

EDINBURGH AIRPORT NOISE ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of Thirty Third Meeting held on Wednesday 6th May 2020

By Webex

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; Bruce Finlayson (BF), North Queensferry CC; Ray Flint (RF), Kinghorn CC; Sharon Gibson (SG), Pumpherston 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, 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 (TW) Cramond and Barnton CC

In attendance: Rob Light ICCAN Head Commissioner

Apologies: None

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

ITEM		ACTION
1	Approval of Previous Minutes Draft minutes of the previous “virtual” meeting held on 1 st April had been circulated to all members for comment leading to a final draft circulated on 2 nd May 2020. Since no further comment had been tabled it was proposed (RG) and accepted by the meeting that the final draft be approved as a true record of the previous meeting.	
2	Matters Arising from previous meetings	
2.1	21.4.4 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 criteria for the noise modelling, which EAL then commissioned ERCD	

<p>2.2</p> <p>2.3</p> <p>2.4</p>	<p>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>Updates from Sub-Groups:</p> <p>30.2.5.2 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 9th 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>After further contact it was determined that attendance by ICCAN would be better delayed until the next “virtual” meeting planned for 6th May subject to ICCAN agreement and confirmation of arrangements.</p> <p>Arrangements in hand</p> <p>After discussion it was further agreed that a new and separate ICCAN group be formed to determine specific issues to be raised with ICCAN.</p> <p>28.3.3</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> <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 LMcl (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.”</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Ongoing All</p> <p>Ongoing Chair/PP</p> <p>Ongoing HP</p>
----------------------------------	---	--

2.5	<p>did not transfer from NATS to ANS. JM to investigate what happened and request it to be repeated. There remains an option to put the question to the EACC via the representatives from EANAB) 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. <i>It was determined that EANAB should consider a direct approach to NATS in attempt to obtain data relating to the runway 06 trial</i></p>	Ongoing AW/RF
2.6	<p>Health 29.4.4.1 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. The meeting took place as arranged. To be discussed later under issues log. <i>Report has been circulated. NHS have offered to provide some data, not yet received. Options being considered.</i></p>	Ongoing AC
2.7	<p>29.4.5.1 Review of Issues Log 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. <i>It was noted that some updates had been made and circulated within a new issues of the Log "Working Draft 2020 ISSUES LOG Rev A" to be discussed and noted later at this meeting.</i> <i>Awaiting responses from Issue Champions</i></p>	RG Ongoing Ongoing AW
2.8	<p>30.3.1 AW agreed to forward report sent by EANAB to the CAA to RC/EACC. <i>AW had not been aware that this was an action, but will send.</i> There was no separate EACC submission. <i>Email received from RC</i></p>	Ongoing LC
2.9	<p>30.6.3 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. Waiting to hear back. <i>Contact with Janice Howgarth of EACC will continue via email</i></p>	
	<p>31.7.1 Review of Issues Log 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</p>	RG

2.10	<p>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. Dealt with under Item 6 below See item 2.17 below</p>	<p>CLOSED</p>
2.11	<p>31.8 AOB 31.8.2 A question was raised as to whether Glasgow have a Noise Board. It was planned for end of 2019. LC to liaise with JH. LC to determine status of a Glasgow Noise Board under present Coronavirus issues.</p>	<p>Ongoing LC</p>
2.12	<p>31.8.6 ACP update. Further to discussion In view of ongoing uncertainty it was determined that EANAB write formally to the CAA requesting clarity relating to the ACP timetable, and, given the perception that the ACP appears biased towards capacity issues and significant projected growth in air traffic to raise awareness of the potential long term downward impact of the present coronavirus. ACP suspended until further notice</p>	<p>CHAIR In abeyance</p>
2.13	<p>The New Situation/The Way Forward 32.3.1The EANAB – MA offered to collate Member’s comments for uploading to the website to inform Communities of continuing EANAB effort in relation to aviation noise.</p>	<p>ALL/MA Ongoing</p>
2.14	<p>32.3.2 The impact on the ACP to be clarified by writing formally to the CAA requesting clarity relating to the ACP timetable.(see Item 2.19 above), and, given the perception that the ACP appears biased towards capacity issues and significant projected growth in air traffic to raise awareness of the potential long term downward impact of the present coronavirus. ACP suspended until further notice</p>	<p>CHAIR In abeyance</p>
2.15	<p>32.3.3 Noted that whilst EAL are impacted by the immediate downturn in demand a window of opportunity exists for EANAB to continue activities and to promote its concerns and ideas to both the CAA and ICCAN</p>	<p>Ongoing ALL</p>
2.16	<p>32.3.4 In this respect the planned attendance of ICCAN representatives at the next meeting on 6th May provides a unique opportunity to draw attention to concerns relating to anticipated changes in runway capacity, and projected growth. To this end it is intended the meeting will include a presentation to ICCAN, potentially based on the pending EANAB annual report. ICCAN presence confirmed</p>	<p>CHAIR CLOSED</p>
2.17		<p>HP CLOSED</p>

