East Midlands Airport Consultative Committee (EMACC) Monitoring, Environment, Noise and Track Sub-Committee (MENT) Meeting

Date: Friday 9th October 2026

Time: 10:00 – 12:30

Location: Microsoft Teams (Virtual)

Agenda:

Timing	Agenda Item	Lead	Resources (paper, presentation etc)
5 minutes	1. Welcome and apologies:	Chair	
5 minutes	2. Declaration of Interests:	Chair	
5 minutes	3. Minutes of the Last Meeting: a. 5th June 2026 Minutes b. Matters Arising	Chair	Draft Minutes
5 minutes	4. An Update by the Chair:	Chair	
10 minutes	5. Water Management update (standing item) to include post-winter 'lessons learned:	James Ayre	Presentation
10 minutes	6. PFAS update (standing item):	Nicola Rushton/Mark James	Paper
15 minutes	7. Future Airspace Update (standing item):	Emma Welch	Paper
35 minutes	8. Noise & Operational (Environment) Reports (standing item): b) New reporting format - Q&A c) Resolve Action 9.1	Danielle Marvin	Paper/Presentation
10 minutes	9. Noise Action Plan (NAP) update (standing item)	Danielle Marvin	Presentation
15 minutes	10. a) Options for Future NAP b) Action 11.1	Danielle Marvin	Presentation
10 minutes	11. Weston on Trent noise monitor relocation:	Danielle Marvin	Presentation
10 minutes	12. ISO50001 certifications	Tom Rix	Report
5 minutes	13. AOB: future planned or proposed items:	Chair	
5 minutes	14. Future Meeting Dates: Friday 26 February 2027	Chair	

DRAFT

1. Attending and Apologies:

Attending:

Title/ Organisation	Name	Initial
EMACC Independent Chair	Guido Liguori	Chair
Independent Secretariat	Carol Pull	CP
Airport User Group:		
DHL	Charlotte Hickman	CH (DHL)
Nottingham College	Robin Atherlay	RA
Local Interest Group:		
People Against Intrusive Noise (PAIN)	Dr Paul Grimley	PG
Save Aston and Weston Village Environment (SAVE)	Ed Green	EG
5 Parishes Community Group	Julian Coles	JC
Leicestershire and Rutland Association of Local Councils	Cllr Angus Sowter	AS
Kings Newton Residents Association	Dr Chris Tyler	CT
Melbourne Civic Society	Martin Keay	MK
Local Authority Group:		
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cllr Andy Brown	AB
Rushcliffe Borough Council	Cllr Andy Edyvean	AE
North West Leicestershire District Council	Cllr Ray Sutton	RS
MAG / EMA Representatives:		
Future Airspace Consultation Lead	Emma Welch	EW
EMA Community Engagement Manager	Colleen Hempson	CH
EMA Asset Management Director	James Ayre	JA
Head of Energy Strategy Group Technical - Utilities, Energy & Environment	Tom Rix	TR
MAG Flight Evaluation Unit Advisor	Danielle Marvin	DM
EMA Environmental Specialist	Mark James	MJ

Apologies:

Title/ Organisation	Name	
Leicestershire County Council	Cllr Charles Pugsley	
People Against Intrusive Noise (PAIN)	Tom Barton	

DRAFT

2. Declaration of Interests:

None.

3. Minutes of the Last Meeting:

a. 5th June 2026 Minutes:

The Chair noted that action 11.1 was not included in the summary section at the end of the June 2026 minutes document. CP will update the minutes.

Following the above amendment, the minutes of the meeting of the MENT Committee held on 5th June were approved as an accurate record.

b. Matters Arising:

All outstanding actions from the June MENT meeting are included in today's agenda in items 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Action 7.1 brought from the General meeting is included in item 5 of today's agenda.

A discussion took place between the Chair and RS regarding Item 6.1 from the June 2025 meeting. RS advised that, despite the matter remaining important, it had not been possible to make progress with the meeting. RS agreed to close the action and he will continue to pursue the matter outside the committee should the opportunity arise.

4. An Update by the Chair:

The Chair will provide his update at the EMACC General Meeting in December.

5. Water Management update (standing item) to include post-winter 'lessons learned':

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

JA took members through the following highlights:

- Summer maintenance and inspections were completed, and the airport is in a good position ahead of the winter season which runs from 1st November 2026 to 31st April 2027.
- The new SCADA control system is in the commissioning phase and remains on schedule for delivery. This will provide improved automation, data accuracy and management of water across the network.
- A Bio Chord trial is planned before Christmas. This will support the breakdown of de-icer within the water system. Its performance will be monitored, with the potential for wider use if successful.
- Other improvement initiatives are due to start over the following 12 months.

