

Appendix E

Public Consultation Feedback

The first draft of this Noise Action Plan was submitted to the Airport's Consultative Committee (representing local councils, residents and businesses) and Technical Working Group (noise experts for the local councils) for consultation. The feedback received was used to update the draft Noise Action Plan. Details of the comments received and our responses, including where we made changes to the draft Noise Action Plan as a result, are presented in Appendix D.

Following this update, the draft Noise Action Plan was subject to open consultation. The consultation was launched online on 8th August 2022 and was open until 30th September (a period of 8 weeks). The consultation was advertised on our website and social media. A total of 60 responses containing around 380 individual comments were received. This appendix presents details of the comments received and our responses, including where we have made changes to the Noise Action Plan as a result.

Following the open consultation, several new actions were added in response to the comments raised. Because of this, there are some discrepancies between action numbers quoted in the consultation responses and the action numbers in the final published version of the Noise Action Plan.

Theme	Comment	Response
Bans of specific aircraft / The airport's ability to limit times of flights or types of aircraft	6.1.4 says noisier aircraft are banned although 4.1.1 says you have no direct control over aircraft. A contradiction.	<p>Given the international nature of aviation, any 'ban' on aircraft types (including particular Chapters, which set maximum acceptable noise levels for different aircraft under specific test conditions) must legally follow the requirements of Regulation 598 which stipulates that noise related operating restrictions cannot be introduced as a first resort – the other mitigation measures in the Balanced Approach (see Section 3.1) must be considered first. If a noise related operating restriction is considered necessary, it can only be imposed after the 'cost effectiveness' of the restriction has been considered which must consider impacts on other airports. For this reason ban on aircraft within particular chapters is typically introduced at an international level rather than at individual airport level, i.e. EC Directive 92/14/EEC which banned Chapter 2 aircraft from landing in the EU from 1 April 2002.</p> <p>As part of Action 11, we will undertake reviews of our differential aircraft charging system on an annual basis to encourage the industry adoption of quieter aircraft. We will undertake a review and benchmarking of differential landing charges and other methods of incentivisation to determine if it would be viable to introduce additional measures at Southampton Airport. This commitment to undertake a review and benchmarking has been added to the NAP in response to these comments.</p> <p>Change made to NAP – section 6.1.4 has been reworded and new action 12 added</p>
	Limits - ban noiser crafts please.	
	4.1.1 Third paragraph does not appear to sit with 6.1.4? Do you have "powers" or don't you?	
	I disagree that you have no control over the aircraft that operate at the airport, of course you can do more than just influence this. In fact, in a later section you state that you have stopped noisy planes using the airport.	
	More detail is needed. We appreciate that you cannot tell airlines which aircraft to use - but you CAN tell airlines which aircraft you will allow them to use at Southampton. London City Airport is stating that if it expands its operations, 'only new generation planes will be allowed to fly' during its additional hours of operation. If London City has the power to make such decisions, this must also be possible at Southampton. If you permitted only the quietest of modern jets, rather than say the predicted noisy A320 and A319, noise impacts on local people would be much less. This would have more impact than	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>differential charging.</p> <p>Action 10: Differential charging won't make much impact on the fleet mix unless charges for the noiser aircraft are set significantly higher than they are at present, but you give no indication that you will be doing this. Reducing the numbers of the noiser aircraft like the A320 could be more easily done by advising airlines that these noisy planes will not be allowed at Southampton, at least at those days/times when people are most likely to be disturbed (eg early morning, and summer weekends when they may wish to enjoy being outdoors.) London City Airport intends to allow 'only new generation planes' during its additional hours of operation if it expands them – which means it must be possible for Southampton to make a similar decision.</p>	
	<p>10. Southampton airport could ban airlines from using the noisier aircraft at Southampton, rather than just encouraging them not to.</p>	
	<p>Action 10 relies on 'differential charging' to encourage airlines to use quieter aircraft but please just ban noiser aircraft. You can tell airlines which type of aircraft are allowed to take off from Southampton so ban the loudest ones.</p>	
	<p>Action 10 relies on 'differential charging' to encourage airlines to use quieter aircraft but please just ban noiser aircraft. You can tell airlines which type of aircraft are allowed to take off from Southampton so ban the loudest ones.</p>	
	<p>Action 10 relies on 'differential charging' to encourage airlines to use quieter aircraft but please just ban noiser aircraft. You can tell airlines which type of aircraft are allowed to take off from Southampton so please simply ban the loudest ones.</p>	
	<p>Differential charging is unlikely to make a difference, so please just ban noiser aircraft and tell airlines which type of aircraft are allowed to use from Southampton.</p>	
