

Minutes of the meeting of the Edinburgh Airport Noise Review Panel (EANRP) on 17th August 2021

The meeting was held remotely via Microsoft Teams.

Attendees : **Robert Carr**, EACC Chair and Joint Convener of EANRP, **Cllr Kevin Lang** as EACC EANRP representative and Joint Convener of EANRP, **Janice Hogarth** as Secretary to the EACC (and minute taker for the EANRP), **Lindsay Cole**, the Chair of EANAB and member of EACC, and **Ray Godfree, Pippa Plevin & Bruce Finlayson** as EANAB EANRP representatives. **Gordon Robertson** as EAL Representative.

It had been agreed that Robert Carr would chair this meeting and Kevin Lang the following one.

Draft Minutes of the meetings of 27th July and matters arising

The draft minutes of the meetings of the 27th July were approved.

Robert Carr updated the meeting on three matters arising :

- The interview with Gordon Robertson had taken place on the 13th August and Gordon had distributed the responses to two specific questions raised during that meeting as well as his responses to certain of the original questions for EAL where he had been asked to be more specific. Janice Hogarth would produce and circulate a note of the verbal discussion.
- Ray Godfree had circulated the final collation of the individual responses
- Gordon Robertson and Bruce Finlayson had forwarded the final collation of the community councils.

Robert Carr sought confirmation that in addition to the papers from Gordon Robertson, Ray Godfree, and Gordon Robertson and Bruce Finlayson referred to above, the members of the Panel also had before them the email from Bruce Finlayson with his views on Purpose. That was confirmed.

Purpose – Robert Carr asked two preliminary questions of the panel based on the responses and interview noted as follows

1. Is it worth the candle ? In other words, should EANAB continue ? There was agreement that it should evolve but not dissolve
2. Is it the job of the Panel to specify the precise Purpose and remit or should it just collate responses ? There was agreement that the Panel should not be over prescriptive in finding the exact words to define Purpose but should recommend a number of themes.

Pippa Plevin commented that the current purpose was different from the original remit as the origins of EANAB had been the public response to the TUTUR flight path trial and matters had moved on since then. The Purpose was now different and it was clear that EANAB could not continue in its present form and it needed a total revamp. Communication was key along with an educational remit and the need for a broader number of people to be involved.

Bruce Finlayson agreed that a revamp and modification was the best way forward.

Lindsay Cole asked whether after four years of meetings there had been any reduction in noise levels as a consequence of the activities of EANAB? He doubted it, and added that EANAB had come a long way and that there was now in place an organisation which was well versed with the issues surrounding noise and who were ready to take on the task to find a way forward although he recognised that EANAB needed broadening, widening and deepening.

Ray Godfree stated that EANAB was intended to be a conduit to and from communities, but it was clear it was not being effective in that object in particular as there was no tabling of issues from community councils but only from individual members of EANAB and the actions of EANAB were not effective in reducing noise.. Ray Godfree felt that the issues regarding night noise were crucial moving forward as would be EANAB's role with the ACP.

Kevin Lang felt that there was a need for a clearer sense of partnership and that the current members could make it work and Gordon Robertson added that there was a need for a clearer set of objectives.

What should EANAB be and what should it do ?

Pippa Plevin asked what was the best way to get the communities to engage and suggested that a key would be effective communication to communities and education of communities to make the issues more understandable and more than a list of acronyms.

Discussion turned to training and whether this should be made available for everyone on EANAB.

It was agreed that external expertise was needed at certain times but that training should be encouraged. Lindsay Cole suggested that not everyone would maybe need or would want training but commented that there were some very good courses provided by the CAA and EANAB members should be offered the opportunity for training. That was agreed.

Should the purpose be for EANAB to look at "Business as Usual," or "ACP," or both? There was agreement that EANAB should be involved in both and in everything noise related including action plans, consultations and engagement with appropriate external agencies.

Ray Godfree re-emphasised that EANAB should be a conduit between the communities and the airport on all noise related issues.

Bruce Finlayson agreed with the comments on the need for communication with the communities although he added that three letters had been sent to each community council previously with little response except from the community councils directly affected by noise who were already represented on EANAB. Bruce Finlayson agreed that education was really important and said that noise management could be explained but maybe not at monthly meetings.

Lindsay Cole felt that EANAB could not do everything as they could not stop noise but could only mitigate the levels of noise and could only go so far in achieving this.

Kevin Lang talked about deciding what do we want and then who do we want to do it and he then put forward the following comments:

- There is a need for a shorter, simpler overall objective. He suggested: "to provide advice to Edinburgh Airport on how best to minimise the impact of noise from its operations".
- As an advisory board, it should focus its advice to the airport on two areas: who is being impacted by noise and why; and how best to mitigate those impacts on local communities.
- EANAB should have a clear sense of the impact of noise; ie what percentage of people in each area say they are disturbed by noise from the airport?
- EANAB must be the key external body responsible for oversight of the creation of and delivery of the airport's Noise Action Plan (NAP).
- EANAB must proactively reach out to communities to understand concerns and priorities for management of noise.

Kevin Lang's points were agreed.

Janice Hogarth commented on the fact that the name of EANAB as a Board created an expectation of what would be achieved and what the organisation represented and asked if that was the right name.

In addition, Janice Hogarth asked whether people attended community council meetings and saw that as their best avenue to get issues resolved as she felt that these days it would be via social media, people were more likely to take action directly with EAL via Facebook, twitter etc.

Gordon Robertson agreed that training on the technical side would be good but it was maybe not for every member of EANAB. Gordon Robertson continued to say that with the next ACP that he would like EANAB to be more active on ACP rather than participants.

Gordon Robertson commented that there was now a better level of understanding within EANAB and that the NAP could be worked on jointly. Moving forward with a structured workplan would be ideal and this should perhaps form the basis of EANAB's agreed structure by creating what could be termed as a common workplan.

Bruce Finlayson stated that community engagement was key and commented that if EAL wished to be a 'good neighbour' that it should reengage with the community councils jointly with EANAB. He added that health impacts were also a key issue and he suggested that there should be a conformity of the way that representatives of community councils reported back to their community councils at meetings.

Pippa Plevin stated that one of EANAB's purposes related to planning and provided a number of examples of recent activity where it had provided comment on proposed new housing developments and the impact of noise on these areas. EANAB was a depository of expertise on how noise from the airport impacted on communities and geographical locations. Ray Godfree responded that he had assisted local community councils in the past and both Bruce Finlayson and Lindsay Cole agreed that this was already happening and that it was a good additional area to be involved in and should maybe be expanded but it could again require further expertise in technical knowledge.

The subject of health impacts as more flights start to restart was discussed and Janice Hogarth commented that with changes in work patterns and a spotlight on mental health that this could return as an increased issue. People living in the areas surrounding the airport had become used to less noise and people were generally a little more fragile at the moment so this should be on the radar.

The question was asked about the purpose of the relation to the EACC and that this relationship between the two organisations should be clarified. Robert Carr commented that a report from EANAB on the issue of noise would now become a standing item on the EACC Agenda.

The Panel members were asked to forward any additional thoughts or comments to Janice Hogarth by Friday 20th August 2021.

AOCB

The next meeting will take place on Tuesday 24th August at 1800 and will be chaired by Kevin Lang.