

**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 8 May 2009**

**Present:**

Independent Facilitator & Chair

Mr B Whyman MBE, Ch, JP

**Organisation:**

Melbourne Civic Society

UPS

Rushcliffe Borough Council

North West Leicestershire District Council

Dr P Grimley

Mr A Bradley

Cllr Mrs M Males

Cllr D Stevenson

**East Midlands Airport:**

General Manager – Environment and Safeguarding

Director of Planning and Development

Minute Secretary

Mr N Robinson

Mr J Froggatt

Mrs A Lamin

**09/04M APOLOGIES:**

The Chairman welcomed Mr Adrian Bradley to the meeting. Mr Bradley replaces Mr L Macefield as UPS representative. Apologies were received from Cllr L Pendleton, Mr G Stocks, Mr S Charlish, Mr A Morris-Richardson and Mr P Hewett.

Cllr Stevenson confirmed his continuing declaration of interest with regard to planning matters related to North West Leicestershire District Council.

**09/05M MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6 FEBRUARY 2009**

a) **The minutes of the meeting** held on 6 February 2009 were accepted as a true record subject to the following amendments:  
Page 1: The meeting was an Ordinary not an Extraordinary meeting  
Page 1: Cllr Males amended to Cllr Mrs M Males  
Pages 1 - 4: Paragraphs to be renumbered 09/01M – 09/03M.

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

Page 4: EMA have investigated the Bournemouth Airport webpage and the way the site handles complaints.

**ACTION: EMA**

**09/06M CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

a) The Chairman advised on the query raised by a member on the format used by other airports in responding to complaints. 11 of 23 airports have responded on their complaints procedure and the details will be reported to the member and to the next ICC meeting. EMA will summarise the details to MENT members for discussion at the next MENT meeting.

**ACTION: CHAIRMAN/EMA**

b) Dr P Grimley queried the action under Minute 09/02 of the ICC meeting held on 13 March 2009 which confirmed delegation of

consideration of the paper circulated for agenda item 7 of that meeting – **“Update on Environmental Noise Regulations 2006 and Action Plans/ Consultation on proposed amendments to the Environmental Noise Regulations 2006”** - to the MENT sub committee to enable a reply to be submitted by the deadline of 11 May 2009. Copies of the paper were tabled and it was agreed this paper would be reviewed under agenda item 4 a).

c) The Chairman reiterated the importance of adequate representation and attendance at the sub committee meetings by members or nominated substitutes as appropriate. EMA and sub committee members will review attendance at meetings as appropriate and necessary.  
**ACTION: EMA and SUB COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**09/07M NOISE ACTION PLANS - AGENDA ITEM 4**

(i) The details of the paper circulated were outlined and reviewed. EMA will proceed with the production of a Noise Action Plan in the following timeframe:

- Draft Noise Action Plan published 1 July 2009
- Public consultation completed 21 October 2009
- Final plan submitted for approval 30 November 2009

It was confirmed that the noise maps under consideration by the Directive are an assessment of noise from aircraft operations in the calendar year 2006, published in 2007. EMA confirmed that the noise maps will next be reviewed in 2011. Copies of noise maps can be viewed on the DEFRA website.

EMA displayed the latest 2008 noise maps which indicate little difference from those published for Summer 2007. The definition of agglomerations is due to change which in future could include the city of Derby. The noise levels relating to planning guidance were outlined. A member said that the WHO guidelines suggest significantly lower levels as acceptable, but it was agreed that all planning submissions need specific and individual review.

In discussion regarding PPG24, it was agreed that sound levels of below 57dB are unlikely to create a problem. A member expressed concern that the banded levels indicated in the paper increased by 9 in each category, whereas an increase of 10 is considered to double the perceived loudness.

EMA illustrations of noise contours showed that the number of people affected is much lower at EMA than for some other airports. It was stressed that the Noise Action Plan should strike an appropriate balance between positive and negative impacts.

EMA confirmed to a member query that the noise contours show East Leake as coming within Category B in PPG24 for night flights at 55 dB.

A member suggested that EMA should be a statutory consultee if plans are submitted for new domestic developments within a 10/15 mile radius of the airport. EMA will review the position with the relevant District Councils.

**ACTION: EMA**

(ii) The Strategic Objectives summarised in the paper were reviewed in detail.

A member said that the details outlined as objectives are in fact objectives, processes and constraints and a key objective omitted is to limit the number of people affected by noise – particularly night noise. EMA will review and re-categorise the proposals as appropriate.

**ACTION: EMA**

In response to a member query, EMA confirmed that flights have not be re-routed over Gotham but flight paths change periodically due to wind direction.