	<p>Differential charging will barely make a difference, so please just ban noiser aircraft. You can tell airlines which type of aircraft are allowed to use your airport.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>Differential charging is unlikely to work so please tell airlines which type of aircraft are allowed to use Southampton and simply ban the loudest ones.</p>	
	<p>Relying on differential charging to encourage quieter aircraft won't make much difference unless charges are high enough to deter airlines from using the airport. If you really want to be a 'good neighbour' and 'minimise and where possible reduce' noise impacts you should restrict the numbers and/or times when the noisier aircraft are permitted to take off. This must be possible because London City say they are going to do it for their proposed extended opening hours.</p>	
	<p>Action 10 seems overly light touch. Why merely 'encourage' industry uptake of quieter aircraft? Why not enforce? (The answer of course is because of the ambitious expansion plan of 25% growth by 2029 concealed in clever language in section 6) If you're begging for more business you are not going to be pushing for anything demanding. We will be left with the oldest, noisiest and least green aircraft working out of Southampton whilst less desperate to expand airports will be raising their game and improving quality of life and quality of service.</p>	
	<p>Re Action 10 The proposal to use 'differential charging' to encourage airlines to use quieter aircraft also seems disingenuous. There are other means at your disposal to ensure the use of quieter aircraft, and if you were serious about noise reduction, you would use those other means. It's true that you can't tell airlines which aircraft to use, but you can tell them which are allowed to use Southampton Airport; so you could tell airlines that, if they want to use the airport, then they will have to use quieter aircraft. Your current proposal instead allows airlines to use noisier aircraft - but only as long as they pay you more! And it's quite easy to imagine that that arrangement might suit both parties quite happily. So given that you could insist that airlines use quieter planes if they want to use the airport, it's very hard to see why you wouldn't—unless, of course, you not really that bothered about noise reduction. I really hope that's not the case. So please show that it isn't by requiring airlines who want to use the airport to use quieter planes. You have that power and the fact that you don't seem to want to use it suggests a lack of good faith when you profess to be concerned about noise.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>a ban on certain aircraft types would be much better for the residence living on the flight path</p>	
	<p>Action 10 relies on 'differential charging' to encourage airlines to use quieter aircraft. Why not actually ban the noiser aircraft? (Para 6.2 says they can't tell airlines what aircraft to use: true enough, but they CAN tell airlines which type of aircraft are allowed - or not - to take off from Southampton.)</p>	
	<p>You admit you have no control over the types of aircraft which airlines may choose to fly. There is a lot of talk about influence and mention of fines later on, but we don't know if these fines have any effect. If an airline chose to use noisier planes than those you might prefer, would you turn them away?(4.1.1)</p>	
	<p>Differential charging probably won't encourage airlines to use quieter aircraft so please just ban noiser aircraft. You can tell airlines which type of aircraft are allowed to take off from Southampton so simply ban the loudest ones.</p>	
	<p>Whist it is interesting to read that Chapter14 will be the noise standard, in the document SIA states that it will have no control over the aircraft used by the airlines. If this is so then there is no case for extending the runway to accomodate larger aircraft as SIA does not know what aircraft will be used.</p>	
	<p>Action 10 - annual review of differential aircraft charging. It is good that noiser aircraft could be charged more, but there is little detail here. I appreciate that the impact of differential charging on airlines will be complicated by other factors such passenger demand and charges at other airports. I am concerned that there is a conflict on interest here... you need airlines to come to SOU so why would you charge them what it would really take to get them to switch to quieter ones for the sake of local populations?</p>	
	<p>You also say you have no direct control over the aircraft fleet, which leaves the door open for noisier aircraft.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
Wording of NAP	In the very first sentence of this document you have included the phrase "as far as reasonably practicable", and by so doing, have given yourselves a legal "get-out" clause to not reverse the adverse effects of aviation noise.	<p>The level of technical detail presented in the NAP is commensurate with the guidance on the production of Noise Action Plans provided by Defra. We have aimed to explain technical aspects in sufficient detail to allow a non-technical audience to understand the concepts and metrics that form the basis of the NAP. A non-technical executive summary is also provided at the beginning of the document.</p> <p>Phrases such as "as far as reasonably practicable" have been used in the NAP to mirror the language used in Government noise policy. As set out in the Noise Policy Statement for England "taken in isolation and to a literal extreme, noise minimisation would mean no noise at all. In reality, although it has not always been stated, the aim has tended to be to minimise noise 'as far as reasonably practical'".</p> <p>Some of the wording in the NAP has been modified as a result of the consultation responses, such as the use of the word 'just' when referring to the length of the runway extension.</p> <p>Change made to NAP Section 2.4</p>
	Para 2.4. Use of "just" is subjective and has no place in an objective document.	
