

transport operators to find an alternative. It was acknowledged that the interchange between the 68 and 69 services was causing problems in Melbourne. There were insufficient passengers to make the 69 service economically viable and the impending closure of the Swadlincote Arriva depot had also influenced the decision.

- g) The Airport's assumption that the rate of growth in cargo traffic will accelerate such that the White Paper target for 2016 will be met is questioned and it is considered that it may be appropriate to revise the forecast downward. The case for doing so is further reinforced in points (h) and (i) below.**
 - h) The development of more long haul cargo services to connect to short haul routes from other European destinations would appear to offer less potential benefit to the East Midlands economy than would freight routes beginning or ending at the Airport site. The loss of amenity to local residents caused by such flights may therefore be less justifiable particularly since the aircraft referred to in the Draft Master Plan generate far more noise than most other types.**
 - i) The transfer of freight operations from the South East would involve the movement of freight over greater distances by land-based transport to reach the Airport. The White Paper proposed additional airport capacity for the South East to assist in accommodating the requirements of that region. Relocation of freight operators is therefore considered both unsustainable and unnecessary.**
4. JH/NR acknowledged that growth in cargo was still below the level forecast in the Master Plan, but that the airport was mandated to work to Government forecasts as set out in the White Paper. The matter would be looked at again as part of the five-yearly Master Plan review. The freight operators established at EMA chose to locate centrally due to ease of access to markets. The White Paper intended that EMA should continue to grow as the national hub for express freight operations.
5. EMA and the London airports were not in direct competition as they were serving different markets. It was therefore not anticipated that there would be significant displacement of cargo passing through EMA from the South East. There was not very much over capacity at EMA and growth had been deferred a little to better utilise assets.
6. Cllr JH requested that TER Sub Committee minutes and statistics be sent directly to RG from this point onwards. This would include information on such matters as volumes of cargo, airmail, employment figures and public transport usage. JH/NR agreed to arrange this.

Action JH/NR

- n) That the testing of aero-engines at the Airport site be undertaken in a new purpose-built facility so as to mitigate the impact of noise on the local community.**

7. Cllr JH said there were occasional complaints about engine testing noise from Weston-on-Trent but not from Melbourne, however this was largely dependent upon wind direction. NR said that disturbance complaints relating to this issue were small in number and were not spread over a wide area. Procedures did not allow for engine testing at night and it was carried out at different locations on the site depending on wind direction. Engine testing was being scaled back as such activity increasingly tended to take place in Eastern Europe. The cost of an engine testing building, which would need to be borne by the operators, would be a minimum of £3 million and was considered to be too high. It made more sense to spend £1 million pa on sound insulation grants which mitigated all noise from EMA rather than that arising from just one operation affecting relatively few people.
 8. Cllr JH asked how much was spent on the sound insulation grant scheme. JH/NR replied that £1 million would be spent on sound insulation on 2007. This involved 180 dwellings although few of these were in South Derbyshire. Cllr JH said he received a lot of complaints from Kings Newton, particularly Main Street, and was surprised that so much of the village fell outside the scope of the scheme. NR/JH said that EMA had been criticised for basing the scheme on average noise contours and had therefore amended it to include Single Event Level (SEL) contours, which increased the size of the scheme by 10-15% and picked up a few additional properties in Kings Newton.
 9. JH/NR said that if the Antonov flew at night a fine of £10000 had to be paid, although this only occurred on rare occasions. The MD11 flew on 3-4 nights per week and was operated by Lufthansa to the US. These wouldn't be phased out in the near future. The sound insulation grant scheme covers areas within the 55 dB night-time contour and the 90 dB SEL footprint. The grant was now £3-10000 per dwelling and EMA expected to continue to spend around £1 million pa.
- o) Aircraft take-off and landing should be included as sources of Carbon Dioxide emissions within the Master Plan.**
10. JH/NR said that EMA would manage what was under its own control but couldn't take responsibility for emissions from aircraft using EMA. JH said the airport was seeking to establish wind turbines and was considering ground source heat pumps and bio fuels. It was not the responsibility of EMA to restrict emissions from aircraft and the best that could be done was to try to nudge operators into doing something. From 2011 the EU emissions trading scheme would be in operation. This will involve off-setting one's own emissions by paying someone else to reduce theirs. The baseline would be the 2004 emissions level, but the US airlines may resist the scheme.
- p) The Airport Company should review the ratio of day-time to night-time use in favour of greater day-time use and prevent the night-time 57dBLAeq 8 hour noise footprint achieved in 2004 from growing any further and thereby breaching its cited event intent to "bear down on noise". This commitment should be embodied both in the Master Plan and in the revised version of the Airport's "Ten Point Plan" on night noise.**

