

EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT

INDEPENDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Monitoring, Environment, Noise and Track (MENT) Sub Committee

APPROVED Minutes of the Meeting
held at East Midlands Airport on Friday 31 January 2014

Present:

Independent Facilitator & Chair

Mr B Whyman MBE, Ch, JP

Organisation:

Nottinghamshire County Council

Leicestershire County Council

Rushcliffe Borough Council

DHL

Consumers' Association/WHICH

Kings Newton Residents Association

Melbourne Civic Society

SAVE – Save Aston Village Environment

PAIN – People Against Intrusive Noise

Councillor A Brown

Councillor T Pendleton

Councillor M Males

Mr P Hewett

Dr A Manhire & Mr I Jones

Mr S Leech

Dr P Grimley

Mr J Gidlow

Mrs P Beddoe

East Midlands Airport:

Corporate Affairs Director MAG

Environment Adviser MAG

Minute Secretary

Mr N Robinson

Mr D Foote

Mrs A Lamin

14/01M APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. There were no apologies and no declarations of interest.

The Chairman apologised for the late despatch of papers for this meeting. It was confirmed that for future meetings papers will be despatched for receipt by members one week before each meeting.

14/02M MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 27 SEPTEMBER 2013

a) The minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2013 were accepted as a true record, subject to an amendment on 13/19, para 8 which is amended to read: '*Recently* there are more complaints relating to Bournemouth airport which reflects different flight patterns and the local situation at this time.'

b) Matters arising not covered on the agenda:
13/19M

Cllr Pendleton and Neil Robinson had met with the complainant and the concerns raised relating to acoustic insulation and night noise had been acknowledged. Discussions are ongoing and Cllr Pendleton will continue to mediate on behalf of the complainant. A member said that complainants need to be dogged and should not be intimidated although it was accepted that noise issues had improved. EMA confirmed that all complaints are acknowledged and investigated. Cllr Pendleton will report progress to the next meeting.

ACTION: CLLR PENDLETON

A member raised concerns about a complaint made on 4 September relating to training flights. This was raised again at a Community Outreach event in October together with information from Webtrak. A reply was received from Community Relations stating that the noise was due to the direction of the wind. The member said this was dumbing down and whitewashing the issue and requested that more

accurate information be received. Replies from Community Relations were not satisfactory and these matters should be dealt with by the Environment Department.

EMA said that through the proposed Environmental Plan the new noise and monitoring system will be able to report accurately and there will therefore be no dispute on where aircraft are and the route patterns. EMA are aware of the issues raised and will discuss the issues outside this meeting.

The member said it would be useful to be able to print from the Webtrak system. EMA will investigate this and report back to the meeting.

ACTION: EMA

13/21M

The Chairman will review the frequency of 2014 meetings for ICC and sub groups and report to the ICC.

ACTION: CHAIRMAN

14/03M CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

The Chairman advised that comments received relating to agenda items were included in the agenda; details are available on the CAA call on airports relating to landing charges; and a recent press report included confirmation that EMA has had its busiest summer since 2008 with over 3m passengers - an increase of 10% from 2012.

14/04M MASTERPLAN/SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1. Introduction

Neil Robinson outlined the overall summary. The Sustainable Development Plan is made up of four detailed plans that cover:

- Community
- Economy and Surface Access
- Environment
- Land Use

The Environment Plan, including the noise chapter as part of the Noise Action Plan and Community Plan as circulated, were reviewed by the MENT group. EMA confirmed that comments received are welcome before the Plan is finalised.

The Chairman reiterated the ICCs role in scrutinising plans and expectations.

2. Context:

A member said this is a comprehensive report but there is no business or air traffic plan and no forecasts.

EMA confirmed the information is in the parent document and individual plans are guided by this. There is a need to ensure planning for the capability of the airport.

A member asked if the forecasts will be translated into air traffic movements. EMA advised the need to ensure that proposals can be accommodated rather than place limits. The primary driver is the long term view of airport operations through the planning document.

DHL said there is no correlation in increased freight volume, for example more freight could mean more trucks but not more aircraft.

A member asked if implementation meant extending the runway which was included in the land use plan.

A member suggested that the phrase – 'wherever it is practical for us to do so' be removed from the P2, para 2 statement relating to EMA taking responsibility for the

site. EMA confirmed responsibilities and will consider removing this caveat.

There was disagreement between the members on whether businesses can be dictated to and their ability to comply with the laws of the land given the human element involved. A member said that no company will break the law, unwittingly or otherwise and challenged and refuted the implication.

In relation to Transport, a member said that both passengers and staff travel to and from the airport and there was no bus service to East Leake and other villages, and requested that the airport put pressure on the bus companies to provide a service to all villages. This was endorsed by another member.

EMA advised that routes need to be commercially viable and a minimum volume of passengers needed. EMA are keen to promote more services as the airport grows. EMA will raise the issues with the TEP group.

ACTION: EMA

3. Environmental policy

EMA confirmed that the Environment Plan commits EMA to controlling all aspects and members said this is expected of an airport.

4. Key performance indicators

A member requested the indicators be reported quarterly rather than annually. EMA suggested consideration of one of the elements at either one or every MENT meeting.

Indicators include:

Climate change
Waste
Local Air Quality
Landscape and Ecology
Noise
Water Quality

Scorecards are produced monthly or annually as relevant and these can be incorporated into the monthly report. EMA will put forward options to the next meeting.