	Only four points are of interest to a member of the general public - the rest is verbage	
	More verbage	
	Irrelevant to the public	
	Getting far too technical for the man-in-the-street	
	See response above	
	Ditto	
	The documents are very technical for the average person. Maybe a summary would have helped.	
	There is no indication of the extent to which you will regard measures as "possible" in the context of "limit, and where possible, reduce total adverse effects on health and quality of life from aviation noise". The document as a whole covers many matters where it would be possible to reduce noise, but such possibilities are not contemplated.	
	These are all vague statements of intent not actions or commitments to improvements in noise reduction. "Work to achieve visionary noise goals" etc is meaningless.	
	Weasel words here, 'as far as reasonably practical'. To say you support the government's to 'limit and where possible reduce ... adverse effects from noise' is simply inconsistent with the runway extension leading to a massive increase in numbers of the larger, noiser planes. You have not even made it clear whether minimising noise will have top priority among the options for airspace change.	
	I am disappointed at the constant insertion of get-out clauses throughout the section. It speaks vividly of a lack of genuine intent to reduce noise. For example '... to limit, and where possible, reduce total adverse effects'. This actually means nothing at all. All noise levels are not infinite, and therefore limited, and the introduction does not even offer a firm intention to reduce by the smallest amount - only 'where possible'.	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>I strongly object to the use of the phrase 'a design that minimises, and where possible reduces' in action 19 and other places. It sounds like it is signing up to downward pressure on noise and other health impacting effects but actually allows for an increase, eg: to accomodate the ambitious 25% expansion plan by 2029 which is apparently considered necessary. This is highly misleading use of language.</p> <p>You include a lot of get-out clauses that effectively neuter the plan. Consider, for example, commitments 'to limit, and where possible, reduce total adverse effects'. You could double those affects and still say they were 'limited'-'Well, we didn't triple them, did we?!'-and you say 'where possible' when we know it certainly is possible, if-for example-you are willing to insist that only quieter aircraft can use the airport.</p> <p>'as far as reasonably practicable' sounds like another one of the get-out clauses with which the plan is peppered, clauses which effectively neuter the plan.</p> <p>Any adverse effects' should read 'the adverse effects'</p> <p>1.My initial and continued impression of this consultation document is that it is designed to be over-complex and requiring of a great deal of time and effort on the part of any respondent undertaking a response. There is no sense in which it offers a choice of outcomes.</p>	
Hours of operation / night flights	<p>Also your comment on no flights between 23:00 and 6:00am or 7:30am is untrue. There are plenty of flights that occur within this period. You need to state that flights can happen in this period of time but to set measures, then people would understand.</p> <p>23. Is incorrect, you need to add that you allow a set percentage each year that can break this rule so people understand</p> <p>The noise action plan is very disappointing as does not include any concrete actions to reduce the noise generated by the airport or its impact on those living in it's flight path. As a minimum there should be an 8 hour period overnight with no flights to enable people living under the flight path to get a full nights sleep.</p>	<p>Flights between the hours of 06:00 – 07:00 account for a small proportion of our overall Air Traffic Movements (ATMs). It is important to note that the limit of 15 aircraft scheduled between 06:00 – 07:00 is a strict limit rather than an expected average number of movements. Despite this, these operations are an important part of our business and the economic welfare of the region. Flights between these hours are vital for UK connectivity (i.e. connecting the Channel Islands to other UK cities) and to maintain an interconnected global transportation system.</p> <p>However, we recognise the adverse effects that can be caused by aircraft noise at night and so we do not permit scheduled flights or helicopters during the night-time period from 23:00 – 06:00 (Mon-Sat) and 23:00 – 07:30 (Sun). As highlighted in the NAP, exceptions</p>

