

**Independent Consultative Committee (ICC)  
MENT  
Monitoring, Environment, Noise and Track Sub-Committee**

**Friday 16<sup>th</sup> February 2024  
1000 – 1200**

**Virtual via MS Teams Present:**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Initial</b>
Independent Chair	Mr G Liguori	Chair
Independent Secretariat	Mrs C Pull	

**Organisation:**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Initial</b>
SPCG	Mr J Coles	
Rushcliffe Borough Council	Cllr A Brown	
Save Aston and Weston Village Environment (SAVE)	Mr E Green	
NWLDC	Cllr R Sutton	
DHL	Ms F Horrocks-Burns	
Loughborough University	Dr A Timmis (joined at 10.30am)	
Melbourne Civic Society	M Keay	
PAIN	Dr P Grimley	
Kings Newton Residents Association	Dr C Tyler	

**East Midlands Airport (EMA):**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Initial</b>
EMA Community Engagement Manager	Ms C Hempson	CH
Head of ESG and Environmental Strategy	Mr A Freeman	AF
MAG Head of Environment	Mr M Churley	MC
MAG Flight Evaluation Unit Manager	Mr D Smith	DS
MAG Planning Services Director	Mr J Bottomley	JB
MAG Flight Evaluation Unit Advisor	Ms H Dimmick	HD
MAG Planning Graduate	Ms A Cooper	
Future Airspace Manager	Ms E Welch	
SUONO (Acoustic Consultants)	Ben Holcombe / Fred Davies	BH

<b>Apologies</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Initial</b>
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cllr M Barney	
DHL	Mr A Smillie	

<b>Absences</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Initial</b>
Leicestershire County Council	Cllr T Pendleton	

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Description</b>
1	Welcome and Apologies

	<p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting including Dr Paul Grimley who returns as the new representative of PAIN and Cllr Ray Sutton who now attends as representative for NWLDC.</p> <p>AF introduced new members of the Airport team to the committee.</p>
2	<p><b>Declaration of Interests</b></p> <p>None</p>
3	<p><b>Minutes of the last meeting</b></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2023 were taken as approved as an accurate record.</p> <p>There were no outstanding actions from the meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2023.</p> <p><u>Matters arising from previous MENT meetings.</u></p> <p>Action 7: the Arcadis (was AECOM) model, will be addressed during item 8 of today's agenda.</p>
4	<p><b>An update by the Chair</b></p> <p>The Chair was pleased to attend the Kegworth Disaster Memorial on 8<sup>th</sup> January. The event was well attended by members of the community, the Airport and others who wanted to pay their respects and also those who had a part in the disaster recovery efforts.</p> <p>On 24<sup>th</sup> January, the Chair attended an ANEG Meeting on behalf of UKACC and gave an overview of the topics discussed.</p> <p>In his bulletin of 19<sup>th</sup> January, the Chair asked elected members on their awareness of Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group (SASIG) within their local authority. There have been no responses, and he understands from SASIG that none of the local authorities on our ICC are members. The Chair would really like to understand this, so asked members to respond.</p> <p>The Chair reminded members that his survey remains open, and he encouraged people to complete it.</p>
5	<p><b>S23 Community Noise Monitoring Results</b></p> <p>The papers were circulated, taken as read and are available on SharePoint.</p> <p>BH took members through the reports.</p> <p>DS added that the reports have been circulated to the Parish Councils concerned and are published on the Airport website. The Airport has also offered meetings to both Parish Councils to discuss the reports if required.</p>

	<p>A member asked what percentage of all departures were on the Daventry route during this period. BH confirmed 53.7% of all departures, 37% of which were at night.</p> <p>The Chair thanked BH for his presentation.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p><b>Environment Reports</b></p> <p>The report was circulated, taken as read and is available on SharePoint.</p> <p>DS took members through a presentation.</p> <p>A member asked for clarity on where performance is measured, as track keeping goes off route at a certain point. DS advised the requirement is that the aircraft must stay within the corridor up to height of 5,000 feet. Any aircraft leaving the corridor under this height is non-compliant and will trigger as an infringement.</p> <p>A member asked for an update of plans to restore the easterly Trent corridor to realign with the NPR. DS advised that information has been reviewed since identifying the problem on this departure in 2020. The Airport has identified that the gradual increase in the deviation on this route is due to magnetic variation changes which haven't been corrected over the years. If changed, the tracks would shift in excess of 1km which would trigger either a level 1 Airspace Change proposal (ASP) or a Planned or permanent redistribution of Air Traffic (PPR) which would require public consultation. A decision was made approximately 2 years ago, as highlighted and agreed with MENT, to include this in the wider ASC programme.</p> <p>A member highlighted an error on the CAA website which shows zero mail shipments for November 2023. He has reported this to CAA but has received no response so asked the Airport to raise the issue. DS agreed he will follow this up and this action was reported as having been undertaken during the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair asked where the air quality monitoring equipment is located. AF responded this is on the Airport at the Aeropark and explained why. A report of data coming from that location is published on the website. AF confirmed that air quality measured at the monitoring station has never exceeded the Government's health-based air quality objectives.</p> <p>The Chair noted he would like Air Quality as a standalone item at a future meeting.  <b>Action 6 (1) : Air Quality to be added to the list of future agenda items at a future agenda setting meeting.</b></p> <p>A member asked if the information on the website is up to date. AF confirmed that it is up to date. He advised the member in his new capacity as NWLDC representative, that it is the local authority who has legal responsibility for air quality, rather than the Airport. The member thanked AF and will look into this.</p> <p>The Chair gave the member the option to attend the next agenda setting meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2024 and will send him the date.  <b>Action 6 (2) : Cllr Sutton to be invited to the next agenda setting meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2024.</b></p> <p>A member commented that Aston is very affected by training flights and asked for confirmation that the number will reduce in line with the new noise action plan (NAP).</p>