	<p>32.3.5 The new ICCAN Group to gather information together and formulate an agenda for the meeting with ICCAN Agenda prepared</p> <p>Review of Issues Log</p>	<p>ALL/RG Ongoing</p>
2.18	<p>32.6 Whilst “New issues” are invited from Members at any time, in the first instance, all members listed against each and every Issue are asked to feedback current update information so that the Log may be completed to reflect the current status quo. Awaiting responses from Issue Champions</p>	<p>Chair Ongoing</p>
2.19	<p>Annual Report</p> <p>32.7.1 It was noted that whilst any immediate pressure to submit the report to EAL was reduced allowing time to perfect the final issue it would be pertinent to complete the report as soon as possible. A draft copy is to be circulated for discussion/comment. Draft issued</p>	<p>RG Ongoing</p>
2.20	<p>32.7.2 Further to recent events it was agreed that the Governance sub-group review the EANAB Code of Conduct with a view to introducing measures for controlling potential breaches of the Code and a mechanism for addressing complaints.</p>	<p>Ongoing ALL/CHAIR</p>
2.21	<p>32.7.3 It was noted that a document charting the process of determining design principles for the ACP appeared to conclude principles that in some cases ignored basic principles established in consultations. As an example, an intent of “No Change to Flightpaths” appears to be ignored in final conclusions. Members were asked to draw attention of the Chair to similar issues so that the CAA might be informed by letter.</p>	<p>In abeyance CHAIR</p>
2.22	<p>32.7.4 It was reiterated that EANAB wish to know if the CAA intend abiding by present time scales for the ACP, in particular the next gateway on 24th April 2020. See item 3.2 above. ACP Suspended until further notice – See item 2.11 above</p>	<p>Ongoing LG</p>
2.23	<p>32.7.5 It was noted that feedback/comment is still required relating to an email on Planning Issues circulated previously. The email to be circulated to all members as a reminder.</p>	<p>Ongoing HP/ALL</p>
2.24	<p>32.7.6 It was noted that the consultation deadline relating to FASI North and FASI South had been extended to 27th May 2020 and reminder to members to consider this is required.</p> <p>32.7.7 A draft email to EAL, prepared requesting minimal funding to EANAB to cover costs of a minutes secretary is to be circulated for comment and further action.</p>	<p>Ongoing BF/ALL CHAIR</p>
3	Presentation by Rob Light of ICCAN	

A presentation of slides as noted below was given by Rob Light, Head Commissioner of ICCAN – The Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise:

In so doing, additional comment and information was made as indicated in red text below

Why was ICCAN established?

- Independent body to explore aviation noise impacts, first proposed in 2015 Airports Commission report
- From 2015 to 2017, Government held consultations to confirm the role of this independent body
- Officially formed in late 2018 to participate in the debate around aviation noise
- ICCAN, funded by the Department of Transport was formed in 2018 and will be subject to a review after two years, i.e. at the end of 2020
- ICCAN may make recommendations but has no Power of Enforcement
- ICCAN has no functional involvement in expansion of aviation but noise should be managed better than it was in the past if changes are being made.
- ICCAN is based in Woking with a complement of thirteen staff

ICCAN's objectives

- ICCAN is an advisory, non-statutory arm's length body
- Established to act as credible and impartial voice on all matters relating to aviation noise they have started to change the debate in some areas.
- Initial two-year remit to make evidence-based recommendations to government
- After thorough engagement, produced Corporate Strategy, setting our key objectives, to:
 1. Increase trust, transparency and clarity in the aviation noise debate
 2. Promote consistency, responsibility and accountability within the aviation industry and beyond
 3. Establish our expertise, authority and credibility
 4. To be important as an impartial voice

How does ICCAN engage about noise?