Theme	Comment	Response
	Scheduled flights and helicopters should not be allowed between 22:00 and 07:00 to allow those living under the flight path to get a full 8 hours sleep.	<p>to this are only allowed for civil aircraft emergencies, emergency response aircraft or aircraft delayed by adverse weather or extraordinary Air Traffic Control Procedures. It is not possible for us to put a limit on these operations as they are outside of the airport's control, however these exceptions are very rare, for example there were only around 30 such exceptions allowed in the whole of 2019, all of which were between 23:00 and 23:30.</p> <p>Change made to the NAP Section 6.1.1 – additional detail on night-flights added</p>
	I would estimate that many people are still asleep between 6-7am. I think 7am should be the earliest for flights to leave. Already the BA jets on Saturday and Sunday are an early morning wake up alarm.	
	Times are given for when there will be no flights. SIA will have no say in this as very recently DoT has given a directive to extend the hours of night time flights at Heathrow in order to reduce the chaos at the terminals, caused by the gross apparently of airline operators, freight and baggage handling companies and even HM Gov Border Control.	
	Already I am do not feel this is a serious document but a whitewash.	
	No more than 15 scheduled flights between 6-7am means one every 4 minutes, plus private planes. This is excessive while people are sleeping. You may not want to do this now, but it gives permission for the future.	
	So the night cut-off is just 7 hours, with an extra 1.5 hours on Sun? Insufficient. The amount of sleep recommended is 8 hours, and many people don't immediately fall asleep the instant their head hits the pillow! What about children, going to bed at 8, or shift workers? And a "strict limit" of 15 choppers per hour between 6 and 7 in the morning? Only 1 every 4 minutes then, that won't be at all annoying! (That's sarcasm, by the way.)	
	There is a much larger area impacted, with a much larger number of people than claimed in these reports. We are already regularly woken up by flights between 6am and 8am, we live with it as is but an increase in planes and noise will seriously impact our lives.	
	Starting flights from 07:00 renders all the 17 hr data redundant. Although numbers are restricted there could still be 20 flights per day before 07:00.	
	Firstly I'm sure when I moved here 27 years ago the NO Flights times were 23:00 7:00 during the week. When did this change?	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>6.1.1 15 scheduled flights between 6am and 7am in the mornin is a lot. One every 4 minutes. It is difficult to think how you could run more flights than this.</p> <p>The airport will be able to run its loudest aircraft every 4 minutes between 6am and 7am.</p> <p>As I have already said 6.1.1 I do not call 15 flights between 6am and 7am a restriction and I can only assume Southampton Airport will be able to run flights more often than this in daytime. Action 25 is about all we can hope for from you.</p> <p>A limit of 15 flights between 06.00 and 07.00 does not seem small to me, being one every 4 minutes. I am regularly woken up at this time by aircraft.(6.1.1).</p> <p>Flights take off and land over a largely residential area. The area in which I live (Bitterne Park) has many families living within it, as is probably true for other affected areas. I notice that flights are permitted on Mon- Sat from 6.00 until 23.00 and from 7.30 until 23.00 on Sundays. I assume that the later time on a Sunday is to give some noise respite/ peace, but I would be interested to know the reasoning behind this. The aircraft noise can be considerable, particularly during the summer when windows may need to be kept open (which will probably increasingly become the case as a result of climate change). That means that children's sleep is disrupted, as is that of their parents/ carers. Therefore, I believe that flights should be required to cease at a time earlier than 23.00.</p> <p>2. I don't see any mention of encouraging noisier aircraft to operate in less disruptive hours. You should discourage noisier aircraft from operating before 9am and after 9pm.</p> <p>As long as section 23 is applied properly and you don't allow yourselves to be bullied like back in the days of Flybe. How will we be informed or given reasons for operations outside of these hours by commercial airlines?</p> <p>Action 23 – add '...to no more than 15.' i.e. the number of flights in the 0600-0700 (Mon Sat) shoulder period as limited by the runway extension planning permission.