

## Scottish Environmental Noise Steering Group (SENSG)

### Notes of Second Meeting – 26 November 2007 Room 1F57/58 Victoria Quay Edinburgh

#### Present:

David Wallace (DW) - Scottish Government and SENSG Chair  
Duncan McNab (DM) - Scottish Government  
Linda Story (LS) - Scottish Government  
Martin Valenti (MV) - SEPA  
Colin McNab (CM) – Hamilton & McGregor  
Alastair Brown (AB) – Glasgow City Council Chair and Glasgow Working Group Chair  
Steve Williamson (SW) – Edinburgh City Council Chair and Edinburgh Working Group Chair  
Alastair Young (AY) – Transport Scotland – Rail  
Drew Hill (DH) – Transport Scotland – Roads and Transport Chair

#### Apologies

Dr Bernadette McKell (BM) – Hamilton & McGregor  
John Stirling (JS) – REHIS

#### 1. Welcome and Action Points from Previous Meeting:

DW welcomed everyone. The notes of the previous meeting were agreed and approved for publishing on the noise mapping website. Action points were ongoing or would be covered in the course of the agenda.

#### 2. Data for Submission to European Commission

2.1 CM reported that the consultants are on track to provide the data for the commission by end of December. There were however potential problems providing full and accurate information on quiet facades and special noise insulation. It was agreed, should sourcing this data prove too problematic, it need not be included as it is not mandatory to do so. This could be explained further in the accompanying report. The deadline for the report to the commission must take priority, and if there are likely to be any problems in this regard DW should be advised. **Action – CM**

#### 3. Report from Glasgow Working Group (AB)

3.1 The Glasgow group had their second meeting on Friday. The group have secured the attendance of a roads engineer from Glasgow Council but are still in the process of securing planning input. The next meeting is planned for 19 December and a representative from SPT will attend.

3.2 The group were given a demonstration of the data that could be available from the consultants and asked if Hamilton & McGregor could supply as much detail as possible, including representation of population noise exposure, on drawings as tabled at the last meeting. It was agreed this can be provided but priority at present will be

given to pulling together the data for the European Commission as noted in point 2 above

3.3 The group had discussed the prioritisation matrix and suggested some minor changes. These changes were agreed. **Action MV to update the matrix**

3.4 CM asked if there are any copyright issues on the consultants using Google maps. **Action LS to check with solicitors**

3.5 The group asked for guidance on the level of consistency that would be required between the working groups. DW advised that the groups should bear in mind the terms of the Directive otherwise there is flexibility for each Group to adopt an approach local to their needs (for example in how they set the levels of noise annoyance). It was agreed that it makes sense to focus on things that are already in place.

#### 4. Report from Edinburgh Working Group (SW)

4.1 Reported that the group had received support from Planning in all three of the Local Authorities in the Edinburgh Agglomeration.

4.2 The definition of “strategic” was discussed, with the result that SENSG asked Hamilton & McGregor to consider revising the current definition on the website to minimise the risk of misunderstanding, or misuse, of the maps. This would include revising the FAQs. **Action CM to revisit.**

4.3 The group had agreed to look at existing plans policies and programmes for the next meeting on 18 December. They had also agreed to look closely at the maps on the website. It was noted the drawings from consultants, as noted in 3.2 above, were eagerly awaited.

4.4 Noted that the noise mapping for the Edinburgh Grassmarket area appeared to be an anomaly. It was also noted that the noise mapping for Edinburgh Victoria Quay appeared to be based on an outdated industrial classification.

4.5 The group had discussed Candidate Noise Management Areas and chapter headings using the terms of the Directive as a starting point.

#### 5. Validation of Maps

5.1 Discussion took place on how to validate the noise maps and CM pointed out that the noise modelling paradigm is currently under review, within Europe, and changes are being discussed. This has been understood throughout the noise mapping process and it is agreed Action Planning will feed into and improve the noise model. It was further agreed Industrial noise is currently well regulated and consideration of further action under the Environmental Protection Act and IPPC could be a legitimate part of an Action Plan if necessary.

## 6. Report from Transport Working Group (DH)

6.1 The transport group had discussed the prioritisation matrix process and looked at possible Action Plan headings. The preferred matrix was to be developed by calculating an influence value for each of a series of 300m radius event circles, at 100m centres, along the various route corridors. The influence value for each event circle would be calculated based on the accumulation of the individual noise levels for each property within the event circle (this would include adjustment for occupancy and annoyance). The total series of values would then be ranked numerically into quartiles A, B, C, and D. For each of these quartiles a series of appropriate specific actions would be considered (area D for example would require more intensive actions). Part of the process of preparing the action plan will be to capture the range of current noise related measures being carried out, and to look to refocusing these to gain value.

6.2 It was agreed different methods for each of the groups were acceptable but that we should think about the interface between priorities from a transport viewpoint and agglomeration viewpoint. **Action working group chairs to meet once priorities have been identified. DH to circulate notes of transport working group meetings and any headings for Action Plans.**

6.3 AY stressed that he had spent some time scrutinising the noise maps to check, in empirical terms, that the assumptions (on a rail basis) on which they were based appear to be valid in terms of outputs. This appears to be the case.

## 7. Graphics

The question of how the public would view the prioritisation graphics would be held over to the next meeting, but everyone should give some thought to the issue. **Action everyone**

## 8. Dates for next meetings

Agreed that dates for next meetings will be

23 January 2008 at 11:00 am

20 February 2008 at 11:00 am

19 March 2008 at 11:00am

**END**