the public</p>	<p><b>CLOSED</b></p> <p><b>Ongoing Chair</b></p> <p><b>JM</b></p> <p><b>CLOSED</b></p>
<p>3</p>	<p><b>Aviation Sub Group Discussion</b> A summary email has been sent out. The group intend to present to the Board in the April meeting. Further data is required from EAL to enable a comparison between 2018 using old models versus new technique (an example of vertical profile data provided for 2018 contours based on LGW profiles and population tables showing population by contour was circulated). This comparison is intended to aid understanding of the relationship between profiles and footprint and to enable discussions of plane locations in three dimensions. It was explained that an email has been sent to EAL with five specific data requests. EAL suggested that, subject to reviewing the requests, it may be more appropriate to provide the data to a qualified external consultant for analysis. It was clarified that some requests did not in fact need any analysis and that there may have also have been a misunderstanding that raw data is required. However, the requirement</p>	

	<p>was not necessarily for raw data, such as the requested kml files, which are in fact processed data. On this basis, it is hoped that EAL can provide the requested data. It was suggested that it would be useful for EAL to receive background information about the reason for data requests and the objective of the presentations and how this would aid with communicating with communities. It was explained that it would be useful to highlight the benefits of the new modelling methods.</p> <p>It was commented that better use could be made of an external consultant if EANAB had access to the data first to help focus the brief.</p> <p>It was noted that the reason why PDFs were less useful is explained within the email request and it was confirmed that EAL are in possession of the existing PDF footprints in kml format. EAL will read and respond to the email request.</p>	<b>JM/LMcl</b>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>EANAB Review</b> Eight or nine replies were received from the email request sent to Board Members for input and the report is progress. EAL emphasised the importance of the report particularly for strengthening engagement with EANAB and specifically in relation to the West Lothian local authority.</p>	
<b>4.1</b>	<p>LC requested for those who have not provided updates already to please do so in next few days. Members requested to provide an update of the last year and to focus on future plans (5 lines worth of ideas from all members requested). LMcl offered to review draft report.</p> <p>LMcl mentioned that EAL would be happy to include a feature piece in the community newsletter (once report is published) to help raise EANAB profile.</p>	<b>ALL</b>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>EANAB (2020 Plans)</b> Discussion held with members suggesting the main points that EANAB should be focussing on for 2020. Ideas included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Focus on noise (mentioned by several members)</li> <li>● ACPs</li> <li>● How noise is monitored/accuracy of monitoring</li> <li>● Noise from night flights (mentioned by &gt;1 members)</li> <li>● Clarify how EANAB inputs into developments of new flight paths.</li> <li>● Improve community awareness of EANAB to reduce apathy and increase community engagement</li> <li>● Achieve confidence in accuracy of data and modelling and be able to engage in discussion providing critical assessment of data</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ensure noise is minimised for communities, requiring accurate data (in the spirit of CAP1616)</li> <li>● Achieve full quantification of existing aircraft noise and present situation and baseline for the ACP to really understand where the aircraft are and where the noise is.</li> <li>● Need for validation exercise to help community trust in models. Understand relationship between profiles and noise.</li> <li>● More cooperation and openness between EANAB and EAL.</li> <li>● Health (mentioned by &gt;1 members)</li> <li>● Understand what can be done to reduce noise over communities</li> <li>● Ensure EAL acknowledge and follow Government policy on noise mitigation and ensure that no areas are excluded from development of the ACP</li> <li>● Work towards a defined Night Time when there will be no flights (example: Frankfurt airport)</li> <li>● Recognise progress made by EANAB and benefits of dialogue with EAL</li> <li>● Mitigate noise for our communities and offer a robust critique of proposed changes</li> <li>● Achieve a relationship with communication flowing both ways with EANAB between EAL and communities. Help to rebuild trust which communities have lost with EAL</li> <li>● Consider Health and environment (whilst avoiding mission creep)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>6.1</b></p> <p><b>6.2</b></p>	<p><b>Up-dates from Sub Groups</b></p> <p><b>Aviation</b> Nothing added further to preceding discussions.</p> <p><b>Outer Airways</b> It was clarified that there is an Outer Airways subgroup, but that this is not “Departures”. Waiting for a meeting with Sandy Leggat to put forward suggestions for arrival pathways.</p> <p>A question was raised about the EAL position on the community desire for greater use of the wider part of the Firth of Forth. LMcI to respond (it was requested that updates are provided on a regular basis)</p> <p>It was mentioned that Neil met with Gordon (EAL) and Gordon McGregor (Head of Corporate Affairs) and LG read out the response received from the MP regarding consideration given to flying our further East over the Fife estuary, which suggested a potential misunderstanding of the route and direction in question.</p>	<p><b>LMcI</b></p>



