

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 5 February 2010

Present:

Independent Facilitator & Chair

Mr B Whyman MBE, Ch, JP

Organisation:

CPRE Leicestershire
Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce
DHL Aviation (UK) Ltd
Kings Newton Residents' Association
Leicestershire County Council
Melbourne Civic Society
North West Leicestershire District Council
Rushcliffe Borough Council

Mr G Stocks
Mr A Morris-Richardson
Mr P Hewett
Mr S Leech
Cllr L Pendleton
Dr P Grimley
Cllr D Stevenson
Cllr Mrs M Males

East Midlands Airport:

Director of Sustainability
Principal Planner
Minute Secretary

Mr N Robinson
Mr J Hockley
Mrs A Lamin

10/01M APOLOGIES:

Apologies were received from Mr J Froggatt and Mr A Bradley.

Mr Stocks and the Chairman advised of the recent deaths of Kevin Cleghorn who attended ICC meetings as a substitute on behalf of PAIN, and of David Taylor MP. All present acknowledged the loss of Kevin Cleghorn and David Taylor.

Cllr Stevenson confirmed that no declaration of interest was now necessary regarding the Runway Extension Planning Application since this had now been considered by the Council's Planning Committee.

Lesley Pendleton confirmed a continuing personal interest in the SIGS.

10/02M MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 SEPTEMBER 2009:

a) **The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 September 2009** were accepted as a true record. A member pointed out that in minute 09/12M a) second paragraph, 'the sound levels of below 57dB are unlikely to create a problem' should specify 'sound levels of below *57dB_{LAEQ}*.'

b) **Action points arising from the minutes**

Minute 9/17M b): EMA confirmed that population figures will be included in future complaints reports.

ACTION: EMA

10/03M CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS:

The Chairman confirmed that the Draft Noise Action Plan had been referred to him by a member and this was the next item on the agenda.

10/04M EMA DRAFT NOISE ACTION PLAN UPDATE:

The Airport outlined the Report on the Consultation Process and Responses. The report is available on the EMA website. EMA thanked everyone who contributed to the consultation process.

- a) Para 3.1: EMA will verify the number of responses which total 81 in the Appendices.
ACTION: EMA

Para 2.1: The second bullet point should read: The two District Councils of North West Leicestershire and South Derbyshire, and Rushcliffe Borough Council.

ACTION: EMA

EMA confirmed that East Leake is outside the noise maps area but it has been agreed that during 2010 an outreach event will be held in East Leake.

It was noted that comments were received from only two MPs.

- b) The main themes of comments received were highlighted:

5.1 1996 Night Noise Contour and Related Issues

- (i) The night noise contour benchmark should be 48dB not 57dB
- (ii) Why was the 1996 contour chosen as the benchmark date
- (iii) EMA should commit to reduce night noise rather than increase it from current levels.

- c) EMA said that the contour limit is set to allow the airport to develop. EMA are considering the recommendation that the noise contour target should be based on a lower night noise contour than 57dB, perhaps using 48 or 55dB. Consultation on this issue will be undertaken with the MENT group working towards the Master Plan review in 2011. A member commented that the contours are not included in the report.

A member said that 57dB is an average noise and it was agreed that the suffix LAEQ should be added in all references so that this is clear.

ACTION: EMA

EMA confirmed that a whole range of limit proposals had been made but EMA felt that the level was not the most important part of the target, as it was primarily a relative target based on noise impact at 1996.

- d) In response to a member question, EMA advised that the review of the Master Plan, in 2011, would be informed by the latest forecasts passenger and freight growth available from the Government as part of the national picture.

A member said that different airports have different timescales for Master Plans and EMA said that there is no firm commitment but an understanding that information will be issued by the Government to inform reviews and a five year review is an appropriate time to review targets.

- e) EMA confirmed that the present night noise footprint remains well below the target level and is not forecast to grow substantially before 2011, when the review of the Master Plan would take place.

Regarding the 2011 Master Plan review, EMA confirmed that a new Master Plan would be subject to substantial consultation, including the ICC and MENT.

ACTION: EMA

- f) A member asked what happens if the airport does not comply with the Regulations that require the production of a noise action plan.