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>4. One can only assume that the; 'continued commitment to no scheduled flights or helicopters during the night-time period from 23:00-06:00 (Monday-Saturday) and 23:00-07:30 (Sunday) supposes that these are the hours that the said population's sleep patterns would be adversely affected. In my experience this is far too narrow a time period.</p> <p>It is stated that no scheduled flights or helicopters will be allowed during the night time period from 23.00 – 06.00 (Mon-Sat) and 23.00 – 07.30 (Sun). This means that only seven hours per day will be flight-free, and children particularly will be affected by this. Children need more than seven hours for healthy growth and development, and it is commonly known that sleep disturbance can affect educational performance, behaviour and mental and physical health.</p> <p>You say there are no night flights but (ignoring the fact that 'night' really ought to include the shoulder hour 6-7am during which you have allowed yourself 15 ATMs which is a larger number than the average daytime hour!) we still hear flights after 11pm.</p> <p>56.00 am is unreasonably early to start flights, most households don't wake before 7.00am and it is generally accepted that building works and works that create nuisance noise should not start before 8.00am. The airport needs to put community needs before profit and not have any flights before 7.30am at the earliest on weekdays and 8.30am on Weekends</p> <p>6.00 am is too early, the cut-off needs to be 7.30 am weekdays and 8.30 am weekends</p> <p>Interesting that Southampton Airport should choose to run flights from 6am when (in 4.2.2) it is seen as having a much greater penalty to the people below.</p> <p>The statement that the airport is effectively 'closed for the majority of the night' is not helpful. It is too short a period, and many people, particularly children, will experience sleep disturbance as a result. The fact that the time that flights are permitted to start is later on Sunday mornings would seem to be an admission that sleep is indeed affected by flight noise.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
Engagement with other councils / areas	<p>Para 6.1.5 notes the establishment of of an Airport Community Health and Wellbeing Board with Eastleigh Borough Council. Given that the majority of residents affected live in the Southampton City Council area this board should have Southampton City Council representation.</p> <p>Lorna Fielker Chair – Health and Wellbeing Board Southampton City Council</p>	<p>EBC is mentioned throughout the document as they are the planning authority for the airport. We have engaged with a variety of councils and stakeholders on a range of issues during the development of the NAP. Most of our reporting is done through the Airport Consultative Committee and Technical Working Group which include representation from several local authorities including Winchester City Council, Allbrook & North Boyatt Parish Council, Eastleigh Borough Council, Test Valley Borough Council, Twyford Parish Council, West End Parish Council, Southampton City Council, and Hampshire County Council. The NAP has been updated to include a list of local authorities and organisations we have engaged with during its development.</p> <p>Change made to NAP Section 2.6.</p>
	Action 1 – 9 should have Southampton CC as partners with Eastleigh BC given	
	As a major portion aircraft takeoff and landing approach is over Southampton areas, I'm failing to understand why its just Eastleigh Borough Council that are mentioned when Southampton would be a larger stakeholder and require a say in noise abatement measures especially as later in the action plan you start that 64% will be flying to the south.	
	I would like to see you liase with SCC especially and WCC as many people in these areas are affected especially SCC Townhill area, and not just EBC.	
	As with previous comments, Southampton City Council (and residents, and interest groups) should be explicitly mentioned – I assume that the mention of "the council" should be taken to mean "Eastleigh Borough Council".	
	This is shameless figleaf and bribe to Eastleigh Council. Who are taking decisions which impact on a far wider area than Eastleigh.	
	Winchester doesn't appear to be part of your 'local community'. Winchester is badly affected by private and public jet noise.	
	It is disturbing that there is no mention of working with Southampton City Council, nor explanation for this omission. A substantial part of the City is affected by aircraft noise, yet no Southampton City group is given expectation of inclusion in, for example, the Noise forum.	