	<p>The member also asked for clarity on the definition of an overflight. DS explained there is a selection zone, which is a 3-dimensional cube covering the villages. If an aircraft penetrates that zone an infringement will be generated. Using the overflight cone would give slightly inaccurate results.</p> <p>The member asked if a comparison of the overflight cone and the information being used could be given. DS advised they aren't comparable and explained why using the report. The member stated concern about the difference in definition as this could lead to confusion. DS took the comment on board. AF understood the member's concerns and suggested this be looked at as part of the training flights action of the new NAP. The member agreed this would be a worthwhile exercise.</p> <p>A member suggested an existing site between East and West Leake for community noise monitoring. DS thanked the member and will look into this.</p> <p><b>Action 6 (3): The Airport to look into the member's site recommendation for a mobile noise monitor location near East Leake.</b></p> <p>A member doesn't agree that the Kegworth monitor is not included in the peak noise report. He added that NAP22 didn't make exceptions for particular types of monitor. He asked what actions are being taken with operators and requested a report on the challenges being made to the operators. DS responded that fining monitors and community monitors are different, and the detail of the reports shows a change in aircraft type. This is an emerging situation and an issue that occurred as part of lockdown. Charges were previously increased and 747-400s are now banned at night. AF added that the report will always show the noisiest type of aircraft and that members views have been considered over the years. The Airport are introducing a community noise portal as part of its NAP 2024-28. There are 2 types of noise report produced to report on noise as there are 2 different types of noise monitor. There are many perspectives from communities who do not have a noise monitor which have to be considered. The verbal updates given at meetings provide a very good read out to members on actions being taken with operators. The QC4 and removal of the 747's is one of the key actions delivered from listening to the committee and other stakeholders. AF would resist creating another report to add to the current deck of information to focus on just one issue.</p> <p>DS asked members to send suggestions for community noise monitor locations by the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2024 and noted the member's suggestion from earlier in the item. DS ended by suggesting if there is no 2<sup>nd</sup> community monitoring site, the Airport could pick one fixed monitor to report on.</p>
7	<p><b>NAP Adoption</b></p> <p>The NAP is currently with DEFRA and the Airport await their feedback.</p> <p>The Chair asked if a timescale for feedback had been given. AF advised there has been no timescale, but he hopes for feedback within the next few weeks and months.</p> <p>A member asked when the Airport would be engaging with members on the planned changes to training flights in the new NAP. AF responded that this would be done, as previously confirmed, within the first year. Members will be updated at future MENT meetings, and the Airport are working on all actions as if the NAP has been adopted. He highlighted some actions which have already been carried out including SIGS, QC4 and amendments to the Community Fund.</p>

	<p>A member was contacted by a constituent in Thrumpton who had contacted the Airport with regard to training flight noise. The member questioned the Airport’s response with regard to the height of the aircraft over the village. He suggested an update be made to the AIP to ensure the aircraft is flying at the correct height of 2000 feet above ground level. DS advised this will be covered in the training flight review. It wouldn’t be feasible to make a change to the AIP without consulting with air traffic control to ensure there would be no operational impact and would be safe. DS concluded that the Airport would raise the issue as part of the upcoming training flight review.</p>
<p>8</p>	<p><b>Surface Water Management Update</b></p> <p>The report was circulated, taken as read and are available on SharePoint.</p> <p>An acronym explainer has been added to the report as requested and will be updated when required.</p> <p>The trial date for the legal action brought by the Environment Agency has been set for the 19<sup>th</sup> of May 2025.</p> <p>MC apologised for the lack of update on outstanding action 7 on the Arcadis/AECOM model. No further information is currently available. This item is deferred to the next meeting.</p> <p><b>Action 8: The outstanding Arcadis/AECOM model to be deferred to 16 June 2024 MENT</b></p> <p>MC took members through the reports.</p> <p>A member thanked MC for his presentation and advised he’d be happy to continue being part of the working group in his new capacity. The Chair advised the working group can continue and invited a new representative from Kegworth. The Kings Newton representative is also happy to continue.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p><b>Future Airspace (including emerging preferences)</b></p> <p>The report was circulated, taken as read and are available on SharePoint.</p> <p>EW confirmed that the Airport is now at stage 3 of the process and gave an overview of what this involves. Public consultation will happen at the end of this stage. Updates will be provided throughout this stage as it is a lengthy process.</p> <p>A member raised the point of early turns and how they affect Kegworth. He asked if he could carry out some research and approach the Airport outside of the meeting. EW advised she’s happy to discuss with the member outside of the meeting and clarified the process for other members.</p> <p><b>Action 9: PG to research early turns and contact the Airport and the Chair with his findings for discussion by the 7<sup>th</sup> of June 2024.</b></p> <p>A member thanked EW for the information she sent prior to the meeting. He will go through and respond with any questions.</p>

