



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



Date: Thursday 9th October 2025



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. 6 th June 2025 Minutes b. Matters Arising	Chair	Draft Minutes
5 minutes	4. An Update by the Chair:	Chair	
15 minutes	5. Climate Adaptation (4 th round Climate Adaptation Risk Assessment):	Joe Heathcote	Presentation
10 minutes	6. Air Quality Annual Report:	Sue Thomas	Paper
10 minutes	7. Reducing Night Noise – Noise Fine review:	Duncan Smith	Presentation
10 minutes	8. Review on aircraft types including Chapters, Quota Counts (QC) etc:	Duncan Smith	Presentation
25 minutes	9. Environment Reports, including: a/ Reason for increase in % of night pax flights from pre-Covid (Action 9.2) b/ European Air Transport CDA compliance (Action 9.4)	Duncan Smith	Paper/Presentation
15 minutes	10. Noise Action Plan (NAP)– including update on Training Flights Report (Action 10.1)	Duncan Smith	Report/Presentation
20 minutes	11. Water Management Update:	James Ayre	Presentation
15 minutes	12. Future Airspace Update, including: a) Action 12.1 - members' suggestions for improvements to routes given FAS delays caused by external factors	Emma Welch/FEU	Paper
5 minutes	13. AOB: future planned or proposed items:	Chair	
5 minutes	14. Future Meeting Dates: Friday 13 th February 2026	Chair	

1. Attending and Apologies:

Attending:

Title/ Organisation	Name	Initial
East Midlands Consultative Committee Independent Chair	Guido Liguori	Chair
Independent Secretariat	Carol Pull	CP
Derby City Council	Cllr Martin Rawson	
North West Leicestershire District Council	Cllr Ray Sutton	RS
Rushcliffe Borough Council	Cllr A Edyvean	
Kings Newton Residents Association	Dr Chris Tyler	CT
Melbourne Civic Society	Martin Keay	MK
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	JCo
Leicestershire and Rutland Association of Local Councils	Cllr Angus Sowter	AS
Loughborough University	Dr Andrew Timmis	AT
DHL	Charlotte Hickman	
DHL	William Fuller	WF
MAG Head of Noise & Community Engagement	Sue Thomas	ST
EMA Community Engagement Manager	Colleen Hempson	CH
EMA Asset Management Director	James Ayre	JA
EMA Environmental Specialist	Mark James	MJ
MAG Future Airspace Manager	Emma Welch	EW
MAG Future Airspace Consultation & Technical Liaison Manager	Jonathan Challis	JCh
MAG Flight Evaluation Unit Manager	Duncan Smith	DS
MAG ESG Manager	Joe Heathcote	JH

Apologies:

Title/ Organisation	Name	Initial
Rushcliffe Borough Council	Cllr Andy Brown	
Northwest Leicestershire County Council	Cllr Charles Pugsley	
MAG Flight Evaluation Unit Advisor	Danielle Marvin	
MAG Environmental Specialist (Utilities, Energy & Environment)	Nicola Rushton	NR

2. Declaration of Interests:

Standing declaration of interest with Cllr Stephen Taylor regarding Freeport.

3. Minutes of the Last Meeting:

a. 6th June 2025 Minutes:

MK and RS advised they hadn't received the minutes from the June meeting. CH apologised that they weren't included with the meeting pack; however, they were circulated following the meeting. She will re-send the minutes following the meeting. She reminded members that the minutes are published on the airport's website.

The minutes of the meeting of the MENT Committee held on 6th of 2025 were approved as an accurate record subject to MK and RS commenting on accuracy by 30 10 25; any amendments to be notified to CH and the Chair by this date, otherwise the minutes will be taken as approved.

b. Matters Arising:

Actions from previous MENT meetings:

Action 6.1 is included in today's agenda at item 6.

Action 7. EG requested that this item be carried forward to the next meeting.

Action 8.1 is complete.

Actions 9.2 and 9.4 are included in today's agenda at item 9. Action 9.3 is complete.