- We want to talk to anyone having conversations about aviation noise – understanding views and opinions is key for ICCAN's work
- Reviewing how airports engage about noise – seeking to find best practice and promote this where it exists
- Noise forums present unique opportunity for ICCAN to understand how issues are presented and discussed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICCAN are looking to emphasise similarities around the country and to build consistency. Engagement important as there are a lot of different voices but not a lot of listening. <p>How does ICCAN operate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board of five Commissioners bring specialist knowledge about local government, aviation industry and acoustics • Secretariat of 13 staff, including analysis, communications & engagement and business support teams, working on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attitudes to noise – published review of SoNA / developing new attitudinal study in December 2019. To contain agreed criteria and be published every 5 years going forward. • Researching current ‘slowdown’ – impact of covid-19 on aviation noise and attitudes • Consultation – best practice on how to engage and consult on airspace change. Have prepared a “Toolkit” for ACP change consultations to improve consistency. This will be published when relevant. • Health review – exploring links between noise and health. Accepting the impact of noise on health data is somewhat patchy and ICCAN is putting forward a review • Insulation schemes – reviewing UK airports’ noise insulation schemes and considering the provision of a National Standard as there is no consistency across regions at present. Will set out an acceptable standard. • Planning and land use – examining what guidance exists for planning / building. There is an awareness that Local Authorities are not necessarily well served with appropriate guidelines for planning applications and the use of land below flightpaths. ICCAN hoping to produce guidance early autumn 2020. • Noise metrics – ICCAN forming opinion on noise metrics with a report to be published by the end of June 2020. Offering opinion so as to promote debate to bring metrics to a more meaningful base. Aware that there is no consistency in published Noise Data and looking to bring all major airports into alignment as a 16 hour average does not reflect experience of people around all airports, and looking at frequency and growth. • Regulation – recommendations for regulation and enforcement. ICCAN intention to publish “Thinking” later in 2020 whilst considering consistency, transparency and night noise across the UK. DfT will be publishing consultation on night noise shortly. ICCAN is looking at the role ACCs can play in future together with noise management boards. <p>Key insights from our first year</p>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise management can be improved but needs people to come together and do things differently. • Increased pace of technology and innovation. Management can be improved as can the use of modern technology • Building social capital is key for when relationships become tested in making tough decisions. <p>What does the future look like for ICCAN?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We believe the UK can be the world leader for the management of aviation noise • Want to ensure aviation noise is being discussed alongside carbon • Reducing noise a key driver in boardrooms as this has not been a key driver before now. • Want to help improve the lives of those impacted by aviation noise by bringing this objective into Airport Boardrooms as a “key driver”. <p>Future role of ACCs noise boards and community groups?</p> <p>As Edinburgh Airport is one of the largest airports in the UK promoting links between Noise Boards such as EANAB and Airport Consultative Committees is seen as hugely important for Airports to engage with Communities through forums for discussion.</p> <p>Aviation post COVID-19?...</p> <p>Seen as having to be a different aviation scheme offering opportunity for quieter, smaller planes, whilst questioning the continuing use of large airliners.</p> <p>Anticipating greater public awareness (of noise) when operations re-start and an important opportunity to change relationships</p>	
4	<p>Comments (C) Questions(Q) and Answers(A) for ICCAN</p> <p>C: Pleased to see planning and land use at the forefront as aviation is broadly unchecked when considering permission for development. Scottish Government currently refreshing Scottish Planning Policy so it is a good time to be making any policy recommendations.</p> <p>A: ICCAN conscious that planning conditions in Scotland differ from those in the rest of the UK</p> <p>C: EANAB are aware of a rigid night time closure at Frankfurt Airport. Are ICCAN aware of this?</p> <p>A: Yes, and there has been a possible similar regime discussed for runway 3 at Heathrow. Quotas would be one way to achieve a consistent approach. UK regional airports often defensive of night time</p>	

flights for both long haul and freight as exemplified by East Midlands being busier at night than during the days.

C: Definition of night time varies. WHO definition different to airports.

C: Data relating health and noise is perceived as inconclusive against a probable time frame of 5 to 10 years before more meaningful data is available.

Q: What other Noise Boards is ICCAN involved with.

A: There are noise boards at Heathrow, Gatwick and Edinburgh, though there are a number of Airport Consultative Committees similar to EACC with subcommittees.

C: EANAB are finding it difficult to engage with NATS in the pursuit of ideas utilising more airspace over the Firth of Forth east of Edinburgh.

A: Recommend keep pursuing this line of enquiry, noting that Birmingham Airport is engaged in dialogue with both NATS and the Military, and government pressure is likely to assist in opening up potential air space in this way. ICCAN are going to give advice to ACOG re the need to look at use of wider airspace (not just existing) for opportunities to reduce noise.

Q: Is there any forum EANAB might join to pursue this wider use of airspace as redundant military airspace is said to be open but it appears that EDI cannot make progress?

A: Some airports engage in direct business with the military – EDI and EANAB need to make their voices heard.

Q: People say they will engage, seemingly as a box ticking exercise but do not follow through with actual consultation.

A: A problem with official consultation is that it is often seen as a means of gaining consent to a proposal without making changes to the proposal.

C: The CAA put back the 1st ACP at Edinburgh as they were not satisfied with the public consultation. What happens if an airport changes part of an ACP proposal following comment from the CAA, but then the airport is not required to re-visit the consultation process? There is a flaw within the CAP1616 process around verification of the Statement of Need.