<p><b>6.3</b></p>	<p>It is understood that NATS are looking at options out and over the North Sea, but details are not available at this time.</p> <p>Janice and Adam were thanked for passing on communications including the Airspace Reclassification Consultation. Members were urged to try and respond to this if the system allowed even though closing date is today (4 March).</p> <p><b>Health</b> See 2.14 above</p>	
<p><b>7</b></p> <p><b>7.1</b></p>	<p><b>Review of Issues Log</b></p> <p>The Issues log has not been updated in earnest since the end of 2019. It was suggested that this be rationalised to be more readable and more precise so that all Board Members (not just those in the sub groups) can understand the original issue, the objective and what the plan is to achieve the objective. It was suggested that those named as Champions meet separately to create a new version. This was agreed by the Board and RG offered to arrange the meeting.</p>	<p><b>RG</b></p>
<p><b>8</b></p> <p><b>8.1</b></p> <p><b>8.2</b></p> <p><b>8.3</b></p> <p><b>8.4</b></p>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>It was requested (earlier in the meeting) that EAL provide a list of proposed locations of temporary noise monitors to allow this information to be shared with members of the public when they ask.</p> <p>A question was raised as to whether Glasgow have a Noise Board. It was planned for end of 2019. LC to liaise with JH.</p> <p>Further discussion was held regarding departures going out over the Forth and it was suggested that without emphasis placed on it (by EANAB) it would be likely that FASI North would stay as it is with FASI South taking preference. Meeting with Sandy Leggat as per 6.2.</p> <p>It was queried whether the conversation should be with ANS or NATS (noted that ANS is the air traffic control company responsible for control of EA airspace and is subcontractor of EAL). It was acknowledged that ideally both should be included in a meeting, but that this was unlikely to happen. EAL to ask ANS to engage with EANAB.</p> <p><u>News article in Edinburgh News by Elsa Maishman.</u> EAL updated the Board with actions taken to respond to repeat complainer, including home visits and offers of noise monitoring. It is understood that the source of the data used in the article was the EAL community newsletter.</p> <p>It was queried why EAL report complaints in such a way, highlighting that a large number of complaints were received from very few complainants. EAL explained that it is shows it is not the issue of multiple complaints coming in and that they have seen a reduction in</p>	<p><b>JM</b></p> <p><b>LC</b></p> <p><b>LMcl</b></p>

<p>8.5</p> <p>8.6</p>	<p>the number of people complaining showing that they have potentially improved the way noise is talked about.</p> <p>It was questioned whether EAL had undertaken any analysis to show that people are in fact happier and not just disillusioned with the complaints process. EAL described that in some cases their engagement with repeat complainers has resulted in a better understanding for the complainant and therefore led to a better relationship between them people and EAL.</p> <p>With regard to the repeat complainants, there was a discussion about whether EANAB should get involved. EANAB were mentioned in the article and as the noise board, it was queried whether engagement with the complainants would be appropriate in order to understand their issues. Some members expressed concern that EANAB were not in a position to get involved, but that complainants could involve EACC via their council representatives.</p> <p>It was suggested that EAL could pass on details of EANAB/the appropriate council representative to complainants and to that end EAL requested a generic email address that could be given out.</p> <p>It was mentioned that it still cannot be fully quantified where/what noise is.</p> <p>It was explained that when complaints are received, EAL have limitations in so far as if the flights are within regulations, there is nothing much that can be done.</p> <p>EAL suggested that EANAB may wish to review the EAL complaints process and make suggestions.</p> <p>EAL confirmed that the noise measurements in the newspaper article, which were inaccurate, were not provided by them. It was agreed that given EANAB were mentioned in the article it would be appropriate for EANAB to submit a correction. LG and HP to draft a response and circulate to the Board.</p> <p>It was mentioned that there are financial disincentives for airlines flying at night and airlines were fined in some cases.</p> <p>Concern was raised at the January Uphall Community Council regarding the timing of the Edinburgh Airport sustainability survey. It was issued on the last working day of 2019 and listed 25 major items, including noise. The survey closed on 6 January 2020, the first working day of 2020. Uphall CC were not aware of it until 14 January. EAL responded that it was carried out by an external organisation and that it was extended, however it was recognised that it was not ideal.</p> <p><b>ACP update.</b></p>	<p>LG/HP</p>
-----------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

	<p>Clarification has been requested, as per email sent out. Meeting due in March. Update from LG's MP advises that Stage 1 and 2 running concurrently, which is being queried. LMcl can seek clarification if required. Website states Edinburgh ACP, previously agreed date for defined gateway was 31.1.2020, proposed revised date is 24.4.2020</p>	<b>LMcl</b>
	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS:</b> <b>Wednesday 1 April 2020 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>	