ANNEXE A

East Midlands Airport Meeting
8 August 2007

East Midlands Airport

Present:	John Froggatt	Director of Development
	Neil Robinson	General Manager – Environment and Safeguarding
	Jon Hockley	Planning Advisor

South Derbyshire District Council

Present:	Councillor John Bladen	Chairman of Environmental and Development Services Committee
	Councillor Martyn Ford	Deputy Chairman of Environmental and Development Services Committee
	Councillor John Harrison	Deputy Leader
	Ian Reid	Deputy Chief Executive
	Richard Groves	Planning Policy Officer
Apologies:	Councillor Stephen Taylor	

1. JB indicated that SDDC wished to establish an on-going dialogue and engagement with EMA referring to the Council's Corporate Plan, which seeks to work in partnership with EMA to ensure it is viewed as a good neighbour.

2. JF explained the background to the production of the Master Plan, explaining that they were a requirement of the Air Transport White Paper. The Department for Transport's non-statutory guidelines indicated that Master Plans should use the air transport forecasts contained in the White Paper.

Public consultation

3. JF said that EMA's 2004 consultation exercise on airspace change had proven problematic and that consultation on the Draft Master Plan had therefore been far more extensive. A report on the consultation exercise was also published. This was condensed and did not respond to all the points made, as this would have resulted in it being too large,

although EMA would be happy to reply in detail to all the points made by SDDC in regard to the Draft Master Plan if asked to.

4. A review of the implementation of the White Paper was recently published and showed very little deviation from the original forecasts. EMA would prepare a report on the Master Plan every two years in regard to whether forecasts had been correct and whether targets were being met. A replacement Master Plan would be completed in 2011.

5. EMA intended to consult parish councils on an on-going, rather than a reactive, basis from this point onwards and expected to frequently attend the meetings of nearby parish councils and local authority Area Meetings.

6. IR said that EMA had responded admirably to requests from SDDC to appear at meetings. He considered that regular reporting afforded an opportunity to celebrate successes rather than be reactive, which tended to be negative. He said that SDDC could help to communicate messages from EMA to the community and vice versa.

7. JF asked how frequently meetings with Elected Members, such as this one, should take place. MF suggested that once per year would be appropriate. Cllr JH said that he would like meetings to take place more frequently as issues requiring action sooner rather than later were likely to arise. Once key concerns had been established it may be appropriate to move to less frequent meetings e.g. once per year.

8. MF suggested that it would also be useful for DHL to attend to discuss their activities. JF said he could ask whether they would be willing to do so and whether an appropriate representative could be identified.

Action: JF

9. Cllr JH said that there would be four Area Meetings per year in Melbourne and asked whether EMA could attend twice per year. JF said he thought this would be possible.

10. JB said that SDDC needed to be seen to be reacting to community concerns and also needed to ensure that a balanced message was communicated, having regard to the wealth and employment potential of EMA.

11. JF raised the issue of sustainable surface access saying that this had vexed EMA. He referred to the success of the Nottingham bus service and said that the Leicester one was beginning to work. He acknowledged problems with the Swadlincote-Melbourne service and explained that EMA had not anticipated these and was learning from the experience. EMA has to balance its customer requirements against community requirements.

12. IR said that a note of this meeting would be circulated and that there could then be further dialogue between meetings to iron out any issues raised.

Action: RG

13. Cllr JH asked whether EMA could respond directly to each of the points made by Environmental and Development Services Committee at its meeting of 8 March. IR said that Cllr JH and RG could meet with JF to establish an agreed position on outstanding issues from the report.

Action: RG, Cllr JH, JF

14. NR asked for the dates of the Area Meetings. IR said that not all the forthcoming dates had yet been established, but that these would be circulated when available.

Action: IR

15. MF said it would be helpful if DHL were also to attend the Area Meetings. JF said he would do his best to get someone.

Action: JF

Growth Forecasts

16. Cllr JH noted that growth in flights handling cargo had not been as great as projected in the White Paper and asked EMA to comment on this.

17. JF said that the pattern of the past two years would not necessarily be typical of the whole Master Plan period and that the forecasts would not be changed prior to the five-year review of the Plan. He said that if high growth were possible EMA would need to plan for it, but that it would not make sense to invest to accommodate it until it was just about to happen. He said that members of the Independent Consultative Committee were free to take away reports circulated at the meetings and that much of this information could be accessed on the EMA website.

18. IR said that a digest of the information circulated at the ICC could be prepared to form the basis of a Committee report if appropriate.

19. MF asked how far in advance the air operators provided the information needed by EMA to enable it to plan for future investment. JF replied that detailed requirements were only known for the short term and that only a general guide could be provided for the long term. He said it was beneficial to look beyond the operators to see what was happening more generally, recognising that changes in air transport

tended to follow changes in the economy, e.g. passenger numbers tend to fall during economic recessions.