Actions 10.1 is included in today's agenda at item 10. Action 10.2 The Chair closed the action as nothing further was received.

Action 11.2 is closed. Two members have expressed interest in remaining on the wastewater working group, but no further interest was received. The group will not be reconvened unless specific issues arise, as regular reporting from the environmental team provides sufficient information for MENT discussions. The option of bringing in external experts on an ad-hoc basis is being explored. DRAC-related issues, which originally prompted the group's formation, are now well managed through existing processes, and DRAC have been able to advocate for themselves directly. The working group will remain on hold until required.

Action 11.3 The Chair closed the action as nothing further was received.

Action 12.1 is included in today's agenda at item 12.

4. An Update by the Chair:

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

The Chair continues to have regular meetings with the DfT and CAA.

The Chair reminded members of the upcoming November sub-committee elections.

Item 4. Questions & Answers:

None

5. Climate Adaptation (4th Round Climate Adaptation Risk Assessment):

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

JH introduced himself and took members through a presentation.

Item 5. Questions & Answers:

RS congratulated JH on the presentation and commented on the surface water process as a whole and whether the system may need to be reviewed at some point. JH and RS agreed to discuss following the meeting.

CT thanked JH for the presentation and highlighted the point of sustainable surface drainage in the area from other developers. The proposed new warehouse and housing developments will have an impact on surface water drainage at the airport and surrounding areas, some of which have been badly affected by flooding in the past. He asked to what degree the airport can influence and criticise their surface water drainage proposals which are likely to be inadequate. JH responded that flood risk mapping around the area has been completed and will be updated to include future developments and changes to surface permeability. Airport engagement with government bodies, and local councils is being strengthened to minimise flood risk and improve coordination, particularly around travel alerts and operational responses during flood events

CT asked to what extent are the airport influenced on the topic of climate change by central government, given that, at times, they have not been accepting of the available data. JH advised that it's currently voluntary to report on climate change adaptation (however some climate change reporting is regulatory under the Government). It may in future become mandatory for key infrastructure providers such as the airport and MAG as a whole. If this changed, a more data led approach would be taken.

The Chair thanked JH for his presentation asked if the airport or group is finding disjointed thinking by local authorities on their approach to planning. Are they finding any barriers within the planning authorities and departments which makes their job harder. JH advised that barriers are there around the sharing of information and data. They are trying to improve this through MAG and by talking to different airports and authorities. MAG has recently worked with Greater Manchester Combined Authority on climate adaptation plans for Manchester and they hope to do the same for East Midlands. JH couldn't comment on disjointed thinking at East Midlands but hoped that if this was an issue that the additional engagement would help things move in the right direction and create a lasting impact.

6. Air Quality Annual Report:

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

ST took members through a presentation.

Item 6. Questions & Answers:

RS thanked ST for the report and gave an update on the additional meeting which is being arranged with Cllr Pugsley to discuss this issue. There is no date set yet, but discussions are in place. ST confirmed she is happy to attend the meeting.

RS asked if the UK standards are less than the rest of the world around air quality. ST responded that until government makes a change on the air quality objectives, the UK continues to follow EU standards. The World Health Organisation recognises that there is no safe limit for PM 2.5. ST believes traffic is the biggest source for the areas that are monitored.

CT commented on the increased awareness of the dangers of fine particulates. With the planned increase of activity at the airport, particularly around freight, and the planned large developments in the airport area, the airport must keep a close eye on this and other pollutants. ST advised that the short-term objectives consider the projects CT highlighted. Future developments will be kept under review and new receptors would be considered if necessary.

The Chair asked if the airport finds working with DEFRA frustrating in terms of how long it can take to make policy decisions. ST believes that evidence is being taken into account, but that air quality is not as high on the agenda as it was when it was being managed by the EU. Airports are not a top consultee on air quality. Local authorities are responsible for declaring air quality management areas and putting measures in place. The airport carries out monitoring for the local communities.