11. JH/NR said that this had been addressed by charging a premium to flight operators on night flights. The highest charges were for noisy aircraft flying at night whilst the lowest were for quieter aircraft flying during the day, although there was a need to be realistic about the business models of the express freight operators. Cllr JH said that it sounded like a good fiscal lever in theory and asked if the schedule of charges could be made available. NR/JH said that John Froggatt had prepared a paper for the ICC and that a copy could be sent to RG.

Action: JH/NR

- q) The Airport operator incentives and penalty schemes should be independently audited. The penalty levels on noise should be published and the Community Fund into which fines are paid, should be open to public scrutiny. The level of penalty should be set at a level that discourages infringements.**
- r) The Airport Company's noise infringement levels and enforcement locations and their effect on noise exposure should be reviewed independently on an annual basis.**
12. JH/NR said that the operation of the system of operator incentives and penalties was independently audited. The right balance needed to be struck between setting effective penalty levels whilst avoiding unreasonably severe impacts on business. They were unaware of any independent professional body that would be qualified to review penalty levels. The Civil Aviation Authority might be able to do it, although JH/NR were not aware of them doing so elsewhere.
- s) That the prohibition of training flights at night must be maintained and training flights using large commercial aircraft should be restricted to those required for familiarisation with the EMA site.**
13. JH/NR said that training flights came through as a significant matter in the Master Plan consultation and that EMA had responded by prohibiting training flights on weekends and banning training by airlines not operating from EMA. It would not be possible to restrict training only to those pilots flying to and from the airport on commercial flights as airlines cannot accurately predict where their pilots will be flying from/to.
- t) The noise benefits of the proposed runway extension should be explicitly quantified in the final version of the Master Plan.**
14. JH/NR said that further information in support of the application to extend the runway was being submitted to North West Leicestershire District Council and it was hoped that it would soon be determined. The proposal offered both benefits and disbenefits. It would make some larger aircraft taking off on westerly departures noisier. SDDC should expect to be consulted about this by North West Leicestershire District Council. Cllr JH said it would be important to ensure that SDDC was consulted on the additional material. RG said he would make sure the information was sent through to SDDC for consideration.

Action RG

- u) **Whilst the Council welcomes in principle the proposed increase in the levels of noise insulation grants, a review of the costs incurred should be undertaken by the Airport and published to allow an assessment to be made of the adequacy of the level of assistance provided.**
15. JH/NR said they could see no reason why this information should be withheld and would take on board the Council's request.

