

EAST MIDLANDS AIRPORT
INDEPENDENT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

GENERAL MEETING

APPROVED Minutes of the Meeting
held at DHL Offices, East Midlands Airport

20 June 2008

Present:

Independent Chairman

Mr B Whyman MBE, Ch, JP

Users:

AOC

Mr D Keegan

Consumers Association

Mrs C McDowall MBE, JP

DHL Aviation Ltd

Mr P Hewett

Emda

Mr S Harley

UPS

Mr L Macefield

Unison

Mr R Young

Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire Chamber of Commerce

Mr A Morris-Richardson

Local Authorities:

Broxtowe Borough Council

Councillor B Wombwell

Derbyshire County Council

Councillor C Cutting

Erewash Borough Council

Councillor R Parkinson

North West Leicestershire District Council

Councillor D Stevenson

Rushcliffe Borough Council

Councillor M Males

South Derbyshire District Council

Councillor J Harrison

Local Groups:

CPRE Derbyshire

Ms C Barker

CPRE Leicestershire

Mr G Stocks

CPRE Nottinghamshire and Rushcliffe

Mrs B Walker

Kings Newton Residents Association

Mr S Leech

Leicestershire & Rutland Association of Local Councils

Councillor J Pike

Melbourne Civic Society

Mr I Turner

PAIN - People Against Intrusive Noise

Mrs P Beddoe

SAVE - Save Aston Village Environment

Mr J Gidlow

East Midlands Airport:

Divisional Manager - Environmental

Mr N Robinson

Planning and Development Director

Mr J Froggatt

Head of Government and Industry Affairs

Mr B Conway

Deputy Managing Director

Mr B Thompson

Minute Secretary

Ms A Lamin

08/10 **APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular new members Roger Young, Derek Keegan, Cllr Brian Wombwell and Ian Turner attending for Dr Grimley. **Apologies** were received from Dr D Gillingwater, Cllr G Carlile, Cllr M Barrett, Cllr Mrs L Pendleton, Cllr A Clark, A Corbett, S Charlish, Cllr D Adams, Dr P Grimley, Cllr J Barton, D Coulson and Ms P Coates.

A continuing Declaration of Interest was received from Cllr Stevenson, North West Leicestershire District Council in relation to Item 7c – Planning applications.

08/11 **(a) MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29 FEBRUARY 2008**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 February 2008 were accepted as a true record.

(b) ACTION POINTS FROM THE MINUTES

08/04 (ii) EMA will raise the issue of non-attendance by sub committee members at the appropriate sub committee meetings.

ACTION: EMA

08/05 EMA will consider the inclusion of demographic changes to support the Socio Economic Group graph included in the CAA Passenger Survey Report 2006.

ACTION: EMA

08/07 (a) EMA has reviewed the scale shown on the Moving Annual Totals graph and a chart was available at the meeting. However, the original scale illustrates the information more clearly and this will be retained.

08/07 (b) Anna Thompson has been appointed to the position of Community Relations Manager, assisted by Leonie Parkin.

08/12 **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

The Chairman advised that all communications received by him were reported to the ICC. The Chairman reported on two items and requested the guidance of the ICC members on the first item.

(i) The Chairman had received a telephone call from a senior officer of a local authority who was investigating a complaint about that authority's representative on the ICC who was alleged to have given an inappropriate response to a matter raised at an ICC meeting. The Chairman had responded to the Senior Officer that all ICC members have their own views and these views are accepted and respected. The Chairman expressed concern that the complaint was raised in the manner that it was and was raised outside the meeting.

The Chairman then read to the meeting a letter from an ICC member published in the local press which was very critical of the Airport and expressed the view that the MENT and TEP sub groups now have no voice and that the Association of Airport Related Parish Councils (AARPC) had been denied a place on the sub groups as a result the changes in committee structure and in the numbers of meetings. The article was also very critical of a Local Authority representative on the ICC and included the name, email and telephone number of the representative (who had spoken in respect of this issue at a previous meeting) with a suggestion that complaints should be directed to that representative.

The Chairman raised the question of a protocol of conduct and asked for the views of ICC members and recommendations on how to proceed with this issue.