EMA advised that no feedback or acknowledgement had been received from the DfT who advise DEFRA. It was understood that subject to advice from DfT, DEFRA would accept or reject the draft noise action plan. Members expressed disappointment that no acknowledgement had been received from DfT or DEFRA.

- g) The Chairman pointed out that many thousands of people are over flown by EMA-related aircraft but only 81 responses had been received and should the question be asked if the public are really interested in the number of decibels or more interested in specific noise incidents.

EMA said that some of the one-off incidents have a disproportionate effect and this is difficult to measure. A night noise metric has been devised to include the number of people affected by a single event and EMA are monitoring the results to possibly use the information in targets. However, EMA have some reservations about this method.

A member requested that information on the Night Noise Metric be provided to MENT. This work has been done by Rupert Taylor, a Noise Consultant, for NWLDC. Members confirmed support of the objective of this research. EMA will provide details at the next MENT meeting.

ACTION: EMA

- h) **5.2 Sound Insulation Grants Scheme (SIGS)**

EMA advised that the boundary lines are queried regularly by individuals. EMA will continue to honour the commitments made in the Master Plan and there are no immediate plans to change the parameters of the scheme.

A member said that EMA has more night flights than most airports and many people affected are waiting for sound insulation. The member said a balanced view should be expressed in the scheme literature and publicity as EMA needs to offer the scheme because of the numbers of people affected. It was agreed that EMA should concede in publicity that EMA is aware of the impact. EMA advised that the resources available are targeted on those most affected. EMA will refer the comments made to EMA press and PR officers. The member said that people are affected both by noise and vibration and queried the requirement for air vents in the insulation installed. Secondary glazing and mechanical air vents are options but are not usually taken up. EMA will take advice on the requirements but stressed the need to comply with building regulations. Details will be presented to the next MENT meeting.

ACTION: EMA

Members pointed out that East Leake, West Leake and Melbourne are all close to the boundary but are not eligible.

The EMA SIGS is the only scheme in the UK based on night time noise. Comparison with other airports is therefore difficult.

A member said that the Directive required publishing the area of contours, but not many airports do this.

- i) A member said that the outreach events are good but are not maximised by the public. EMA confirmed that every effort is made to respond to attendees and questions when promised. A summary of comments is recorded on a matrix and is

included in the NAP report.

j) 5.3 Strategic Noise Maps and Related Issues:

EMA said that the Strategic Noise Maps approximate and compare and are not a measure of particular incidents. This is a standard measure used across Europe. A member said the contours showing an 'average noise' are an archaic and difficult concept for people to understand.

A member expressed support of the application with the proviso that loud events should be reviewed.

A member asked how the housing development planned for the west of Castle Donington will affect the airport. EMA confirmed they are in discussion with planners and developers with the aim of achieving a balanced development.

A member said that there are approximately 90,000 people in North West Leicestershire and double that number of people have been consulted in total. From this 81 responses have been received. The NWLDC receives more complaints over lawn mowing on a Saturday and perhaps the level of complaints received by the airport should be viewed in perspective. EMA confirmed that there are a wide range of comments about the airport.

A member said that feedback he has received is that it is difficult to find the route to complain and also complaints fatigue is a factor to be considered.

k) Additional comments included:

5.4, third paragraph - NPA's should read NAPs.

5.10 Surcharges

EMA confirmed that surcharges apply to both passenger and cargo flights. A member suggested that the night noise limit should be lowered. EMA will confirm the details of the surcharge levels to the next meeting.

ACTION: EMA

5.15 Noise Preferential routes

It was agreed that the wording should be changed to clarify that the NPRs extend to 1,500 metres either side of the centre line of the route.

A member said he felt this was an honest report which acknowledged the feedback received but does not do anything to change the noise regime. The member said he was pleased that the reviews will be incorporated into the Master Plan.

The EMA view is that the plans have the right balance and confirmed inclusion in the Master Plan review.

l) 5.19 Community Fund

A member as Chairman of the Community Fund accepted the comments. There is a meeting of the Community Fund scheduled for 10 February when there is £28k available to be paid out. The Community Fund Chairman said that the aim now is to award something to many rather than awarding the full request. The money received from fines is decreasing although £10.5k has been received in advance of the next meeting.

m) 5.20 Designation

Members were concerned that the public need more information on Designation for EMA and that it is no longer an option. The ICC has overwhelmingly rejected Designation. It was felt that this report paragraph does not acknowledge the views of the ICC.