JCo questioned why there is only one monitoring point and suggested that now would be a good time to add additional stations. ST explained that the automatic stations are very expensive to run and calibrate. This is supported by nitrogen dioxide monitors and the wider UK monitoring network. Additional stations would only be considered if pollution levels approached air quality thresholds. Current levels remain well below the limit, but future residential developments may prompt a review in partnership with the local authority. ST added that not all airports have an automatic station.

7. Reducing Night Noise – Noise Fine review:

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

DS took members through a presentation.

Item 7. Questions & Answers:

RS thanked DS for the presentation and asked if noise from aircraft engines starting up in places close to runways (such as that from 27 Kegworth departures) is considered in the methodologies. DS advised that this isn't taken into account. He confirmed there is a preference for westerly operations and where possible, especially at night, aircraft use intersection departures, which don't use the full length of the runway to reduce noise impact on Kegworth.

EG thanked DS and suggested the airport adopt a single night-time noise limit rather than varying limits by QC rating, as this could provide a stronger incentive for operators to use quieter aircraft. DS noted that while QC ratings themselves don't strongly incentivise quieter aircraft, charging structures can. Removing QC2 aircraft at night is unlikely as they are still being built. A single night-time noise limit, as used at Stansted, would be simpler, though many airports are moving towards QC-based limits. DS acknowledged the point.

PG asked why the airport doesn't base review on effects of noise heard by population rather than using complex technical arguments. DS doesn't know how this would be monitored and asked PG to contact him if he has suggestions on how this could work.

8. Review on aircraft types including Chapters, Quota Counts (QC) etc:

DS took members through a presentation.

Item 8. Questions & Answers:

The Chair highlighted that the QC issue is quite technical and asked if there is a resource available which simplifies the information. DS will share a government produced chart which shares the difference in aircraft types, and he will add some additional information for members. The Chair requested that DS do this following the meeting.

MK asked why only some of the monitors produce fines. DS explained noise monitoring locations are positioned in relation to departure routes. The Kegworth monitor is slightly offset, and applying the same noise limits there would be excessive.

PG asked if it was time to look at options for the next NAP, given how lengthy a process this is. The Chair requested that this be added as an agenda item for the MENT meeting on 13th Feb 2026.

Action

8.1 Agenda item to be included on an overview of new EMA environmental reporting through Power BI for discussion at MENT meeting on 13th Feb 2026

8.2 Members to send suggestions of how noise issues could be reported using “lived experiences” rather than using technical arguments to CH and The Chair by 30th November.

9. Environment Reports:

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

DS took members through the report.

- a) Reason for increase in % of night pax flights from pre-Covid (Action 9.2)

The graph on slide 31 showed that nighttime movements in general have decreased. Passenger numbers have increased slightly; however, freight numbers have reduced.

- b) European Air Transport CDA compliance (Action 9.4)

Slide 32 in the presentation showed that BCS CDA is lower than the airport average – This is being investigated with the operator.

Item 9. Questions & Answers:

PG requested an explanation of a late QC4, B747-4 aircraft on August 18th which took off slightly after 23.00. DS explained that the aircraft had a technical issue making it late. A gap in arriving traffic was created before 2300; however, ATC received an emergency police aircraft call meaning this aircraft was given priority to take off before the 747. This resulted in the 747 taking off one minute after the 2300 cut off. The Chair asked is there a mechanism at the airport to understand if what the police asked is an appropriate request or is it accepted as being appropriate. DS was informed that there are levels of categories relating to the type of police call and that this call came under one of the highest categories.

EG noted the lower number of training flights over Aston and Weston and asked why this has happened. DS thanked EG for his assistance with the location of the monitor. DS advised there have been discussions with air traffic control and Ryanair. Due to slower aircraft deliveries and a stable fleet size, Ryanair is training only around a quarter of the pilots it did post-lockdown. This reduced recruitment and training level is expected to continue for another year or 2.