One member expressed shock at what had occurred and several members expressed the view that the actions were irresponsible and unacceptable. It was accepted that the details of the elected member are publicly available from alternative sources but members felt that these details should not have been published in the letter.

One member disagreed and endorsed free speech, reiterating that the AARPC had accepted the decision of the ICC but felt that they no longer had a voice. The member felt there was no reason why the press should not be invited to the ICC meetings but it was pointed out that this has been debated previously by the committee and rejected.

Several local group members spoke about their concerns on this issue and said that they accepted the decisions made by the ICC. It was agreed that all committee members should be able to speak and vote as they feel appropriate without being vilified in the press and in other local groups.

The Chairman asked if committee members felt a code of conduct should be introduced and if so, if sanctions should be imposed on those disrespecting such a code of conduct. Most members present agreed that sanctions should not be imposed. Members felt that following open discussions, the decisions of the committee must be respected by all members.

One member asked that the minutes should record that ICC members attend at the invitation and agreement of the Airport. All members are expected to behave with integrity and respect each others views at all times. This was seconded and overwhelmingly endorsed by other members.

Barry Thompson, Deputy MD of EMA reiterated that the Airport has to facilitate free and open discussion and any disruption to this must be dealt with. The ICC needs to do the job it was set up to do and this behaviour threatened the operation of the ICC.

A member said that the ICC had previously decided that names should not be used in minutes and therefore the release of a name in this instance was unacceptable.

The Chairman summarised the expectations of the ICC members, that each and every member acts with integrity, responsibility and in a professional manner. He said that these expectations had been made very clear by the Committee and asked all members to respect these expectations and the views expressed by individual speakers.

(ii) The Chairman outlined details of the annual meeting of ICC's held at Heathrow. Discussion included aircraft noise, aviation study, UK aviation update, through-Airport passenger experience, access, immigration delays, aircraft slots and planning applications. Copies of the Stansted Airport Consultative Committee's notes of the meeting and the agenda bundle provided for the meeting were made available to members. The formal minutes of this meeting will be circulated to ICC members when available. EMA had been asked to consider hosting a future meeting.

ACTION: EMA

08/13 **CIVIL AVIATION ACT 2006**

The following documents were received and reviewed in detail:

- (a) DfT letter dated 8 April 2008
- (b) Melbourne Civic Society (MCS) report, revised from the report presented to the MENT sub committee on 6 June 2008
- (c) EMA report – Civil Aviation Act 2006
- (d) Minutes of the MENT sub committee held on 1 February 2008
- (e) Minutes of the MENT sub committee held on 6 June 2008
- (f) TABLED: EMA Summary Matrix – Civil Aviation Act 2006

The Chairman summarised the information presented to the ICC and confirmed that, as detailed in the minutes of the MENT sub committee meeting held on 6 June 2006 (minute 08/09M), no consensus could be reached on the draft reply to be sent from the ICC to the DfT. The matter had therefore been referred to the full ICC meeting. A short recess took place for members to consider the Matrix tabled by EMA.

EMA said that DfT had confirmed that an extension of the response date to the end of July had been agreed, but that the response must be agreed by the ICC.

The MCS representative asked that the MCS paper be accepted by the ICC and forwarded as the ICC response to the DfT, advising that if the ICC cannot agree a response then MCS would submit an independent report.

A member expressed concern that details of the MCS paper had now been revised from that originally presented to the June MENT sub-committee, where a considerable amount of time had been spent discussing details which had now been revised.

EMA outlined the Summary Matrix (f) circulated to the meeting. The MCS said there was not a great deal of difference between the MCS and EMA papers but that the Airport had conflated issues, particularly relating to noise and night flights. ICC members were asked to agree the specifics, ie where powers have and have not been implemented. Another member expressed concern on emissions and said EMA made no attempt to measure and restrict emissions.

A member said there was no mention of training flights with no consultation in the Master Plan. SAVE had written to EMA on this and also on the change of routes, but no replies had been received. The member said that the Airport was not responding well enough to the powers in the Act.

Several members supported the EMA response saying that the response was factual and clear. Some members felt this should be referred back to the MENT Sub-Committee but the Chairman pointed out that the MENT Sub-Committee had failed to agree the response and therefore the matter was before the ICC.