Action JH/NR

- v) **The Sound Insulation Grant Scheme should be available to all dwellings within the 54dBLAeq 8hr noise contour and the affected properties should be clearly identified in the Master Plan.**
16. JH/NR said that grants were now available to cover the cost of insulation for properties within the 2001 55dBLAeq 8hr noise contour. This threshold was used because it has significance in government research and because the contour is now smaller than it was in 2001. As noise levels grow, properties re-entering the contour would already have the benefit of insulation. Take up of grant assistance has been very strong: 160 were insulated in 2006 and around 180 in 2007, with more still expected in 2008.
17. JH/NR explained that the insulation was applied to windows and doors. Cllr JH asked about roofs and JH/NR replied that standard rockwool loft insulation was sufficient for this. However, a resident of Kegworth was having his property re-roofed as a pilot test and if successful this would be built into the grant scheme in the future. The application of sound insulation can be problematic within Conservation Areas and in Listed properties, but EMA tries to be as flexible as possible to overcome this.
- x) **The Master Plan should set a sufficiently challenging target (10-15%) for public transport usage, which is monitored and reassessed on a regular basis.**
 - aa) **Regional Spatial Strategy Policy 55 indicates that land should be identified and safeguarded for the purpose of identifying and establishing a heavy rail link in the long term and it is considered that the Master Plan should incorporate a firm commitment to meeting this requirement.**
18. Air link buses to the surrounding cities were achieving success in attracting passengers and staff.
19. JH/NR said that work on the Parkway Station was due to begin shortly. The Station would open in 2008 and would be linked to EMA by half-hourly shuttle bus. EMA, alongside EMDA and the Highways Agency, was also part-funding a study by ARUP, looking at the possibility of direct rail connections to the airport. The presence of the River Soar and the M1, separating the Midland Mainline from EMA, was an obvious impediment and it would be necessary to ensure that proposed works to junction 24 would not preclude a rail connection. There was a need to consider whether the number of passengers likely to use such a facility would be sufficient to justify it.

20. The Study would look at the freight potential of a heavy rail link. JH/NR thought a second runway would be required in order to justify this and that it would probably be 2050 before EMA generated sufficient passenger throughput to justify this.
- bb) The potential of the Parkway Station to serve Airport passengers would be greatly enhanced through the establishment of a continuous passenger rail loop linking the facility to Leicester, Coalville, Swadlincote, Burton and Derby and incorporating the proposed National Forest Line. The desirability of such provision should be acknowledged in the Master Plan.**
21. JH/NR said that this matter was outside the control of EMA.
- ff) The attention given to the issue of freight in the Surface Access Strategy is considered to be inadequate in relation to five of the seven points relating to the Airport set out in the East Midlands Regional Freight Strategy.**
22. JH/NR were unsure about this point, but said that the use of rail freight heads would be a matter for the operators.

Any Other Business

23. Cllr JH said that the Council recognised that EMA was an economic asset and that the central problem was noise during the night. He asked whether EMA would be willing to consider the practicalities of setting up a voluntary restraint arrangement in relation to growth in numbers of flights at night until aircraft engine technology improvements made it unnecessary to do so. It would impose limits on operators but not to a degree that would distort the market and it would be very well received by the communities affected by EMA activity.
24. JH/NR said that EMA would prefer to focus on noise levels rather than flight numbers and deal with the issue in relation to the noise footprint. The projected noise footprint for 2016 would be no larger than it was in 1996. This was a voluntary restraint and represented a model similar to that suggested. JH noted that this still left the SEL problem associated with the noisier aircraft. NR said that this had been looked at and was in the hands of the operators and the technology available to them. It might not be possible to remove the larger aircraft.
25. Cllr JH proposed that separate meetings be set up between the District Council and representatives of the express freight operators, DHL, UPS and Royal Mail, to try to persuade them to adjust their operations. JH/NR said they could facilitate this in consultation with the operators and RG.

Action: JH, NR, RG

26. RG noted that at the meeting of August 8 2007 between SDDC and EMA representatives, it had been agreed that meetings should be held on a regular basis. Elected Members had suggested that, in the short term, these should take place more than once per year. JH felt that it would not be necessary to hold another such

meeting before Summer 2008. RG agreed that when the time came he would organise this.

Action:RG

27. JH felt that it was be important to ensure that SDDC was consulted on all developments at EMA requiring planning consent even where not required by regulations. RG agreed to contact North West Leicestershire District Council to ask for the necessary arrangements to be set in place.

Action: RG

RG 11/12/2007