A: This is yet to be tested. SoN is not within the remit of ICCAN.

Q: Airports are their own authorities for the Noise Action Plans and there is a regulatory gap. Government has no immediate authority over Airports.

A: ICAAN see this as something to investigate with a view to imposing consistent regulations. What is the point in the data if it is not being looked at? ICCAN looking at what is the right frequency for review.

Q: Looking for a better understanding of the impact of aviation noise on health there is a lack of consistency and clarity such as what is the right metric – is it average noise or is it noise peaks and against what background level? ? Noise peaks are important, particularly for night noise.

A: ICCAN are attempting to reflect this in current work.

C: EANAB have demonstrated to EDI that noise maps were flawed but even though maps are being corrected they take no account of maximising noise mitigation through take-off or landing profiles. There are opportunities for reducing noise through how planes are flown.

Q: Are ICCAN considering best practice at an international level?

A: ICCAN are considering areas when informed of Best Practice, including the USA and Australia and will continue to monitor Best Practice at an international level.

Q: In relation to flaws in noise mapping noted above, at EANAB's instigation To70 analysed maps against accurate flight data finding significant differences against the maps compiled on the basis of "Gatwick data" opening a fertile ground for looking at reducing noise. Profile management could be used as a way of mitigating noise.

A: ICCAN consider local solutions need to be run within a National Framework.

Q: Does ICCAN have any skill base to continue analysis such as that carried out by To70?

A: No – ICCAN is restricted in terms of a tight budget and limited overall resources.

Q 1.4: How do you measure the success of ICCAN?

A: By changing, over time, behaviours and better noise managements for the future, hopefully as ICCAN, with some statutory powers, or as a minimum as a Consultee.

ICCAN is working towards holding National Noise Data and acceptance within the industry that noise cannot be ignored, whilst noting that the drive on carbon utilisation together with the impact of Covid19 will make these difficult for at least the next two years.

Q: How can EANAB help?

A: By providing information, both good and bad examples, of which EANAB is a huge potential source.

Q: Noting what it is like in present circumstances without aircraft noise is there any way that ICCAN can measure changes in public perception of change coming out of Covid19?

A: ICCAN are engaged in a qualitative survey this summer again in 2021. ANY INFORMATION from communities/Airports will be useful.

	<p>Q: After Covid19 lockdown, will the social distancing within smaller aircraft lead to larger numbers of aircraft again?</p> <p>A: Reviewing Aviation news, concludes a reduction in fleets for the next 2 to 3 years with the probable axing of larger aircraft. It is understood that airlines are already looking towards not running A380 and 777 aircraft to the end of full design life. It is understood that EasyJet are looking to replace defunct Flybe flights at Glasgow and the concept of “Hub” airports may decline.</p> <p>C: Funding has been difficult for EANAB in some circumstances. For example, a conference on noise that some wished to attend. True consultation has been difficult. Noise report presentation has been a positive as we had a chance to influence.</p> <p>Q: Two and a half years after the formation of EANAB there is no evidence of any actual mitigation of noise. Is this a regular outcome?</p> <p>A: Airports need to demonstrate they can do things and give credit to Noise Boards. EANAB need to share the disappointment in lack of progress.</p> <p>C: Two and a half years with no mitigation and no opportunity to change is frustrating and has recently led to the resignation of a key Board member.</p> <p>A: It appears that Airports consider they can grow without mitigation but ICCAN consider this will change</p> <p>C: Noted that EAL continues to withhold data requested by EANAB when that same data is already in the public domain.</p> <p>A: EAL need to have a better relationship with EANAB and share data. ICCAN is sure this will be achieved at major airports as things have to change. Heathrow appears to already have constructive dialogue, whereas Gatwick is not as good.</p> <p>C: Many airport employees think things cannot be done and “planes have to fly” and so have closed minds.</p> <p>A: If you want people you can sit around a table with then you need to empower those people in order to succeed.</p> <p>Annual Report</p> <p>It was noted that few responses had been received to draft issues of the Annual report by the Chair.</p> <p>C: Noted that the draft report did not grasp the full impact of EANAB actions ICCAN were asked if they had examples of other Noise Boards annual reports.</p> <p>A: ICCAN are aware of a report from Gatwick that effectively “fell apart”.</p>	
5	Updates from EANAB	

	Noting that Christophe Miremont had resigned as a member of EANAB question arose as to how his profiling analysis may be continued. This will need addressing by the full EANAB board.	ALL/MA
6	Any Other Business	
6.1	Complaint Procedure It was noted that a complaint had been received from a Board Member and this needed to be addressed through action ongoing from item 2.19 above.	RG/BF
6.2	Health It was noted that a further potential contact had been made and was to be followed up	AC