ACTION: EMA

A member was pleased to see the commitment the airport are making to water quality.

EMA confirmed that the Odour Study report has been drafted and will be presented to the MENT group on completion.

ACTION: EMA

Following a member request, EMA will investigate issues relating to the willow planting area on Diseworth Lane where trees are covered in ivy and ditches need clearing.

ACTION: EMA

14/05M NOISE ACTION PLAN

The noise strategy was discussed in detail. The noise contour and noise envelope base were outlined and explained. In summary, the contour area is bigger but the level is reduced to 55 decibels. Measures will be put in place to ensure that the contour (55dBlnight) will not exceed an area of 16 sq km.

The Chairman said this indicates that the airport is listening and responding. Members said this is an averaging game and does not materially change things, this is pleasing but not satisfactory but is a realistic change.

It was recognised these are complex issues and measures, and pictures and diagrams were recommended to be included for clarity of understanding.

A member queried again whether adherence to the planning authority level for the noise envelope meant that the runway would be extended.

An illustration of the Sustainable Noise Map was tabled for information and this demonstrated the noise reduction trend. The 16 sq km contour was determined independently of planning conditions. EMA expressed confidence that the forecasts can be met. The SIGS will be aligned as appropriate.

A member queried the calculations compared to the lower figures issued in the regular Environment report. EMA advised the changed basis of reporting for this Plan and retrospective conversions of reported figures needed to be made before comparisons were clear. EMA will clarify the issues with the member outside this meeting.

A member said the proposals were disappointing, unambitious and do not move us forward. The Aviation Report recommends a move to 54 decibels and EMA should be aiming to achieve this level and should be setting requirements well beyond the requirements of Chapter 4. It was noted that by 2015/16 the airport will introduce a noise related charging mechanism that aims to support the target of 100% Chapter 4 compliance.

The issues relating to reporting LAeq or Lden noise contours were outlined. Europe is encouraging a move to Lden as this takes account of times. The Number Above or N contours were outlined. Effective communication and clarification was accepted as important and pictures and diagrams were recommended to aid understanding.

A member said that no contribution to the Community Fund had been received recently in relation to the Noise Penalty Scheme. EMA confirmed an annual review of the Fund.

A member said that one of the achievements of this group was a reduction in training flights although a back-track was feared. Clarification of other airport operations was suggested.

A member said the Plan promises a series of reviews but does not specify ICC involvement. This should be clarified and included in the document and there should be a full discussion with the ICC.

In relation to Chapter 4 operations, in the last Masterplan the ambitious standard was reached, but this is now 20 years old and is an antiquated standard. EMA should be aiming for 'best in class', rather than Chapter 4. This should be defined with the DfT. Standards and targets need to be set out – tighter and better and the process written into the plan.

EMA said the intention is to deal with reviews and consultation in a staged manner. The issues are complicated and complex and full briefings and reviews are needed. The process runs in parallel with the Noise Action Plan which is reviewed every five years. This plan gives the process, is not an unreasonable target, and gives aspirations which in many cases will be exceeded.

It was agreed that the Chapter 4 levels are out of date but in the absence of anything else care must be taken in not policing levels that do not meet other airline standards worldwide. Too many restrictions could kill an airport and care must be taken in imposing individual restrictions. The proposals are realistic recommendations.

A member said that EMA allows some aircraft that are not allowed at other airports.

A member asked why EMA did not move to more use of Ground Power units. EMA said this is not ruled out but within a five year timescale the capital cost is prohibitive. Decreasing reverse thrust on landing is recommended with CDA. EMA confirmed collaborative working arrangements with Air Traffic Control and pilots on best practice.

Training flights:

A member asked if these could be imported if a balance of activity and income is needed.

A member said there is circuit that can be flown avoiding villages and if ATC are controlling flights this is not working. Webtrak is a useful tool and the member suggested that ATC have a monitor available to view training flights to enable review of the circuits flown. The member also requested a monitor near Aston on Trent.

EMA confirmed review and monitoring of the circuits.

14/06M ENVIRONMENT REPORT

The reports circulated were reviewed. Key points outlined included an increase in the number of complaints but a reduction in the number of complainants. Chapter 4 compliance has increased. CDA compliance shows a slight increase and this will be monitored.

A member said that CDA is appreciated and noise has reduced. 95% was confirmed as the target in the Environment Plan.

EMA will clarify the complaint received from London although it was suggested this may be a visitor to the area.

ACTION: EMA

In response to a request, EMA will ensure future reports are dated.

ACTION: EMA

A member commented that the time of night engine testing was too long. EMA outlined the difficulties experienced by an Antonov plane which had to land shortly after take-off. This was licensed to fly and met all standards, and the circumstances were exceptional.

A member said that freight movements have increased while the tonnage decreases, and the average payload of aircraft seems to be reducing.

DHL said the reports show an airport average. DHL continues to be busy. Time is a crucial element for customers alongside speed and connectivity. This does not necessarily equate to more aircraft, but does equate to more road traffic movements. A possible explanation is the feed in from Europe by individual aircraft for onward flights to the USA. The aim always is to put as much freight as possible on to an aircraft. The number of DHL aircraft has not increased, but planes are bigger and quieter.

**14/07M DATE OF NEXT MEETING
Friday 6 June 2014 at 10.00am**

.....