RS asked if there are continuing dialogues with airlines on the number of flights that fall into the nighttime slot. DS advised that the passenger operation will grow and if new flights are from Ryanair, Jet 2 and TUI they are likely to be departing in the first slot which falls into the nighttime period. RS requested information on arrivals. DS commented that there have been a number of delays in recent times, due to European ATC issues. On time performance at Stansted have reduced this year, particularly in Ryanair flights which has reduced the number of delays into the nighttime. RS suggested adding scheduling as a future agenda item to allow the committee to understand more around how this is done. The Chair agreed that flight scheduling should be added as a future agenda item.

ST added that scheduling is a commercial function and that someone from this area would be best placed to attend a future meeting to discuss this topic.

Actions

9.1 A future item on aircraft scheduling from the commercial teams at EMA to be considered for a future MENT, with a particular focus on arrivals after 11pm

10. Noise Action Plan (NAP) including Updated Training Flights Report (Action 10.1):

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

DS took members through the report.

DS shared that he and the team recently spent a fantastic morning with Ryanair in their simulator facility where they shared lots of information about their cadet training programme.

DS suggested bringing information on the findings of the north/south trial to be discussed at the next MENT. The Chair agreed.

Item 10. Questions & Answers:

JCo thanked DS for the work carried out and asked if the areas to avoid could be brought to a future meeting. DS said that Ryanair will investigate the feasibility of avoiding specific areas on easterly and westerly circuits. The team will look to incorporate any solutions into their future reporting

JCo noticed that a third of training flights are with TUI and asked if they would have to comply with the updates. DS advised that Ryanair actually offered to share the session with TUI which is unusual. He added that TUI are also always willing to work with the airport.

CT thanked DS for the information and noted there has been a large improvement in the Kings Newton area including the disappearance of the regular 8-9am flight. He has also noticed variation to landing approaches. He suggested that it would be nice to avoid Melbourne school to avoid disruption. DS advised that Ryanair indicated they are willing to adjust approaches on runway 09 to avoid Melbourne where possible. DS will feed back to Ryanair that this change has been positively received.

EG asked what leeway will be allowed on the proposed 12 o'clock stop and how this would be monitored. DS advised that landing times are monitored through start and end points in the system. Ryanair indicated that any adjustments would add no more than 15 minutes. EG questioned if this would delay the following start up time. DS explained if a student misses a morning session, their flight would be rescheduled within other planned training times, preventing extra aircraft movements that day.

JCo asked why the session isn't for a continuous 8 hours and omit the 2 hours. DS advised the 2 hours were put in to give respite over lunch as part of recent NAP commitments. He believes operators would welcome this suggestion as they are very willing to make changes which work for everyone. DS explained that there needs to be a break available for the 4 students and for the aircraft to be refuelled. There may be the odd occasion where the flights could run 10-15 minutes over to allow all 4 students to carry out their training on the same day. This would stop unnecessary flights carrying over into the following day. DS made a suggestion that flexibility around the 12pm cutoff be trialled over the next few months and the results fed back to operators. DS will make the operators aware of the trial and give clear guidelines of expectations.

RS suggested that feedback from parishes would be valuable. The Flight Evaluation Unit will include information on the proposal at the parish forum on the 11th of November and feedback will then be given by the airport to operators to start the trial.

Actions

10.1 Review results of ATC trial into 'balancing the north/south training split' and 'areas to be avoided' as part of next NAP update standing agenda item at next MENT on 13 Feb 2026

10.2 Review effectiveness of the 4 hrs AM and 4 hrs PM for training flights. Consult Parish Forum about introducing flexibility into respite lunch period on 11 Nov 2025 before introducing a trial to introduce flexibility over respite period – review effectiveness of trial at MENT meeting on 5 June 2026

10.3 Agenda item at a future MENT on 'Considering options for future NAP Actions' – to be timed for 5 June 2026 .

11. Water Management Update:

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

JA & MJ took members through the report.

