

CAP 1984 ANNEX D

CAA analysis of stakeholder feedback and complaints data regarding the Newcastle Post Implementation Review of the GIRLI SIDs

Introduction

1. For the Post Implementation Review (PIR) the change sponsor was required to demonstrate how the actual impacts of the airspace change compare with what was set out in the airspace change proposal and the preferred option on which stakeholders were consulted. Irrespective of the fact that the decision for the Newcastle International Airport Ltd. (NIAL) airspace change proposal was made under CAP 725, the PIR has been undertaken by reference to the current process guidance contained within Stage 7 and Appendix H, CAP 1616 Guidance on the regulatory process for changing the notified airspace design. This specifically included the publication of data received from the change sponsor and the opening of a 28-day feedback window via email, during which any stakeholder could provide any feedback on the data received and the impact of the change.
2. There was a slightly longer PIR data collection period from August 2019 to 13 December 2019 following a request from NIAL for an extension to the deadline for their PIR data submission.
3. The change sponsor provided data as follows:
 - Safety data
 - Traffic figures
 - Traffic dispersion/density comparisons
 - Utilisation
 - Operational feedback
 - Stakeholder feedback/complaints received by NIAL relevant to this review
 - Traffic Figures
4. The Change Sponsor's data analysis and documentation was published on the CAA website <https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/> and stakeholders were invited to submit their own observations by email to the CAA. This feedback survey opened on 13 December 2019 and closed on 27 January 2020.
5. Following a request for NIAL to improve their data presentation, stakeholders were given a further opportunity to provide feedback by email on the updated data in a 28-day window that closed on 18 March 2020.
6. In July 2020 NIAL provided further information at the request of the CAA to resolve figure discrepancies. An additional 28-day window was opened for stakeholder comments and feedback which closed on 4 September 2020.

7. A total of 10 responses were received from individuals and 1 response was received from an unincorporated association namely the Aircraft Noise Action Group (ANAG). One response was received from an airline operator KLM which included some track plots.
8. We have reviewed the feedback received, detailed our findings and provided appropriate comment to the feedback cross-referencing to the main PIR report where appropriate. Our comments to the relevant feedback are below.

Main themes of Stakeholder Feedback

9. The following main themes were identified from respondents' feedback:

(1) The narrow concentration of aircraft departures, compared to wide dispersal prior to the implementation of the airspace change, had led to an increase in noise pollution in terms of noise levels and frequency. Respondents said this had resulted in unbearable noise and visual intrusion for residents and communities living under or close to the flight paths' centre lines. The frequency of flights was referred to as being every 2 to 3 minutes at the peak of summer.

CAA comments: The intent of the ACP was to concentrate aircraft along known routes. The three SIDs as currently designed achieve this aim and as a consequence, at peak times, the noise will also be concentrated below the route. In the ACP, NIAL considered that the villages of Throckley and Heddon-on-the-Wall were the two most noise sensitive areas and as such, the GIRLI 3X and 1Y SIDs were designed to concentrate traffic between them. The track analysis has shown that there is still some tolerable dispersion in terms of design. However, departing aircraft are more concentrated between these villages when flying the GIRLI 3X/1Y SIDs when compared to how westerly departures flew prior to the implementation of the SIDs.

(2) Increased noise impact from early in the morning to late at night. A common theme was an increased and intolerable noise intrusion from flights from early in the morning to night with respondents being woken by the noise of aircraft from 6am (5am in the summer) and being disturbed by flights continuing until midnight (1am in the summer). Reference was made to light aircraft being heard during the night.

CAA comments: Noise impacts in the early morning and late evening/night time is not a matter for the change proposal, nor was this proposal an enabler for increased flights during these periods; this is the responsibility of the appropriate planning authority responsible for the use of Newcastle International Airport Limited and does not form part of the airspace change process.

(3) Impact of increased noise on health and wellbeing, including sleep deprivation and inability to enjoy time outside. Some respondents stated they had suffered stress and that the noise impacted their ability to hold conversations and enjoy homes and gardens. Some residents wished to move home due to the increased noise impact.

CAA Comments: No environmental assessment was completed by NIAL at the time of consultation because no change was expected to noise and environmental impacts. The intention of the change proposal was to replicate the way departing aircraft were routed