

Department for Transport

**SoNA 2014
Peer Review**

Final Report

Prepared by

Dr Hannah Devine-Wright

Placewise Ltd

&

Stephen Turner, MA, MSc, HonFIOA

Stephen Turner Acoustics Limited

Department for Transport Contract: SO 16241-2

Report Number: PW/STA/03

Date: 26 January 2017

CONTENTS

Section	Page
1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 Overview of the review process	4
3.0 Specialist review	5
4.0 Aims of SoNA 2014	10
5.0 Conclusions	13

Document ID: STA-2017-001

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Placewise Limited and Stephen Turner Acoustics Limited (STA) were separately appointed to undertake an expert peer review of the study entitled Survey of Noise Attitudes 2014 (SoNA 2014) carried out by the Department for Transport. Dr Hannah Devine-Wright of Placewise Limited was tasked with focusing particularly on reviewing the social survey and analytical aspects of the survey; Stephen Turner of STA was asked to review, in particular, the acoustics aspects. Despite the different emphases of their scope, both reviewers contributed comments and observations on all aspects of the survey report and it is their combined views that are presented in this document.
- 1.2 It is understood that the main objective of SoNA 2014 was to allow the Department for Transport and other government departments to understand people's attitudes to noise from various sources and specifically, for this study, the impact of noise from fixed wing civil aircraft. Furthermore, the study investigated how attitudes to aircraft noise related to the aircraft noise exposure experienced by the respondents.
- 1.3 This peer review report has five sections. Section 2 provides an overview of the review process. Section 3 of this report provides a response and commentary on various aspects of the study, as required by the peer review scope.
- 1.4 Section 4 examines the extent to which the results of the survey as presented in the final study report met the five aims of the project. Comment is also provided on the robustness of the conclusions drawn. Brief conclusions are given in Section 5.

2.0 OVERVIEW OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

- 2.1 The peer review inception meeting took place on 29th February 2016. At that meeting the peer reviewers were informed that the first draft analysis report, prepared by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) would be provided the following day.
- 2.2 As requested, the peer reviewers undertook an evaluation of that report and provided feedback in time for a project board meeting held on the 14th March 2016.
- 2.3 That feedback highlighted a number of issues regarding the presentation of the information and the analysis that had been carried out. The reviewers concluded that it was not clear from this first draft the extent to which the study had met the declared aims.
- 2.4 No fundamental issues were identified in terms of survey methodology, but it was felt that there would be merit in considering again the narrative structure of the report and in undertaking further analysis of certain elements. To that end, the reviewers provided a suggested report outline and indicated the further analysis that they thought would be helpful.
- 2.5 It was agreed that an iterative process would be adopted so that the reviewers would receive the various report chapters as they were revised and, in turn, the reviewers would provide detailed written and verbal feedback to the report authors. This occurred throughout the summer of 2016.
- 2.6 Overall co-ordination of the review process was managed by CAA, who also arranged teleconference calls and face-to-face meetings with the peer reviewers and members of the project board in September and November 2016.
- 2.7 Co-ordination between the acoustics and social peer reviewers was achieved through regular telephone conversations and/or email exchanges.
- 2.8 A preliminary final report was received by the peer reviewers on 7 December 2016. A Statement of Assurance (Report PW/STA/02, dated 14 December 2016) was compiled based on the text of that report. A final version of the report was received on 19 January 2017 and forms the basis for this peer review.