DRAFT

- ✈ Lessons learned from winter 2025/26 inform preparations for the coming season, with improvements focused around three areas: Recover, Treat and Release.
- ✈ JA advised that the improvements made provide confidence that the airport is well prepared for the upcoming winter season.

Item 5. Questions & Answers:

AE asked whether the de-icer recovery systems had been sufficiently tested given the recent mild winters. JA explained that de-icer is applied at temperatures below 5°C and was used on a number of occasions during the previous winter. Improved monitoring now provides greater detail on where and how much de-icer is applied, which means that recovery vehicles can be positioned more effectively. This will be particularly important during more severe weather when greater quantities of de-icer might be required.

RS asked for clarity on what constitutes a successful winter and whether there had been any permit non-conformities during winter 25/26. JA explained that successful water management means operating in accordance with the airport's Environment Agency (EA) permit. A number of non-conformances were reported to the EA during the previous winter and assessed accordingly. One required corrective action relating to elevated levels in a holding pond, which has since been addressed through additional aeration and back-pumping. JA confirmed that there are currently no outstanding actions with the EA.

RS requested that future surface water updates include additional information to help members understand performance, including comparative year-on-year data where appropriate. The Chair asked the airport to consider what further information could usefully be presented at future meetings, whilst emphasising the importance of MENT's scrutiny being forward-looking and reporting focused on the measures being taken to manage water quality and ensure compliance, rather than reviewing historic performance.

RS also asked if the EA's work relating to PFAS could result in changes to the airport's existing water permit. JA explained that the airport continues to work closely with the EA and has not been advised of any changes to its permit. Any future changes would be addressed with the EA.

RS requested further information on Bio Chord, including its use elsewhere and the planned application at EMA. Following discussion, it was agreed that a presentation on Bio Chord would be provided at the next MENT.

JA confirmed that the airport's offer to meet with DRAC remains open.

Actions

5.1 JA to provide a presentation on Bio Chord at the Feb 2027 MENT meeting.

5.2 JA to consider what additional information can be provided to help members understand performance, including comparative year-on-year data where appropriate, to support future surface water updates at the Feb 2027 MENT meeting.

6. PFAS update (standing item):

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

MJ highlighted that the Regulation 61 process is almost at an end, with sampling complete and the final results awaited. The surface water risk assessment will follow, with submission due by the end of December 2026.

DRAFT

Item 6. Questions & Answers:

RS asked for clarification on the relationship between the Regulation 61 process, PFAS and the airport's environmental permit. MJ explained that Regulation 61 allows the EA to request additional information from organisations holding environmental permits and has been used to obtain PFAS data from airports and other permitted facilities.

MJ confirmed that the PFAS work is being led separately by the EA's Chemical Regulatory Team and that the local permitting team isn't involved in that process. The eventual regulatory outcome, including whether any changes to permits will be required, isn't yet known. The EA has indicated that the matter is expected to be referred to the Secretary of State and applies nationally rather than specifically to EMA. This is likely to be a lengthy timeframe.

RS asked whether more detailed information on the PFAS monitoring results, including the chemicals identified, levels detected and associated risks, would be shared with the committee. MJ advised that, once the data and reports have been submitted and relevant discussions have taken place with the Environment Agency, further information will be shared in due course.

The Chair advised that he would make enquiries through UKACCs contacts at DEFRA to better understand why the matter is being referred to the Secretary of State and will report back if further information becomes available.

The Chair asked for clarification on the timescale for the PFAS Risk Management Plan and whether it could be shared with MENT once available. MJ explained that this will be a MAG-wide plan covering all three airports and therefore requires coordination across the Group. MJ will check whether the plan can be shared with MENT and report back.

Actions

6.1 The airport to confirm whether the PFAS Risk Management Plan can be shared with MENT, with an update to be provided by the next agenda-setting meeting on 11 January 2027.

7. Future Airspace Update (standing item):

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

EW took members through key points of the report.

- The updated ANG/AND and CAP 1616 have now been published.
- The CAA has confirmed that the EMA Airspace Change Proposal, together with the other MTMA sponsors' proposals, will continue under the previous version of CAP 1616, allowing the programme to progress without the need to transition to the new process.
- A Stage 3 Gateway and public consultation date are still awaited.
- Airspace design work is nearing completion, and the coordinated consultation group has been established, with sponsors working together to align consultation plans.

Item 7. Questions & Answers:

The Chair asked if it was possible to start looking at the Stakeholder Reference Groups (SRG) membership to ensure readiness for the next stage of the process. EW advised this is possible and she will be in touch with the Chair.