Item 11. Questions & Answers:

RS welcomed the SCADA system and asked how this related to the Diseworth brook and the number of outlets. JA explained the outlets are not for overtopping but are controlled outlet points. Valves automatically close if contaminant levels in the pond exceed set thresholds, preventing discharge into the Diseworth brook. RS asked if these are subject to permits and JA confirmed that these are all permitted outlets which are measured and controlled.

CT asked if the airport are planning to keep a close eye on the new Severn Trent pipeline which is being installed and the levels of fungus created. JA explained that new monitoring technology is being introduced for the River Trent, including intelligent cameras and chemical sensors, to detect changes before visible growth occurs. This supports closer monitoring during the permitted discharge period (1 November–1 April) in collaboration with consultants and the Environment Agency (EA).

RS asked if the results of task 1 on slide 1 will be available. MJ advised he believes the first two sets of results will be published and available. MJ will check as to whether the detail of the site setting report can be shared.

RS raised a question on the distinction between unpermitted (2A) and permitted (3A) discharge locations and how future site involvement will be determined. MJ advised the EA has been heavily involved in assessing the locations. The discharge permits are for the permitted locations.

RS asked whether monitoring results had been approved, as the slide suggested, or if the results were still under discussion with the EA, given the upcoming meeting. MJ advised that two rounds of results are publicly available and that the upcoming meeting is to discuss the results and look at plans for analysis going forward.

The Chair requested an update on their discussions with the EA at the next MENT. MJ advised they will share anything not deemed as confidential.

The Chair requested that RS submit any unasked questions by email to himself and CH by the 30th of October.

RS commented that the working group may no longer be necessary given DRAC's independence. However, he raised concerns about the group's capacity to effectively scrutinise complex issues such as PFAS and surface water management. While there has been positive engagement with SMEs and Severn Trent, PFAS remains a significant area of concern, particularly regarding the group's ability to ask the right questions and address reputational risks alongside noise and air quality. The Chair stated that he doesn't believe that RS or any other members are being influenced by DRAC. DRAC are able to articulate by themselves. The Chair suggested that there may be members of the council who are able to support RS with some of the technical aspects. If this isn't an option, he suggested that he and RS have a conversation to discuss his concerns following the meeting.

RS will submit his questions to The Chair and CH.

Actions

11.1 Mark James to provide information on first two sets of data (tasks 1 and 2) to MENT (these are in the public domain) by 30 Oct 2025

11.2 Mark James to consider if screening report (task 3) can be provided to members by 13 Feb 2026

11.3 MAG to update members following upcoming November discussions with EA at the 13 Feb 2026 MENT

11.4 RS to supply his outstanding questions on wastewater and PFAS to CH and The Chair by 30 Oct 2026

12. Future Airspace Update including Action 12.1 - members' suggestions for improvements to routes given FAS delays caused by external factors:

The report has been circulated and taken as read.

EW and DS took members through the highlights of the report.

Item 12. Questions & Answers:

CT highlighted the issue of night-time noise impacting King's Newton from wide-body aircraft deviating slightly from the centre-line of noise preferential routes. The question had been asked if narrowing the NPR corridor (ie the tolerances on either side of the centre-line) could help aircraft avoid early turns. The response was given that this action would not result in the desired outcome. DS explained that flight paths are fixed within aircraft flight management systems and aren't subject to change. Narrowing the noise corridor would not alter ground tracks but would instead just increase the number of off-track reports. Closer adherence is not feasible due to factors such as weather and ATC instructions.

MK referred to information provided by the airport at a previous meeting about the new improved satellite navigation. He asked DS to confirm that this allows more precise routing than ground-based systems, therefore enabling aircraft to fly more closely to the centre-line of NPRs and reduce corridor widths. DS explained that current procedures are RNAV-based and fixed, with the $\pm 500\text{m}$ reference drawn from work at Stansted. While future airspace design at East Midlands isn't yet determined, adopting performance-based navigation (e.g. RNP1, RNAV1) would allow for reduced tolerances once coding tables are published and applied to all aircraft. This technology has been proven elsewhere, but East Midlands' procedures remain locked under current systems until future airspace changes are implemented.