ACTION: EMA

10/05M RUNWAY EXTENSION PLANNING APPLICATION UPDATE:

Jon Hockley outlined the details of the runway extension planning application. Finalisation of the S106 arrangements with NWLDC is anticipated soon. Planning permission will not be given until the S106 agreement is signed.

The intention is that EMA will extend the runway but the timescale is not yet clear. The time limit on consent is to start work within 5 years.

The noise limits will be part of the planning consent and these are set at a lower limit than in the Master Plan. A member showed an illustration of the limits.

EMA will provide details on any impact on the Master Plan when appropriate and possible.

ACTION: EMA

EMA confirmed that there is no hidden agenda in extending the runway. The very largest aircraft currently in use will be able to carry larger payloads and will be easier to operate. In response to a question about a rarely used departure route, EMA noted that no changes in take off routes are envisaged as a result of the runway extension. The flight path in question often conflicted with aircraft that depart from London airports and it would be difficult for EMA to operate in conflict with London outbound traffic. Benefits of the runway extension include the facility for aircraft to begin take-off further back and will therefore fly higher over local communities. The landing threshold would be moved and therefore aircraft landing will be marginally quieter over Kegworth.

DHL confirmed that when investing in the base at EMA they had no preconception that the flight path in question would be changed or that their operations would be centralised at Leipzig. A benefit of the runway extension will be to be able to fully load an aircraft in all conditions.

A member stressed the need to secure an American carrier to ensure the sustainability of EMA.

Airlines and operators are advised six months in advance of any runway changes e.g. maintenance required, and will be advised when the work on the runway extension will take place.

EMA confirmed that there will be no community benefit in the S106 arrangements.

A member said that the extension was conceived 8/10 years ago with a business justification. The member queried the business case for this extension as it will not increase the number of aircraft or the revenue on payload.

EMA said the aspiration is to have a modern, high specification airport for the use of customers and this is what customers expect.

The Chairman said, and members agreed, that the airport is a business that needs to constantly review all facilities to ensure that these are right up to date.

10/06M CHAPTER 4 AIRCRAFT - PROGRESS TOWARDS TARGET:

EMA reviewed the details circulated in the Environment report. DHL confirmed that the type of aircraft used is dependent on the type and volumes of freight. There is uncertainty over the future due to the recession. Members thanked EMA for the analysis which clarifies various issues.

A member asked for a definitive description of Chapter 4 and said that as this was implemented in 2006, how do older aircraft become Chapter 4 compliant? EMA indicated that aircraft should be capable of achieving Chapter 4.

The noise formula is calculated from noise assessed at three different points, plus the maximum certified weight, measured against a benchmark figure. Noise emissions must meet certain standards.

A member said that three regulations affect night noise and asked how they relate to each other and how night noise levels might be reduced through reducing to QC4. The member asked for an analysis and an indication of how night noise levels can be reduced. The member also asked for details of the existing fleet - whether there are aircraft that are QC4, how they feed into the existing night noise surcharges, and can the limits be reduced.

EMA said the policy aim of the Chapter 4 target is to ensure operation of aircraft of the quietest type and the penalty scheme is set to achieve the night noise targets. EMA will present further details to the next meeting.

ACTION: EMA

A member said that EMA used to provide details of single event night noise levels and expressed concern about individual loud events which should be reviewed. EMA confirmed that details of aircraft movements are shown on the website. EMA will present a report to the next meeting.

ACTION: EMA

10/07M ENVIRONMENT REPORT:

a) Regular statistics

The noise contour figures for 2009 will be circulated with the minutes of this meeting and will be available on the website. The noise contour maps will be included on the website.

ACTION: EMA

The reduction in complaints was noted. The reduction in the numbers of training flights was noted. This was attributed to the controls introduced together with the impact of the recession. A member said the reduction in training flights had contributed to the reduction in the number of complaints.

The positive performance of CDA was noted.

A member asked if aircraft are encouraged to use air braking rather than reverse thrust and EMA said that the longer runway will reduce the need for reverse thrust.

b) ISO14001 The details were noted as circulated.

10/08M NEXT MEETING:
Friday 21 May 2010 at 10am

A schedule of 2010 meeting dates will be re-circulated

.....