

## **Scottish Environmental Noise Steering Group (SENSG)**

### **Notes of Third Meeting – 23 January 2008 Conference Room 9 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  
Bernadette McKell (BM) – 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  
Drew Hill (DH) – Transport Scotland – Roads and Transport Chair  
John Stirling (JS) – REHIS  
Nick Evans (NE) – Scottish Government Planning  
Jonathan Dennis (JD) - Scottish Government Economists

#### Apologies

Alastair Young (AY) – Transport Scotland – Rail

#### 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 from previous meeting as follows;

- Data to be sent to commission – completed
- Prioritisation – to be covered later in the agenda
- Copyright issues relating to Google maps – to be carried over
- Definition of Strategic on mapping website – BM reported that the text was written and should be uploaded shortly
- Working Group chairs to meet – to be carried over.

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

2.1 SW reported that Victoria Colling from Edinburgh Airport had attended the last Edinburgh group meeting, and had explained the approach to action planning across the BAA airports. It was felt that the input from the airport had been very useful with the added benefit that it would lead to improved communication links between the local authorities and the airport operators. BM had attended the meeting and explained the proposed prioritisation methodology. It had been agreed that the Edinburgh Group would meet again on 8 February to visit the sites of the potential candidate noise management areas (CNMA's).

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

3.1 The Glasgow group had taken steps to ensure that the composition of the group was fit for purpose. They now have a better balance with representation from

Planning and the transport partnerships. The greater Glasgow and Clyde Valley Structure Plan Team will send representation in the future and Jim Stephenson from BAA will attend future meetings.

3.2 The previous meeting was designed to allow Local authorities to attend and commence work on seeking out CNMAs. Now that everyone has a CD people can be clear what to focus on for the next meeting. It was noted that there are more potential CNMAs in Glasgow than in Edinburgh.

3.3 AB stated that the group will need to retain a consultancy role from Hamilton & McGregor.

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

4.1 The transport group were working on the Action Plan and have a rough outline which will be slightly different from the agglomeration plans as Transport Scotland has a statutory responsibility for Trunk Roads. A draft text should be available soon.

4.2 DH was looking at the Defra hedonic pricing study and would share his findings and thoughts with the group at a later meeting.

4.3 The transport group had asked if the cost benefit analysis (CBA) should come in at an early stage in the process and be included in the consultation process. JD explained that ideally the CBA should flow through the process and be refined in more detail as we work through the process.

4.4 Discussion had taken place on the relationship between  $L_{den}$  and  $LA_{eq}$ .

4.5 Discussion took place on the prioritisation matrix, which DH had seen as a cyclical process. This led to the question, if the transport plan would include CNMA's or would be more likely to result in an overall trending down of noise. It was concluded that although the emphasis might be on trending down noise in the transport plan they would also be looking at CNMAs. While the emphasis in the agglomerations might be on CNMAs, trending down noise would also be an important aspect of their plans. It was difficult to conclude where the emphasis should lie as this is a new process for everyone involved and no firm conclusions could be drawn until the groups work through the process. Review and monitoring of action plans are an integral part of the requirements of the directive which is a cyclical process in itself.

#### **Action DH to revisit the proposed matrix and circulate to the group**

#### 5. Cost Benefit Analysis

5.1 JD was encouraged by what he had heard and the approach to action planning seems to be working with the grain of how the Scottish Government would approach CBA. We are correct to look at options and consistency is the key while we should be looking at a common outcome which is relevant to people.

5.2 Traditionally everything is monitored but it is recognised that noise is one of a number of areas that is not easily monitored and so the SG is moving away from that approach. We are therefore going about the process in the correct way and should see the CBA as a tool to make things transparent.

## 6. Prioritisation Methodology

6.1 Discussion took place on the prioritisation methodology and BM explained the background. It was noted that Industry and Airports had not been covered but where aircraft noise affects agglomerations they will be. Procedures for dealing with noise from industry are already in place but further thought would be given to this issue.

6.2 DW thanked BM and MV for the considerable amount of work they had done to reaching this point and felt that the CDs were of considerable help to the groups as a starting point for action planning.

**Action BM/MV? To revisit the methodology amalgamating both versions of the Matrix and providing worked up examples.**

## 7. Planning

7.1 NE explained that there is agreement to review PAN 56. The approach would be in two stages

- To agree what changes were needed regarding the technical noise aspects of the PAN and BM would be advising on that.
- SG Planning would revise and work up the revised PAN, consulting others as necessary but its PANs are not normally subject to full public consultation.

7.2 It was agreed that as long as the revision to PAN56 is underway the deadline for completion does not have to be in July 08.

7.3 SG Planning is keen to play its part in the Action Planning process along with others. The group does however have to bear in mind that the planning system only concerns new development. A wide range of factors can be material considerations in the determination of planning applications and therefore there is the possibility that the outcome will not always be the ultimate solution to Environmental Noise problems.

**Action BM and LS to liaise with NE on the review of PAN56.**

## 8. Strategic Environmental Assessment

DW described the process and timescales. It was agreed that we need to look at the consultation process which could potentially have an effect on timescales.

**Action DW/BM to meet with Will Carlin from SG (SEA) to check on timings and whether or not the Airports are covered. DW to report back to the group.**

9. AOB

9.1 Measurement and validation of the noise maps. It was agreed that we should accept the offer of a noise monitor from Defra and seek some indication of costs for maintenance from Pat Hoey. Everyone should give consideration to a potential site near a busy road.

9.2 Environmental Protection UK Conference MV reported that the conference Health Effects of Environmental Noise & update on Noise Action Planning for Scotland, would be held on 20 February in Glasgow. He asked everyone to circulate the flyer widely as this would be a good opportunity for people to engage in the Action Planning process.

10. Dates for next meetings

Agreed that dates for next meetings will be

21 February 2008 at 11:00 am – Victoria Quay

19 March 2008 at 11:00am – Victoria Quay

**END**