	<p>A member asked if the publication of CAP1616i in November will change the review process or weighting of the shortlisting process. EW clarified that if the Airport is in middle of a stage, guidance from the previous version would continue to be used. There would be no re-work required on stages that are already completed. The member said there is greater clarity in some areas in the new publication and asked if these will be considered. EW confirmed that these areas will be looked at in much greater detail in stage 3.</p> <p>A member voiced concerns over additional noise on southern routes and asked how the Airport is going to examine the risk of increased now on proposed routes during stage 3. EW advised that during a process of refinement and rationalisation the Airport will be looking at routes in more detail including overflight. There is opportunity for the routes to be optimised and refined at this stage.</p> <p>The member understood that there were options during stage 2 to use existing routes which now seem to have disappeared and asked for clarity of this. He believes they looked like better options. EW explained the process around how the options were assessed and shortlisted and how the performance of the specific route option queried is linked to feedback from NATS En-Route relating to their emerging designs for the upper airspace network.</p> <p>The member asked if Northwest 10 could be removed due to the impact on Melbourne and Kings Newton. EW advised that all routes go through the same process and no routes can be removed without following this. The member had further questions, but The Chair advised there will be community meetings are part of the process where issues such as this will be discussed.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p><b>Land Use Planning and Noise (including proposed new fact sheet)</b></p> <p>The report was circulated, taken as read and are available on SharePoint.</p> <p>JB gave an overview of the report and why it has been brought to MENT.</p> <p>The Chair asked if the Airport ever receives questions from the public looking to purchase houses near the Airport and from developers. JB confirmed that they do receive enquiries, usually through the community team via the website. Developers also get in touch at early stage in the planning pre-application process with questions on aircraft noise in relation to large developments. The Chair also asked if local authorities discuss the impact on noise on new developments. JB confirmed that noise contours are shared with planning authorities.</p> <p>A member advised NWLDC and Derbyshire are putting together plans and are showing proposed housing sites but there doesn't appear to be anything around aircraft noise. He asked if this can be included. JB responded that noise has been identified by the local authority for potential allocations in the NWLDC Local Plan. The early consultation stage that was carried out in South Derbyshire last year did not include any proposed sites. The Airport drew the LA's attention to consideration of noise if making any allocations. The same point was made to NWLDC in 2023. They are out to public consultation on allocations and the point will be made again.</p> <p>A member welcomed the Airport's safeguarding role and asked to what extent the risk zones at the runway ends are enforced when an application comes in. JB confirmed these are known as public safety zones. This is a piece of national planning policy which has an</p>

	<p>objective to avoid people living or congregating in these zones at the end of the runway. The DfT recently carried out a review of these zones at UK Airports. The area of these areas has reduced and there are no residential dwellings within these zones at EMA. The Airport would report back to the local authority if an application was received that would increase the number of people living or congregating in one of these zones to advise that the application should be refused. The member would like to discuss the issue further so he will engage with JB following the meeting. JB is happy to discuss.</p>
<p>11</p>	<p><b>Any other Business</b></p> <p>A member asked if Future Airspace will appear on the agenda in future and will the actions be picked up at MENT. The Chair responded that there is an ongoing process outside of MENT, but that ASC updates will be added to future meetings. There is not enough time on the agenda to have regular questions. EW confirmed that the Airport is happy to have dialogue with members outside of the meetings if they have specific questions.</p> <p>A member asked if training flights could be a future agenda item. The Chair confirmed that this is an agenda item for the next MENT in June 2024.</p> <p>The Chair asked members to send any future agenda items to himself and CH.</p>
<p>12</p>	<p><b>Date and of Next Meeting.</b></p> <p>Friday 7th June 2024</p>

*There being no other business the Chair thanked members for their participation and contributions and closed the meeting at 1157*