PG asked for clarity on the difference between UKAC and UKADS and their relevance to the airport. EW explained that UKADS is responsible for progressing future airspace change within the London

DRAFT

cluster and does not directly apply to EMA. UKACS is a subgroup who have a coordination role for the MTMA cluster, replacing the former ACOG arrangements, and coordinates the overall programme and collaborative working between the airports.

PG asked for assurance that previous stakeholder discussions regarding the approach to consultation would be reflected in the forthcoming consultation. EW explained that each airport remains responsible for its own consultation strategy in accordance with CAP 1616 requirements. UKACS provides coordination across the cluster to ensure consultations are aligned, including timing, terminology and information explaining how the individual proposals relate to one another. It does not dictate how individual airport consultations are undertaken.

EW confirmed that the coordinated approach will not override previous stakeholder discussions or agreements regarding EMA's consultation and notes that the SRGs will provide further opportunity to discuss the consultation approach.

The Chair shared the following link to the CAA section on UK airspace coordination. https://www.caa.co.uk/commercial-industry/airspace/airspace-modernisation/uk-airspace-coordination-service/about-the-uk-airspace-coordination-service/

RS emphasised the importance of clear and accessible language within the public consultation, particularly given the technical nature of airspace change and the number of acronyms used. EW confirmed that common wording across the cluster will principally relate to the wider airspace change programme and the relationship between the individual airport proposals. It will not dictate the language used by EMA to explain its own proposals.

EW advised that consideration is being given to how the consultation material can be made accessible to a non-technical audience, including the use of easy-read documentation, and that this will also be considered through the SRGs.

The Chair will ensure that the latest version of the Committee's acronym guide is circulated to members. (Post meeting note: Acronym guide emailed to members along with weekly briefing on 9/10/2026)

Actions 7.1 Membership of the SRG to be considered and discussed with the Chair by the next MENT.

8. Noise & Operational (Environment) Reports (standing item):

The reports were circulated and taken as read.

DM took members through highlights of the reports.

- complaint levels follow the usual seasonal pattern, increasing during the summer months and reducing in September. The extended period of easterly operations during July and August contributed to an increase in complaints during this period.
- A significant number of complaints continue to originate from a small number of complainants in particular locations. The airport continues to engage with the communities concerned.
- Track-keeping performance remains strong overall. The airport is working with TUI to address an identified issue affecting the 27 SAP departure route, with changes expected to improve performance.

DRAFT

- Continuous climb and continuous descent performance remains stable overall compared with the previous year.
- Training flights continue to operate mainly to the north of the airport. Complaints increased in April following a period of very little training activity but have since returned to more usual levels.

b) New reporting format - Q&A

PG asked about the differences between aircraft movement figures in the new reports and those published by the CAA. DM explained that the FEU reports use data from the Airport Noise and Operations Monitoring System (ANOMS), which receives live radar data from Air Traffic Control at the airport. The CAA uses a different data source and definitions, meaning the two sets of figures are not directly comparable. Using ANOMS allows the FEU to use one consistent source across its reporting.

DM provided further clarification on the definitions used within the report, including training and touch-and-go movements. DM explained that the number of training flights and the number of circuits are different measures, as a single training flight may complete several circuits.

It is agreed that ANOMS will be added to the Committee's glossary of terms.

MK requested that definitions be moved to the first page of the reports. DM agreed to do this. The Chair highlighted that the definitions section is a live document which can be updated upon request.

c) Resolve Action 9.1

DM provided updates on a number of outstanding actions.

- Action 8.1 – Training flights within ATM figures. Training and touch-and-go movements are included within the movement figures in the new reporting. This action is now closed.
- Action 8.2 – ASL and Atlas Air CDA performance. ASL's performance has been investigated and the operator contacted, with performance to continue to be monitored. Atlas Air is no longer a regular operator at EMA and there is limited scope for further action. This action is now closed.
- Action 8.3 – Off-track departures. NATS confirms that some aircraft had been vectored before reaching EMA's 5,000ft release height. This has now been communicated to controllers to ensure the correct release height is used. This action is now closed.
- Action 9.1 – Kings Newton exclusion area: DM advised that the existing Melbourne exclusion area already covered part of Kings Newton. However, further clarity is needed on the area that residents would like included before the airport could consider whether a separate Kings Newton exclusion area was feasible. CT agreed to discuss this with the community and provide feedback at the next MENT. It was also noted that the updated South Derbyshire Local Plan may provide useful information on settlement boundaries. This action is now closed and a new action 8.2 has been opened below.