A member confirmed that the EMA paper presented to this meeting was clear and concise and should form the basis for public consultation.

**(iii) The questions set out within the paper were considered.**

Q1: It was agreed that the objectives set out are correct and should guide the airport's development of the Noise Action Plan.

**(iv) Q2: Current Noise Mitigation programme – synchronisation of the Master Plan and the Noise Action Plan.**

A member said this was not achievable as the Master Plan indicates an increase in noise and the Noise Action Plan aims to reduce noise so the two are incompatible. In addition, there is nothing in the Noise Action Plan about limits and controls on night noise therefore the two documents are in conflict.

EMA said the Master Plan follows predicted expansion and includes mitigation of noise where possible. The Government White Paper supports growth but mitigation of noise where possible.

It was suggested that balance is required where EMA will aim to limit noise by targeting and controlling operations but account must be taken of growth and the positive contribution to the area.

A member said that the Master Plan is about growth and the Noise Action Plan is about controlling noise, therefore the two are separate.

EMA confirmed that members' views on Q2 will be taken into account.

**(v) Q3: It was agreed that Noise Maps do not identify significantly different areas of noise impact or issues with regard to the control of aircraft noise not considered as part of the Master Plan process. The Airport has calculated and published annual noise contours for many years.**

It was agreed that growth and the increased effect of noise should not be hidden. EMA said that it was important to consider the specific questions being asked by the NAP guidance, that there is a need to manage expectations and achieve a balance. If, after consideration, noise control measures are adequate, then no further action would be required.

It was requested that populations exposed to noise should be quantified at the start and end of the NAP.

**(vi) Q4: It was agreed that the airport's proposed approach to assessing and developing the current noise mitigation programme would be assessed and discussed as a continual process.**

(vii) Q5: The Airport's proposed approach to public consultation was agreed. Additional consultee organisations suggested are the City Councils and the CPRE who are represented on the ICC.

(viii) It was agreed that the Airport has correctly identified the key stakeholders to be contacted directly.

**09/07M** **CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE REGULATIONS 2006 – AGENDA ITEM 4 (a)**  
(a) Copies of the paper presented to the ICC meeting on 13 March 2009 under agenda item 7 of that meeting, were tabled and reviewed.

The consultation questions outlined on page 3 of the paper were discussed as follows:

- (i) It was agreed that the proposed amendment to regulation 13 regarding the identification of quiet areas had no impact on EMA and therefore no comment would be submitted.
- (ii) It was agreed that the proposal to revoke the duty regarding consolidation noise maps and replacing this with a power on the Secretary of State to produce consolidated noise maps in respect of any area had no impact on EMA and therefore no comment would be submitted.
- (iii) Proposal to revoke the specific duty on the Secretary of State to publish guidance in regulation 14(1) and to replace this with a general power to publish guidance: A member opposed this as a duty was being changed to a discretionary general power and this relates to the duties required by the END and that without such criteria the Noise Action Plans have no objectives. Another member said that the criteria differ from airport to airport and therefore a general power is required. It was thought that more guidance is required as EMA consider that if the change enables a different approach on other transport sources this should be supported. In summary the following response was agreed: "The specific duty to issue guidance should not be revoked as guidance is required in order to pursue properly the requirements of the Environmental Noise Directive.
- (iv) No further comments were made relating to the proposed amendments.

EMA will respond to the consultation request by the deadline of 11 May 2009 and copies of the response will be circulated to ICC members.

**ACTION: EMA**

**09/08** **FREIGHT AIRCRAFT TONNAGE STATISTICS**  
Details had been reviewed at the ICC meeting held on 13 March 2009. In summary the Master Plan predicts rapid growth but the payload is declining and growth has stagnated. How freight aircraft are used is being rationalised and current operations are with smaller but more frequent aircraft. Because of the economic situation it was felt that payloads will decrease further.

A member queried the efficiency of moving the same amount of freight with 20% more flights.

EMA will investigate the potential for DHL and UPS to present details to the next MENT meeting, subject to commercial sensitivity and confidentiality.

**ACTION: EMA**

**09/09**      **ENVIRONMENT REPORT**

The details circulated on the environment report, complaints received and statistics for the period to March 2009 were reviewed.

EMA confirmed that the environment report will be available on the EMA website.

**ACTION: EMA**

The number of complaints received has reduced dramatically, and the figures include a high number of complaints from one individual. All complaints are replied to individually. A member said that comments have been received from the public that the reduction in the number of overhead flights is noticeable. EMA said this could be due to changes in departure times. The increase in engine testing at night was noted and EMA will track the total time and report to the next meeting.

**ACTION; EMA**

**09/10**      **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Friday 2 October 2009

.....