EMA reiterated that the DfT was seeking a response as to whether the Airport had implemented the powers contained in the Act. EMA had extended the references on the tabled paper for clarity and the statements made were factual. The differences against the MCS paper were on the acceptance of policies introduced and the degree of implementation.

The Chairman suggested an itemised review of the proposed EMA response but many members felt they were not qualified to respond and overall agreement could not be reached. The Chairman then asked members to vote on whether they wished to consider and resolve the issues at this meeting or refer the matter back to the MENT Sub-Committee at a single item agenda special meeting to be held in July.

Six members voted to resolve the issues at this meeting. Nine members voted to delegate the matter back to a special meeting of the MENT Sub-Committee. All members agreed that if a consensus could not be reached by the MENT Sub-Committee then a reply would be sent to the DfT by the deadline of 31 July 2008 to say that a consensus could not be reached. EMA will organise an additional meeting of the MENT sub committee to be held as soon as possible.

ACTION: EMA

A member asked for assurance that the papers presented to the this meeting would be the agenda item papers at the special meeting of the MENT sub committee, with no further revisions, and this was endorsed by EMA and MCS.

The ICC members agreed to delegate executive powers to the MENT sub committee with the responsibility to send a response to the DfT on behalf of the ICC. If there was dispute then the alternatives would be detailed. It was clarified that the response to the DfT needed to deal factually with whether EMA had implemented new powers granted by the Act and should not deal with whether any members considered that EMA was, or was not, doing enough as that was a separate issue.

A copy of the response to the DfT will be circulated to all ICC members.

ACTION: EMA

08/14 **MASTERPLAN MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION**

The report circulated by the Melbourne Civic Society was taken as read. EMA confirmed this information was helpful. EMA had committed in the Master Plan to produce a "Monitoring and Implementation Report" every two years with the first one being due by the end of 2008 and it was expected that the points raised by MCS would be included, probably with others.

ACTION: EMA

08/15 **RUNWAY EXTENSION – REVISED ENVIRONMENT STATEMENT**

Cllr Stevenson left the meeting while this item was discussed.

This item had been included on the agenda at the request of Melbourne Civic Society. EMA advised that no date had been received for the planning meeting and there were no outstanding issues. Subject to approval, plans to implement the runway extension would be unlikely to commence quickly due to the need to plan around continuing operations.

One member said that the extension raises more questions on the number of flights and the number of freight flights. As detailed in the minutes of the MENT sub committee held on 6 June, EMA do not forecast any change in the types or numbers of aircraft using EMA, nor any change in departures or the use of runways. The extension would improve the range of larger aircraft that operate for longer distances.

08/16 **AIRPORT REPORT**

(a) **Airport statistics** – reviewed as circulated

EMA confirmed that forecasts are constantly reviewed relating to significant issues, ie the rising price of oil. Any significant changes in the long term forecasts would form part of the Master Plan review process and be reported to the ICC.

ACTION: EMA

(b) **Community Relations report** – reviewed as circulated

(c) **Planning applications** (Cllr Stevenson left the meeting while this item was discussed). An outline application for a High Quality Hotel on Pegasus Business Park was approved on 20 March 2008. Discussions are taking place with several operators.

(d) **Environmental summary**

A member said that the telephone number for noise complaints was not adequately publicised and difficult to find. EMA confirmed that arrangements are in place for the number to be reinstated in all local directories. EMA will, however, investigate how the number can be made more widely available.

ACTION: EMA

A member said that it was noted that the number of complaints was reducing, however, he felt there is "complaint fatigue" and concern remains over noise levels.

Another member said that the Castle Donington noise monitor is unreliable and EMA should be taking steps to reduce noise for health reasons and ensure that the monitor works. EMA confirmed compliance with noise regulations and explained that the noise level referred to by the member was the threshold for hearing protection for employers exposed to continuous noise at work over an 8 hour period and that fines for exceeding noise levels were levied as set out in the report.

08/17 **MINUTES OF SUB COMMITTEES**

- (a) MENT meeting, 6 June 2008
- (b) TEP meeting, 30 May 2008 (including Long Haul Route Development paper)

The minutes of the sub committee meetings were accepted as circulated.

08/18 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Friday 14 November 2008

.....