



## **FARNBOROUGH AERODROME CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE**

**Meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2024.**

### **Questions from FACC Members:**

Geoff Marks - Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc.

### **Questions from Members of the Public.**

None on this occasion.

### **Questions from FACC Members:**

Geoff Marks – Farnborough Airport Residents' Assoc

I have the following member's questions.

1. The onset of significant community noise has been reduced from 57dBLeq 16hours to 54dBLeq16hours. Should we take it that this 54dBLeq threshold also applies when the equivalent continuous noise is evenly distributed over shorter periods of time, eg 12 hours?

*Response - In the Aviation Policy Framework (APF) from 2013 the Government advised that they would 'continue to treat the 57 dB LAeq,16h contour as an average level of day time aircraft noise marking the approximate onset of significant community annoyance'. The change to this was recorded in their Consultation Response on UK Airspace Policy in 2017 where they advised a level of 54 dB LAeq,16h is now acknowledged to correspond to the onset of significant community annoyance and replaces the 57 dB LAeq,16h level in the APF.*

*Neither of these documents makes any reference to when during the daytime or on which day of the week the noise occurs, just to the overall amount of noise in the summer period. So noise being restricted to only some of the daytime does not affect the policy position.*

*At Farnborough Airport the operating hours restrict activity during the evening period, defined as 7pm to 11pm in the Lden metric which is used for noise mapping purposes under the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006 (as amended). That metric applies a 5 dB penalty to noise in the evening to reflect greater sensitivity compared to during the 7am to 7pm period. Consequently, limiting evening activity will give a lower values of the Lden metric than if the noise was evenly spread across the 16 hour day time.*

2. The CAA's CAP2091 describes the process to be followed when noise impacts or benefits accrue through changes in the way the airspace is used. Crucially, it confirms that such changes can only be triggered by the Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSP) – NERL and ATC.

*Response - Incorrect - CAP 2091 para 3.7 states Changes to the design of UK airspace are proposed by an airspace change sponsor, usually an airport or a provider of air navigation services (including air traffic control). CAP 1616 can actually be used by anybody to initiate an airspace change.*

Following the establishment of Farnborough's Class D airspace, single PBN routes were implemented whereas multiple PBN routes giving rise to respite opportunities exist at other airports. Should it be confirmed that multiple PBN routes within Farnborough's airspace are precluded.

*Response - It would require an ACP to achieve this. Theoretically any PBN route could have a "respite twin route" but this would impact the usage and size of surrounding airspace.*

*Aside from multiple routes, a way of providing respite is through restricting the operating hours of the airport, something that already occurs at Farnborough, particularly on non weekdays.*

It would be helpful if ATC justify its apparent opposition to dispersion as a means of providing respite or a fairer way of sharing adverse noise impacts.

*Response - There is no ATC opposition. ATC work within the rules set out by the CAA.*

*Respite (which, for clarity is not mentioned at all in CAP 2091) was discussed during Stage 1 of our current active FASI-S ACP and Design Principle 6c and 6d reflect how the targeted stakeholders wanted this concept to be dealt with. Detailed feedback from Stage 1 can be seen within the documentation set for Stage 1, all of which is available to view on the CAA Airspace Portal.*

*When thinking about respite (for which there is no agreed definition) it should be noted that Design Principle number 2 is required by the CAA.*

*Subject to the overriding design principle of maintaining a high standard of safety, the highest priority principle of this airspace change that cannot be discounted is that it accords with the CAA's published airspace modernisation strategy (CAP1711) and any current or future plans associated with it.*

*More info on the AMS is on the ACOG website where, under FAQ is the following:*

*How will the impact of aircraft noise be taken into account in the Airspace Masterplan?*

*In the Government's key environmental objectives set out in the Air Navigation Guidance (2017), it stated that airspace changes are to 'limit and, where possible, reduce the number of people in the UK significantly affected by adverse impacts from aircraft noise'.*

*This objective was further broken down in the Altitude Based Priorities section of the ANG. 'To limit and, where possible, reduce noise below 4000ft; and to minimise noise providing there is no significant CO2 cost between 4000ft and 7000ft'*

*The Masterplan and the constituent ACPs that the airports are responsible for, must demonstrate how this objective will be achieved.*

#### Additional Info:

As explained in the FACC, respite was not something that the targeted stakeholders wanted to take forward as a Design Principle, instead it was felt that Design Principles 6C and 6D were sufficient. Once an ACP is through Stage 1 there is no process within CAP 1616 that allows Design Principles to be revisited.

In Stage 2 the options have been developed and these are being tested against the Design Principles, so if certain options do not score well against DP6C or D this will show up. This assessment, together with the Initial Options Appraisal will allow us to determine which options we take into Stage 3 for further development. At the moment as we are still in Stage 2 and this decision has not been taken.

3. Table 8-19 in Volume 1 of the current planning application's ES shows N65 contour areas reducing as the number of events increase. A simple explanation of this unexpected event/area relationship would be helpful.

*Response - The N65 metric only considers noise events that individually produce at least 65 dB  $L_{ASmax}$ . The metric is therefore unaffected by events producing lower noise levels irrespective of how many of them there are. A scenario with more movements can therefore have a lower N65 value so long as fewer of the movements reach the threshold, in effect if the fleet is quieter.*

*By way of an illustration, a hypothetical location experiences 5 events under Scenario A which produce noise levels of 62, 64, 66, 68 and 70 dB  $L_{ASmax}$  and so has an N65 value of 3, whereas under Scenario B it experiences 7 events which produce noise levels of 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66 and 68 dB  $L_{ASmax}$  and so has an N65 value of 2.*

4. The now superseded CAP 725 required the production of SEL footprints for night flights and says that they may be relevant to daytime operations. Has this advice been carried forward into CAP1616, and would their production alongside N65 contours be beneficial?

*Response - CAP 1616, which replaced CAP 725, explains the CAA's regulatory process for changes to airspace. This document does not apply to environmental assessments of development such as that currently proposed at Farnborough*

*Airport where the requirement is to identify significant adverse impacts and the application is to the local planning authority.*

*For reference, the advice on SEL footprints is not carried forward in CAP 1616i Environmental Assessment Requirements and Guidance for Airspace Change Proposals.*