	First of all, did you consult with Southampton City Council (SCC)? It looks like you didn't in which case you have been remiss in your duty of care towards Southampton residents who live directly beneath the flight path into and out of the airport. It's ironic that you call yourself Southampton Airport and then pretend that the city is not affected by your business. Secondly, you have extended the hours of flight movements from what	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>it has been hitherto, which is also unacceptable without consultation with SCC. Noise pollution from air traffic does not begin and cease over Eastleigh Borough Council's area of jurisdiction.</p> <p>Again this section is addressed to people living within the Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC) area, but not to residents of Bitterne Park which comes under Southampton City Council. How do you think aircraft appear in EBC airspace?</p> <p>What about provision for people living in Bitterne Park, Southampton? Do you intend to deploy noise monitoring in this area? Will you invite Bitterne Park residents to join the Community Noise Forum?</p> <p>Secondly, Section 1 states in a number of places that the airport will be working with Eastleigh Borough Council with regard to a Noise Forum and Community Health and Well being. I would suggest that most of the affected properties are in Southampton Or Winchester City council areas and so will not be properly represented. I suggest that these council should be heavily involved in these initiatives.</p> <p>2.4 Although you worked closely with Eastleigh borough council, most of the affected properties are in Southampton Or Winchester City council areas who rejected the expansion of the airport at planning.</p> <p>In 1995 when I moved into my house in SO17 2JA, there were regular planes flying over head, then in the 2000s there was noise survey work done and as a result, the number of planes flying over head dropped dramatically to a few a month. Since the Covid lockdowns ended it seem the planes flying over Southampton have increased to their pre 2000 levels. Could it be that as the areas in Southampton home poorer 14pparently14, the planes are being sent that way while the judicial review is being considered.</p> <p>6.1.5 Southampton and Winchester city councils should be involved in this.</p> <p>I notice that you are working with Eastleigh Borough Council to create an Airport Community and Health Wellbeing Board. Many people affected by the noise live outside of Eastleigh Borough Council's catchment- in Southampton City Council's area, Winchester City Council's area or under other jurisdictions. It would seem reasonable for people who represent those areas to have some participation and representation.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>Why are you only working with EBC on the noise forum and health and wellbeing fund? Most of the people affected by noise your operations live outside Eastleigh. This is a major omission, compounded by the fact that the chair and vice chair of the airport consultative committee are also both from EBC and suggests your view of want counts as you 'neighbours' is too limited.</p>	
	<p>6.1 Your Section 106 planning controls appear to be solely with EBC (which I understand is the planning authority), yet the effects of aircraft noise are experienced equally if not more by the citizens of Southampton, particularly on the east side. Bitterne Park, which includes several schools and is densely populated, is badly affected.(6.1)</p>	
	<p>It Is interesting that section one initially references the runway extension scheme but omits the word "extension". An extension scheme which was voted against by both Southampton and Winchester Councils. In this section, mention is made of 'close engagement with Eastleigh Borough Council' but not of engagement with Southampton and Winchester Councils— the cities most affected by overflying aircraft.</p>	
	<p>Reference is made in this section, and throughout the document, to working together with Eastleigh Borough Council, but many of the affected households, and sensitive buildings such as schools, lie within other council areas, such as Southampton and Winchester. The residents of these areas voted against the runway extension proposal, and there is no reference to engagement with them, engagement which I believe is essential. This seems neither fair nor democratic.</p>	
	<p>Again, the engagement with Eastleigh Borough Council is mentioned, but not with the other councils whose residents are so adversely affected.</p>	
	<p>Again, many of the affected households lie outside Eastleigh Borough Council's jurisdiction. Please see comments in sections 1 and 2.</p>	
	<p>6.1.7: Once again, only the involvement of Eastleigh Borough Council is mentioned.</p>	
	<p>I would be interested in having some details about your "working proactively and in collaboration with a variety of stakeholders and local communities". I notice that photo shows a plane flying low over rooftops, something which we experience daily.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
Complaints Procedure	Ref point 7 does this mean that only people living and/or working within this contour can make a valid complaint?	<p>Noise complaint investigation is the process by which the airport will check that the existing agreed rules are being adhered to. Changing flight paths is a highly regulated process which we manage through our Airspace Change Process which is explained in more detail in Section 2.5 of the main NAP document. Being made aware of concerns and trends from our communities is very important to us. The complaints process enables us to investigate particular noise events to ensure that aircraft have adhered to the approved flight procedures. We are currently undertaking a review of our approach to noise complaints. We have employed a specialist contractor to review and improve our approach, looking at aspects such as the investigation and understanding of aircraft activity for any specific flight reported to us alongside simplifying reporting by introducing online forms and a visualisation app showing aircraft tracks. We are also reviewing the data that we report externally.</p> <p>Change made to NAP Section 6.5</p>
	6.5 You need to do more than publish a target of response times, particularly as a " " respons" " could be" " we are carrying out an investigatio" ". To have any effective role the" "Noise Foru" " needs to know of complaints.	