Noise

20. JB said that South Derbyshire residents were concerned with whether the Master Plan contained measures to ameliorate surface access, highway congestion, aircraft noise and other issues.

21. JF said that the Master Plan did broadly do this. The most prominent issue was aircraft noise and night flying. He explained that EMA dealt with the largest pure airfreight tonnage of any airport in the country. EMA had grown to be recognised as a pure freight specialist, particularly in regard to overnight mail, most of which was business to business. The White Paper had anticipated a huge rate of growth in pure freight and actual growth to date had not met expectations.

22. JF said that the only way to keep within the 1996 nighttime noise contour was to reduce the volume of aircraft noise per tonne of freight carried. The sound insulation grant scheme needed to reflect noise levels and EMA felt it had done as much as it could in this regard.

23. JB said that particularly noisy aircraft were a problem and that EMA was the biggest night-flying airport in the country. He asked whether there was any possibility of quieter aircraft being used.

24. JF replied that newer aircraft were quieter. DHL now used ex- BA passenger aircraft, which made 70% less noise than those previously used. These would be kept for a few years as they represented a huge investment, but would eventually be replaced by quieter aircraft. International Civil Aviation Organisation “Chapter 2” aircraft were banned in the UK except in exceptional circumstances. Aircraft used today are “Chapter 3” and new ones being manufactured have to be “Chapter 4”, although the US won’t phase out the use of “Chapter 3” as these are widely in use in that country. “Chapter 2” aircraft would only use EMA in exceptional circumstances, e.g. for use by Oxfam for humanitarian purpose.

25. IR asked how far EMA could go to make improvements in regard to noise from night flights. JF said it was the gift of the International Civic Aviation Organisation to determine the dates by which planes should be phased out, but that EMA was working with the operators to ensure that all planes were “Chapter 4” compliant by 2012.

26. JB asked whether US could use “Chapter 3” aircraft for internal flights only. JF said that some of these were long haul aircraft and that restriction to domestic use would not fit.

27. JF said that “designated” airports had a quota count system and that EMA would not allow aircraft identified as “Quota Count 16” or “18”, i.e. particularly noisy aircraft, at night except in very special circumstances.

For example, EMA will only allow the Antonov aircraft to be scheduled to fly during the day and will only be permitted to fly at night if there has been an unavoidable delay, and only upon payment of a penalty (£5000 for a QC8 movement or £10000 for a QC16 movement) which will be paid to the Airport's Community Fund. Rolls Royce's Trent engine is transported using the Antonov as the Boeing 747 is not large enough to accommodate it.

28. EMA tries to get Antonovs out before 11.00pm, but delaying flights because that time has passed can be very expensive for clients such as Rolls Royce. Antonov take-offs after 11.00pm are infrequent (single figures over past 12 months). It was pointed out that many passenger flights like to take off from EMA between 6.00 and 8.00am and that many of these therefore contribute toward the nighttime noise totals.

29. Freight aircraft arrive and leave between 11.00pm and 6.00am. The largest of these is the MD11, which goes to the US. Sometimes Russian propeller planes can be noisy.

30. Cllr JH asked for an explanation of the noise penalty scheme operating at EMA. Aircraft types are allocated to three noise level categories having regard to how noisy they tend to be. A higher noise limit is applied to noisier aircraft whilst a low noise limit is applied to quieter aircraft. The weight of the aircraft is also taken into consideration. The extent of the fine is dependent upon the degree to which the noise limit is breached. A fine of £750.00 is applied for the first decibel over the threshold and a further £150.00 is levied for each additional decibel beyond this.

31. Infringements do not happen regularly and aircraft should be able to meet the standards. Compliance is determined by how well the aircraft is flown. Where there is an infringement the airline is given 14 days to notify EMA of any extenuating circumstances that need to be taken into consideration.

32. Cllr JH noted that 3 additional decibels doubles the noise level and asked whether the size of the fine should reflect this. JF replied that whilst 3 decibels doubles noise *energy*, it takes 10 decibels to double *perceived* noise levels.

33. NR said the scheme was designed as a deterrent rather than as a means of raising money.

34. MF noted that the community fund would dry up if infringements fell. JF said that EMA had increased its contribution to the fund from £10,000 to £50,000 pa because the number of infringements had fallen.

35. JB asked whether individual aircraft would become quieter still in future. JF said he imagined that this would be so. However, it needed to be

borne in mind that if the level of noise acceptability were to be set too low businesses would suffer.

36. JF said that the noise insulation grant was resourced entirely by EMA and cost £1 million over the past two years. EMA also helped to subsidise public transport services to the airport.

