



EDINBURGH AIRPORT WATCH

Debate in Parliament and public meeting with airport!

Thursday 27th April, 12.45pm Holyrood

We want to say “Thank you” – just a couple of weeks ago, we asked if you could lobby your MSPs and ask them to sign Neil Findlay’s Motion “Flawed Airport Consultation”. We are delighted to report that you did, and in your hundreds and thousands. Our politicians’ postbags and in-boxes are bulging with your messages, and it has made a difference. Cross party support has been achieved, and the motion will be debated on Thursday 27th April at 12.45pm.

But, it does not stop there, we all need to keep up the pressure. Here is how:

1. **Write again** to all 8 of your MSPs and ask them to attend the debate on Thursday and speak up on behalf of their constituents. Send them an email, tell them how you are affected now by the airport, and/or your concerns for the future. Tell them how shambolic the consultation process is, how unclear the documents are, and how poor the data is. See our “Top 10 Reasons to Reject” below for more.

Make sure they understand that as your representative in Parliament, you want them to attend the debate and speak up for your interests, not the airport’s. Facebook or tweet when you have done it.

Look up your **MP or MSP** here:

<https://www.writetothem.com>

2. **Attend the debate at Holyrood.** It is easy to watch the debate in person, just get a ticket from Visitor Services at the Parliament on 0131 348 5200 / 0800 092 7600 and sit in the public gallery on the day. Holyrood is very busy on a Thursday, with First Minister’s Questions beforehand, so allow plenty of time to clear security, collect your ticket and find a seat upstairs in public gallery above the Chamber in time for 12.45pm.
Try and encourage as many people that you know to do the same – a packed public gallery will leave viewers in no doubt about how big a deal this debate is for so many of us. The airport proposals are deeply flawed, but if approved will have life changing consequences for hundreds of thousands of people. If you can’t attend, then watch it online via the Scottish Parliament website <http://www.parliament.scot/news-and-parliament-tv.aspx>
3. **Come and have your say at a public meeting with the airport** in Blackness EH49 7NP also on **Thursday 27th at 7pm.**
The airport and campaigners will be speaking, it is in the Community Hall, next to the school (postcode EH49 7NP)
All Welcome.

Website: www.edinburghairportwatch.com

Facebook page: **Edinburgh Airport Watch**

Email address: edinburghairportwatch@gmail.com

Twitter: **@EAW_Group**



EDINBURGH AIRPORT WATCH

Website: www.edinburghairportwatch.com

Facebook page: [Edinburgh Airport Watch](#)

Email address: edinburghairportwatch@gmail.com

Why this consultation is flawed: Our Top 10 Reasons to Reject the proposals.

Here are our Top 10 reasons why we believe the flight path proposals and the consultation itself are unsound. Feel free to use these in your response to the consultation. We have not provided a set “response template” as we believe that an individual response in your own words will carry more weight.

The consultation end date is the 7th May. To respond, the airport will try and insist you use their survey form, either online - www.letsgefurther.com, or in hard copy: Freepost LETS GO FURTHER, The Consultation Co-ordinator, Edinburgh Airport, PO Box 17473, Edinburgh, EH12 1ND. However they now say they will accept written responses too.

As ever, we recommend that you retain a copy of everything you send to the airport, and CC your response to the Chief Executive of the CAA (andrew.haines@caa.co.uk) and all your elected representatives: MP, MSPs, Local Authority Councillors and Community Council. If you have concerns about the consultation process, the documents or any aspect of the Airport’s public engagement, direct these to the Airport’s consultation experts: The Consultation Institute.

There are Local Councillor Elections on May 4th and a General Election for MPs on June 8th, so find out who your local and general election candidates are, and ask them to spell out their position on the flight path changes. If they won’t support Communities, then why promise them your vote?

Top 10 reasons to reject these proposals

1. There is no coherent, evidence-based justification for these proposals – what is the problem the airport is trying to solve? Where is the statement of need for change on this scale?
2. No assessments of health, environmental or economic impact of change versus no change (status quo).
3. Data published from the previous initial stage consultation indicates that a large majority of responders were against any further flight path change. The astonishing scale of the new proposals effectively overrules public opinion, leading to concerns that the views of the people will again be ignored.
4. A key factor determining route design has been to fly over the fewest numbers of people, yet the airport has relied on outdated population statistics and ignored new and planned for developments. Population numbers throughout the consultation document are wrong. Multiple changes in use of airspace affecting tens of thousands of people have been made already that are widely disputed by residents affected. No count of these “newly overflown” people has even been done.
5. Areas of rural and coastal tranquillity will be permanently transformed by noise, with no assessment of current background noise levels having been carried out prior to any change taking place.
6. Consultation process is seriously flawed – the 900 plus pages of documentation are not “clear, concise and readily accessible” as the regulator (CAA) requires, but inconsistent, jargon rich, with data absent, wrong, unreferenced or shown without any baseline. Inconsistent messages are being given by the airport in response to questions raised with them.
7. Flawed route designs – eg several areas told unequivocally in 2016 that they would not be affected, now find preferred routes over them. The areas of possible vectoring are huge, there is no assessment of the cumulative impact of several routes over an area.
8. The survey response form is too restrictive. It is narrowly focussed and aims to collect primarily quantitative data but ignores many of the quality of life issues that respondents wish to talk about. It is unclear how responses will be analysed, and whether the airport may choose to ignore anything that does not fit with their criteria.
9. High numbers of responses to the initial stage cited concerns with noise and health impact. There is no evidence that any of the current proposals will significantly reduce noise impact for anyone affected now or in the future.
10. Regulations governing airspace change have been recognised as not fit for purpose, and are under review. In the interests of fairness, this consultation process should be halted until the new regulatory framework has been established by the CAA and the new incoming UK Government.