A request has been received from the Parish Council for the temporary noise monitor to be located at Houghton on the Hill next summer. The airport is happy to proceed if no other locations are proposed, although aircraft are generally around 6,000ft at this point on approach to Runway 27, so the amount of useful noise data collected may be limited.

DM advised that the airport has recently received a small number of complaints several months after the flights operated. She proposed introducing a three-month period for investigating and reporting complaints, which would align with quarterly reporting and the availability of supporting operational

DRAFT

data. The Chair requested that draft wording is brought back to MENT for consideration and suggested that the airport contact the EMA Accessibility Forum for their input.

EG asked at this point whether the proposed three-month period would also apply to wider community surveys or studies covering a longer period. DM confirmed that it would apply specifically to individual complaints about particular flights. Wider surveys and studies could still be considered using the longer-term data available through ANOMS. The proposed wording will make this distinction clear.

Item 8. Questions & Answers:

EG queried if there had been more training flight overflights of Aston during Q3. DM explained that when the airport is busier during the peak summer months, this leaves less flexibility for training flights. Circuits need to be adjusted to accommodate arriving and departing aircraft and maintain safe distances.

EG asked about the increased use of Runway 09 over the last two years and whether there was a reason for the change. DM confirmed that increased use of Runway 09 has also been noted by the airport. This is likely to be linked to changing weather and wind patterns resulting in an unusually prolonged period of easterly operations during the summer. The airport will review the 2025/26 data once the full year's figures are available to better understand whether a change in the longer-term pattern is emerging.

PG thanked DM for the helpful complaints analysis and asked whether information on freight-related HGV movements could be considered, particularly as freight activity is increasingly spread across daytime and night-time operations. DM noted that this falls outside the remit of the Flight Evaluation Unit (FEU) and may be more appropriate for TEP. The Chair agreed that the airport should consider whether relevant data is available and how this could be reported through TEP. It was noted that some information may be held by individual freight operators rather than the airport.

JV reported positive feedback from his community on the fairer distribution of training circuits between the north and south and asked whether a 50/50 split could be achieved. DM advised that the current split of around 60/40 is likely to be the best achievable due to interaction with normal airport traffic, which predominantly operates to the south. This is a significant change from the previous split of around 85/15.

RS shared positive feedback from a local resident who had found the noise information available on the airport's website useful and informative.

RS also advised that he had received detailed questions from another resident regarding aircraft noise and the airport's approach to noise management. It is agreed that, subject to the resident's consent, the letter will be forwarded to the Chair and CH for consideration and response by EMA. The Chair will also consider whether any of the issues raised would be suitable for a future agenda item.

Actions

8.1 Airport to consider whether data on freight-related HGV movements is available and, if so, how this could be reported through TEP. The feasibility of this will be considered at the next agenda-setting meeting.

8.2 CT to discuss the proposed Kings Newton exclusion area with the community and provide feedback on a potential boundary at the next MENT meeting.

DRAFT

8.3 The airport to prepare draft amendments to the Complaints Handling Policy, including the proposed three-month period for individual complaints, for consideration at the next MENT meeting. Proposed changes should also be reviewed with the EMA Accessibility Forum.

8.4 An update on the outputs from the Airline Questionnaires to be provided at the 4th of June 2027 MENT.

8.5 Lessons learned from other airports on noise mitigation measures, including ventilation, and the differences between EMA and other airports, including designation to be discussed at 4th of June 2027 MENT.

9. Noise Action Plan (NAP) update (standing item):

DM took members through highlights of the presentation which will be shared following the meeting.

- Airline questionnaires covering operating procedures and ground noise are nearing completion. The responses will provide information relevant to NAP actions 9, 14, 15 and 16. An overview of the findings would be provided at the next MENT.
- Revised daytime and night-time noise limits are now in place and published in the UK AIP, with the airport's fees and charges document also being updated. NAP action 15 is now complete.
- Action 10.1 - DM proposed that NMT3 at Sutton Bonnington be used for this year's annual noise monitor report, given the higher use of Runway 09 during the summer and the fact that the opposite end of the runway was considered last year. Members agreed. Action10.1 is now closed.
- DM confirmed that Sutton Bonnington is a permanent monitor operating throughout the year, although the annual report would use data from the 92-day summer period.

Item 9. Questions & Answers:

None

Actions

None

10. Options for future NAP Actions:

a) Options for future NAP Actions & b) Action 11.1

The presentation will be circulated following the meeting.

