

that it was perhaps regrettable that reporting to the annual CIEH survey was not able to be made mandatory upon all Local Authorities, as was Air Quality Management Reporting and submission of Part A2/B Inspection returns through Hartley McMaster, Defra's consultants. He understood the different context and knew it would not change however. A useful discussion then occurred led by Howard Price on how the noise data returns were prevented from "skewing" the outcomes.

The meeting agreed to minute the importance of the continuing reporting by LA's to the annual national CIEH Survey completed by August of each year and how each LA could then use their Local information outcomes as a possible lever for resources. The context as to how noise, in common with graffiti, air quality and littering, could affect community welfare was discussed and where the meeting gave importance to this noise as an indicator.

It was minuted that the Meeting would remind Chairs of Health and Wellbeing Boards of the importance of the indicator where addresses and contact details would be researched. **Action - JD** ✓

In relation to Neighbourhood Quality, discussion occurred about noise having parallels with other indicators in that where one indicator had a good value, other indicators were likely to be good also.

Colette Clarke indicated Defra's recent work in raising awareness of noise as an issue with the Department of Health, which had led to noise becoming an indicator in the Public Health Outcomes Framework. She added that in relation to Health and Wellbeing Boards, environmental health practitioners could also highlight the importance of noise and other statutory nuisances in relation to health. Colin Grimwood suggested the idea of EPUK being a training advisor for the new Boards in relation to noise where briefings could be delivered from the point of "Well this worked for us".

7.0 The current progress of the Draft Anti Social Behaviour Bill was discussed where the Select Committee on Home Affairs had now reported. Colette Clarke indicated the recent work of the Home Office out in the Regions, where they had had a dialogue with a wide number of stakeholders - mainly police, local authority and housing practitioners - and were noting their suggestions and concerns. The Meeting agreed with the importance to communities of close working between Police, LA's and Social Landlords and where this was occurring already there was not any real concern about the new ways of working included within the new Draft Bill. The new initiatives in the Draft Bill will be tested in the new Enforcement toolkit. The possible need for

comprehensive guidance, in relation to provisions of the Draft Bill when an Act was raised by Jaclyn Williams. Howard Price raised his concerns about the possible proliferation of intervention standards, where it was accepted by the meeting that the issuing of guidance may not stop Stakeholder Partners using the new powers from "tripping over themselves". Howard Price and the Chair indicated their concerns that some contents of the Draft Bill were included because they were "politically driven" and that simplifying different noise control procedures may however make noise issues more complex. The meeting also accepted, in relation to the Draft Bill that "we are where we are". John Dinsdale spoke in relation to neighbour noise issues, about the long held aim of EHO's to be the drivers of "behavioural change" which was a different aim to other stakeholder partners, who by managing noise control issues, sometimes just relocated the neighbour noise control problem.

8.0 Nothing was discussed under Statutory Nuisance issues.

9.0 In relation to Noise Action Week the Chair indicated that Trustees had recognised the importance of continuing with the initiative, stakeholders sometimes different from before were using it, the Press liked it and it also advertised that EPUK were still out there. The Chair indicated the high quality business case prepared by Mary Stevens, its submission to Defra and the need to make progress with this matter for 2013. Colette Clarke indicated that she understood that the noise and nuisance research budget was fully committed but that she would check with evidence colleagues and ask them to get back to EPUK. The Chair indicated that a large number of housing associations had been involved with last year's Noise Action Week and were planning activities this year, too. Colette Clarke suggested that EPUK consider approaching housing associations for contributions towards future Noise Action Weeks. She said that, should Defra not be able to fund this year's event, she would speak to her contacts at the Home Office and DCLG to find out whether they were able to contribute.

10.0 There was no any other business raised.

11.0 It was agreed to meet again in the near future and the date and time of June 20th (now changed to June 27th) from 1.00 pm be chosen, where the venue was to be again at the Corporation of London.

N.B. Room booking to be conducted through
julia.hayden@cityoflondon.gov.uk

0207 332 1170 (T)

who is the P.A. to John Averns, Port Health and Public Protection
Division.

These minutes written by John Dinsdale.

Dated - April 21st, 2013

Docref NOISECOMMINUTES100413.docx

Alan Brett

Chair, Noise Committee

EPUK 16/7/13