JCh added that East Midlands currently uses RNAV substitution, which relies on lower-grade technology than the RNP replication introduced at Stansted. This requires wider tolerances and limits the ability to narrow corridors further. Future implementation through the FASI programme will enable higher precision similar to, or better than, the Stansted RNP1 SIDs. He highlighted that despite these limitations, current track-keeping performance at East Midlands is already at a high standard.

MK expressed concern that high compliance rates may reflect wide tolerances rather than genuine precision, and that residents would prefer tighter routing to reduce noise. He feels this has been lost sight of. He also expressed frustration over uncertainty surrounding the timeline for FAS, with a view that technical improvements could be made at East Midlands sooner. ST emphasised that improvements to routing precision cannot be achieved with the current system. Without FAS implementation, the requested changes are not possible. The published data is intended to provide transparency to the community, not to benefit airlines. The delay in airspace change is outside the airport's control, and the issue continues to be a shared frustration.

The Chair acknowledged community frustration with delays to the FAS process, noting progress is being held up by one particular airport outside of MAG. Community members and local authorities were encouraged to lobby MPs to help remove the logjam through the DfT. The airport's position remains unchanged, and repeated discussion of the same concerns will not progress matters until the national process moves forward. The Chair thanked contributors and closed the discussion.

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

The next agenda setting meeting is on 12 January 2026.

The Chair asked members to send proposed items to himself and CH prior to this date.

Actions

13.1 In light of IT issues, Dr Paul Grimley to submit a list of questions to the Chair and CH by 30 Oct 2025, which will then be sent to the appropriate person within EMA to answer

14. Future Meeting Dates:

Friday 13th of February 2026

Action Log:

- 6.1 (carried over from June meeting) RS to arrange a meeting with the environmental health team within the local authority to discuss air quality monitoring in the wider local area outside of the airport land, and to invite ST. This has been rolled over to 13th Feb 26
- 7.1 (carried over from June meeting) EG to send AF any additional questions. AF to reply. Questions and answers to be circulated by the next MENT. This has been rolled over to 13th Feb 26.
- 8.1 Agenda item to be included on an overview of new EMA environmental reporting on Power BI for discussion at MENT meeting on 13th Feb 2026
- 8.2 Members to send suggestions of how noise issues could be reported using “lived experiences” rather than using technical arguments to CH and The Chair by 30th November.
- 9.1 A future item on aircraft scheduling from the commercial teams at EMA to be considered for a future MENT, with a particular focus on arrivals after 11pm
- 10.1 Review results of ATC trial into ‘balancing the north/south training split’ and ‘areas to be avoided’ as part of next NAP update standing agenda item at next MENT on 13 Feb 2026
- 10.2 Review effectiveness of the 4 hrs AM and 4 hrs PM for training flights. Consult Parish Forum about introducing flexibility into respite lunch period on 11 Nov 2025 before introducing a trial to introduce flexibility over respite period – review effectiveness of trial at MENT meeting on 5 June 2026
- 10.3 Agenda item at a future MENT on ‘Considering options for future NAP Actions’ – to be timed for 5 June 2026.
- 11.1 Mark James to provide information on first two sets of data (tasks 1 and 2) to MENT (these are in the public domain) by 30 Oct 2025
- 11.2 Mark James to consider if screening report (task 3) can be provided to members by 13 Feb 2026
- 11.3 MAG to update members following upcoming November discussions with EA, at MENT on 13 Feb 2026
- 11.4 RS to supply his outstanding questions on wastewater and PFAS to CH and The Chair by 30 Oct 2025
- 13.1 In light of IT issues, Dr Paul Grimley to submit a list of questions to the Chair and CH by 30 Oct 2025, which will then be sent to the appropriate person within EMA to answer

The Chair closed the meeting at 12.40pm.