DM thanked members for their submissions highlighted the feedback received on future NAP actions. The following points were noted:

- Future reporting could provide clearer timescales for NAP actions and use colour coding to show progress. This could be incorporated into future reporting without requiring a separate NAP action.
- Feedback had been received suggesting more stringent daytime departure noise limits. DM explained that daytime limits could not necessarily be reduced to the same level as night-time limits, but other measures to reduce or mitigate daytime noise could be considered.

DRAFT

Action 11.1 is now closed.

Item 10. Questions & Answers:

The Chair asked if it would be possible to have a timescale on relevant NAP actions, such as a colour coded system. DM confirmed that the NAP already identified the year in which actions were due to be completed, but more detailed timescales could be included for some actions where project plans allowed.

RS requested that the development of the next NAP take account of noise mitigation measures being used at other UK airports, particularly in relation to night-time operations. DM explained that direct comparisons between airports could be difficult due to differences in their operations but agreed that there may be lessons from measures being used elsewhere which could be considered at EMA. The Chair agreed that a future MENT meeting would consider lessons that could be learned from noise mitigation measures at other airports. This would also include an explanation of the differences between EMA and the designated London airports and how this affects their regulation.

PG suggested that the NAP should more clearly show how individual actions relate to identified noise issues, including the loudest aircraft movements and how their impact could be reduced. DM explained that this was already a fundamental aim of the NAP but agreed that the link between identified noise issues and the actions being taken could be made clearer.

Actions

None

11. Weston on Trent noise monitor relocation:

DM advised members that NMT1 at Weston on Trent needed to be relocated as the landowner no longer wished to continue the lease. A new site had been identified at Kings Newton, which would be known as NMT4. The new location was closer to the centre line of the flight corridor and is expected to provide more useful data for noise monitoring and fining purposes.

Legal agreements for the new site are being finalised and a temporary monitor had been in place at the proposed location over the summer to maintain data collection during the transition.

Item 11. Questions & Answers:

EG asked if the existing and new monitors could operate in parallel to allow comparison between historic and future noise data. DM explained that NMT1 had been out of operation since earlier in the year due to power issues, so running the two permanent monitors in parallel wouldn't be possible. Historic data from NMT1 is still available and, once NMT4 is operational, the temporary monitor can potentially be located at Weston on Trent to provide a period of comparative data. EG advised he would be happy with this.

PG asked whether the location of NMT4 indicated that the future airspace route was expected to follow a similar flight path. DM confirmed that the location was based on current requirements and was not linked to the future airspace design. The location of noise monitors could be reviewed in future if required following any airspace changes.

Actions

None

DRAFT

12. ISO50001 certifications:

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

TR highlighted the positive outcome of the recent ISO 50001 audit and the benefits of aligning energy management systems across the MAG airports.

Work has been ongoing to improve energy efficiency at EMA, including improvements to building and lighting controls. Wind turbine availability had also improved from around 60% in 2025 to 100% since April 2026. TR also noted that the airport had contracted directly with renewable energy producers to support its energy requirements.

Actions

None

13. Any Other Business (AOB), Future planned or proposed items:

None.

The Chair thanked members for their attendance and participation and urged them to share any future agenda items with himself and CH before the next agenda setting meeting on the 11th of January 2027.

Actions

None

14. Future Meeting Dates:

Friday 26 February 2027 at 10am.

Action Log:

- 5.1 JA to provide a presentation on Bio Chord at the 26 Feb 2027 MENT meeting.
- 5.2 JA to consider what additional information can be provided to help members understand performance, including comparative year-on-year data where appropriate to support future surface water updates, at the 26 Feb 2027 MENT meeting.
- 6.1 The airport to confirm whether the PFAS Risk Management Plan can be shared with MENT, with an update to be provided by the next agenda-setting meeting on 11 January 2027.
- 7.1 Membership of the SRG to be considered and discussed with the chair by next MENT.

DRAFT

- 8.1 Airport to consider whether data on freight-related HGV movements is available and, if so, how this could be reported through TEP. The feasibility of this will be considered at the next agenda-setting meeting.
- 8.2 CT to discuss the proposed Kings Newton exclusion area with the community and provide feedback on a potential boundary at the next MENT meeting.
- 8.3 The airport to prepare draft amendments to the Complaints Handling Policy, including the proposed three-month period for individual complaints, for consideration at the next MENT meeting. Proposed changes should also be reviewed with the Accessibility Forum.
- 8.4 An update on the outputs from the Airline Questionnaires to be provided at the 4th of June 2027 MENT.
- 8.5 Lessons learned from other airports on noise mitigation measures, including ventilation, and the differences between EMA and other airports, including designation to be discussed at 4th of June 2027 MENT.

The Chair closed the meeting at 12.23pm

DRAFT