

Minutes of the meeting of the Edinburgh Airport Noise Review Panel (EANRP) on 24th 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 Kevin Lang would chair this meeting and Robert Carr the following one.

Draft Minutes of the meetings of 17th August and matters arising

Kevin Lang asked if the minutes were a true reflection of the meeting but Bruce Finlayson had made some comments in relation to the minutes. To allow all members of the panel to look at these and so this item was deferred until the next meeting.

Bruce had also proposed that the minutes should be created differently using google docs and Pippa will prepare a document accordingly.

Structure

Discussion followed on the potential structure with Ray endorsing the fact that the core purpose for EANAB is that it is a conduit and that it needs to expand the distribution of its message to wider communities with advice on noise in a more material way. Ray added that EANAB should be watching planning briefs and can help communities with regard to the contours for panels for noise.

Janice Hogarth suggested that EANAB should widen the structure and potentially consist of maybe two levels with one layer including other bodies and another with community councils. An independent chair should be appointed for a set period of years.

Lindsay Cole talked about a layering of the structure and adding to who would be involved and how they would work with the airport – would it be advice ? or would it be to create solutions ?

The conduit has worked but too many of the community councils do not engage as they don't care. Lindsay went on to say that EANAB was really trying to bridge the gap but that there was also a need for involvement with technical people.

He suggested an Executive Group at the top which could include councillors/MSPs and some community councils which would give the group teeth.

Gordon Robertson talked about the need for support at community council meetings and said that the current board was not totally competent on noise but that they had expertise by chance which gives them enough knowledge to answer questions. He went on to say that there is a need for further understanding of noise and analysis needs to be accurate.

Gordon Robertson felt that community councils had a role to may train people in relation to noise but that there was a need for other people to be involved such as local authorities, Scottish Government and maybe the CAA. He also suggested that this executive level of the board need only meet quarterly with the sub groups still meeting regularly.

Gordon Robertson concluded by adding that he felt that EAL should be a full member of the board.

Pippa Plevin advised the panel that there are 160 community councils in the Lothians, Fife, Falkirk and Edinburgh City area and so it is not feasible for all to be represented on EANAB as specified in ToR. Not everyone has an interest or would want to be trained on the complexities of noise. EANAB should use its expertise in the right ways and maybe split its focus into a group that works on educating and communicating with community councils, and then having a separate group that has the interest to concentrate on the technical issues.

Robert Carr said that he agreed with the points others had made on structure. He approved of the methodology suggested by Kevin Lang in his email that day and had adopted that.

In relation to **skills, competencies and expertise**, and desirable characteristics, he said that some of these could be possessed by the internal EANAB members, or resourced externally. He noted a number of skills and characteristics on his list had already been mentioned and suggested the following:

- **Geographical spread**, without overlap or duplication in representation
- **Aviation**, including aircraft type, runway use, operations on landing and departure, flight route planning, the aviation market/industry including issues of growth, contracting including penalties, regulation
- **Noise**, including ideally aviation noise and regulation, effect of noise on health, education and other impacts such as property valuation, noise mitigation, noise action planning
- **Planning and Environmental Health**
- **Governance**, secretarial, chair and office bearers, dispute resolution, complaint handling
- **Engagement**, consultation and communication, including PR, social media, citizens' assemblies, engagement and consultation processes
- **Scientific** method including analysing data and statistics
- **Education**
- **Meteorological and geographic issues**

He agreed with Bruce Finlayson that EANAB needed to have a skill set that enabled its members to know when they needed external resource and support on matters out with their own competencies.

In relation to **where** these skills, competencies and expertise could be resourced he agreed with earlier observations and suggested as follows:

- **Community representatives**, in particular from Community Councils
- **Local authority councillors**
- **MSPs**
- **MPs**
- **Local authority, SG and UKG "officials"** including from DfT, CAA and ICCAN
- **Educational bodies**
- **Doctors**
- **EAL**
- **Other organisations with a legitimate interest and relevant skill set**

In relation to **number**, he said that it was his understanding that to be effective and to enable meaningful participation the number on a Board should not exceed 10. He suggested that as the Sub-groups had been reported as working well it would be possible to have a structure where each Sub-group was represented by and had a member on the overarching Board, but not every Sub-group

member need be on that Board. That would reflect the “layered” approach a number of Panel members had suggested.

Robert Carr observed that it would be possible to present a number of structures in our Report explaining the model we favoured with the reasons why, but recognising any one of these models would work and the final choice was for EANAB and EAL.

Robert Carr said that in relation to balance of members, the majority of Board members should still be from Community Councils, given the Board’s purpose as a conduit for advice to and from communities and EAL, and the interests that those others would have the appearance of representing.

Kevin Lang went on to say that EANAB needs to understand noise and how EAL minimise noise which should include air traffic control. EANAB members need to deepen their insight into community concerns and work with these which would involve buying in technical knowledge as well as a ground floor up approach with a forum within EANAB.

Kevin Lang was not sure about EAL being a full member of EANAB but felt that they should be present at all meetings. Feedback had shown that the sub groups worked well and Kevin Lang went on to suggest that there should be an overarching strategic board with sub groups underneath which could go into more depth on certain topics. (These sub groups would not necessarily be made up of the same members)

Gordon Robertson talked about succession planning and said that the airport have skill sets which they have shared with EANAB regarding the noise plan and that this needs to deliver.

The Gatwick model is an option which includes NATS as a key stakeholder and Lindsay Cole went on to suggest that Graham Lake, who was previously on this board, might be a good person to consult. The management arm could include NATS, ICCAN and business and education organisations to drive things forward.

Bruce Finlayson talked about the need for members of EANAB to be the advisers who receive information from experts and test this before you provide advice which you can then feed back from communities to EAL.

There was acceptance that adding a cohort of interest in differing areas such as noise, health and education would be good but how prescriptive do we wish to be? Maybe we need to put forward 2 or 3 models as options.

Gordon Robertson commented that by proposed changes to the current structure which was doing everything, the proposed approach of two levels would be beneficial in helping the wider issues with communities including communication with group education and community councils as well with quarterly meetings to scrutinise progress.

Bruce Finlayson felt that EANAB dealt with too many issues and asked how an overarching board would work as there was a need to broaden the democratic linkage for more expertise and there would be a great deal of politics on who would then be on the executive board and who would not.

There was a feeling that there was a need for a forum which allows all community councils who want to be involved a chance to come along and engage. There needs to be a place for this forum to be representative and not exclusive. It could be a group that goes out to community council meetings which would then free up the group to be more creative.

The proposed executive board would need to have set procedures and be elected to make it fair but Bruce Finlayson commented that if there was a change of emphasis on an executive board it still needed to be accountable to the communities.

Robert Carr cautioned the make-up of this executive board with comments that the group was meant to be represented by communities and not councillors who could have political agendas which meant that there should always be a balance in favour of communities.

Robert Carr questioned which sub groups were active which would need to be explored further but added that there could be a community forum as a sub group but that this group would need to be represented on the executive Board.

There should be representation from each relevant area but there would be a need to ensure that there was enough coverage of the most affected areas. Bruce Finlayson added that there needed to be the right advice to the board.

Ray Godfree said that there was no reason why some people could not be part of both the sub groups and the Executive board and he suggested creating a sketch of what it might look like and how this would relate to the outside world and he offered to produce a flow diagram which was agreed.

AOCB

The next meeting will take place on Monday 30th August at 1900 and will be chaired by Robert Carr and will address the subjects of Process and Culture.