37. Cllr JH said that EMA needed to be more effective in communicating the systems being operated and the level of contributions being made by the airport, as public perceptions were not favourable. IR said that more information was needed in regard to the current approach to noise insulation.

38. JF said that eligibility for noise insulation grant assistance was determined using 55 dBLaeq nighttime noise contours. Funding was provided to 150 houses last year. Overall 1200 houses are included in the scheme. The Master Plan increased the scheme boundary to include the Sound Equivalent Level (SEL) of the largest aircraft in frequent use. Houses in the 90 db SEL contour for the MD11 are also therefore eligible for grant assistance. NR said that the grant scheme was supervised by professional surveyors who visited properties to make assessments and tell the owners what they could be eligible for. EMA produces a sound insulation brochure explaining the scheme. IR noted that only a small number of properties in South Derbyshire were affected but that take up among these needed to be maximised.

39. The 55 dBLaeq night time noise contour had declined in size in recent years, but EMA had decided to continue to use the 2001 contour to accommodate any fluctuations over time in the area covered. The MP anticipates that the contour will grow again over coming years. At the moment the contour covers only the eastern part of Kings Newton, but more of that settlement would be included in coming years.

40. Cllr JH asked whether EMA would consider a diversion from the standard approach for those who were outside the noise contour but were woken by aircraft noise at night where there was a proven problem. JF said that EMA tried to use goodwill and common sense in determining which dwellings were eligible, but that it would be inappropriate to use anything other than a scientific noise contour-based approach as this ensured that the scheme was fair to all. Government research indicated that individuals were affected by noise at different volumes. The Webtrack system on the EMA website shows where aircraft have flown and it is possible to discern whether they followed the preferred routes. The scheme would need to be reassessed in the next Master Plan but at this stage it was unclear whether changes would be made and, if so, what they might be.

41. MF asked whether aircraft such as Airbus A330s, A380s and Boeing 777s would be likely to use EMA in the near future. JF replied that older passenger aircraft generally tended to be converted for use as

freighters. The four major integrated carriers, of which DHL was one, have worldwide networks with major hubs in Europe and the US. DHL's hub was moving from Brussels to Leipzig. EMA was less likely to attract larger aircraft than were the major hubs.

42. JF said that EMA had made representations at the South Derbyshire Conjoined Inquiry into housing proposals to the south of Derby to the effect that any new residents should be made aware of the presence of airport. North West Leicestershire District Council had recently consulted EMA on options for new housing development sites, one being to the south of Castle Donington. EMA had responded, indicating that this would not be a suitable area for such development.

43. Cllr JH asked for the latest news on the proposed 190 metre runway extension. JF replied that North West Leicestershire District Council had requested that supporting evidence be updated. Once this had been submitted it was hoped that a decision could be made. The outcome would be that larger aircraft would be able to take off with heavier payloads. Heavier aircraft would be a bit noisier as a result. NR pointed out the smaller aircraft would be slightly quieter with the extension as they would take off a little further away from the affected settlements. Take offs toward the east affected Kegworth whilst take offs toward the west affected Melbourne and Kings Newton.

Surface access

44. Cllr JH asked how large a contribution EMA made towards subsidising sustainable surface access in the form of public transport. JF replied that EMA initially provided 30,000 toward the cost of subsidising the link between Swadlincote, Melbourne and the Airport and that the Derby and Derbyshire Economic Partnership also provided £30,000. In the current year (2007-08) EMA was providing £70,000, due to service enhancements, but that by 2008-09, the third year of the scheme, it was hoped that the service would be self-financing. All services are reviewed on a regular basis with Local Authority and Service Partners and EMA expects to contribute £400,000 this year to support all forms of public transport. Cllr JH asked whether statistical trend data, particularly in regard to passenger numbers, was available. JF said that he would ask Colleen Hempson about this.

Action: JF

45. Cllr JH said that buses regularly caused congestion, but on the other hand the potential for job creation was recognised. The fare from Swadlincote to East Midlands Airport, £3.50, was expensive and the same as the fare from Swadlincote to Nottingham. IR said that there was a need to provide an attractive bus service whilst at the same time addressing the problems in Melbourne.

Emergency planning

46. MF referred to the integrated approach to emergency planning and asked whether there was anything SDDC should be taking account of in

this regard. JF said that he didn't have the details of how it worked as it was the responsibility of the Operations Director, who could be invited to attend future meetings. He advised the Members to speak to Ian Shuttleworth, the Derbyshire and Derby City Emergency Planning Officer. If there were any short-term concerns they should be raised straight away.

Next meeting

47. It was agreed that a note of the meeting would be circulated to all present and that arrangements for future meetings could then be determined.

RG/18.7