	We believe you should offer residents the option to use a simple app to report aircraft noise? (Eg WebTrak webtrak.emsbk.com, which is used by other airports but not Southampton.) This would make it easy to make a complaint and would mean your statistics on noise complaints are not skewed by people finding it difficult or being disillusioned by the response. At the moment it is not clear whether an email listing complaints about multiple aircraft is being taken as 'one' complaint or a16pparente.	
	Para 6.5 Our members are reporting that when they email a complaint about noise the reply seems to assume they are complaining about an 'off track' aircraft, whereas in most cases they are complaining about disturbance and annoyance from all of the 'on track' aircraft. We are hearing a lot more noisy aircraft this year, especially at weekends. Nothing in this action plan addresses this.	
	Action 7-- I log noise complaints. Does it make a difference? Other airports have an app to do this-- could you too?	
	I log complaints-- is it worth it, I wonder?	
	I log noise complaints-- is it worth it?	
	My family log noise complaints but is it worth our time?	
	How does emailing a noise complaint make a difference? I's tedious to do and ca't see what impact/change it has. Maybe a simpler way and a better response-- the replies tell me yo've checked route but I do't want to know that. I's a waste of all the emails-- other airports17pparently have apps.	
	does sending coise complaints make a difference?	
	We do noise complaints-- is it worth it?	
	How does sending noise complaints make any difference? I's time consuming and we get replies telling us plane was correct route. We do't need this. Maybe an app would make it better and less emails.	

Theme	Comment	Response
	How does sending noise complaints make any difference? It's time consuming and we get replies telling us plane was correct route. We don't need this. Maybe an app would make it better and less emails.	
	Why not provide an easy to use app like other airports do where you can identify the aircraft/route and make a complaint immediately?	
	Action 7 is somewhat obstructive, and old fashioned. I realise you will need to have a complaint channel available to people who don't have smart phones, but logging and "responding" to phone calls, letters and emails, is pretty much an empty tick box approach. The real point of logging noise level complaints is to ensure that actual noise levels aren't diverging from tests. I don't need a "response" to a complaint, I just want to know that I can submit complaints and that there is public representation on the committee which decides when the threshold for further action has been passed. What would be actually helpful would be something like an app or webpage to make complaint logging simpler. I was out in my garden the other day— supposedly well outside the 51dB contour— and measured noise of 51dB on a free app as a plane went over. Why not create an app to log noise complaints, perhaps even drawing in dB and location data from those happy to share it.	
	Action 7 Other airports provide an app to allow easy reporting of noise complaints. Please do the same.	
	Action 7: they will log noise complaints. But why not provide an easy way to make complaints via an app, which other airports do?	
	Current tracking of noise pollution is not available. Why is there not an easy way to log or look up this information. All currently available is emails and being told planes are at correct height. This is dubious and no mention of noise levels.	
	I have yet to receive a reply to a complaint about noise which says that the aircraft was not on its correct route; it is the routes which are a problem, and the noise produced by aircraft following them.(16)	
	6.5: Is an App available for the reporting of aircraft noise nuisance, as is used at many other airports? The current method of reporting is cumbersome and also ineffectual.	
	Moreover, reporting seems a futile exercise, because the response is always that the aircraft has	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>been investigated and that no deviation from the designated flight path has been found. The complaint is logged but the problem is not addressed.</p> <p>I have noticed noise increase terribly in 2022 over how it was in 2019, probably because of the different aircraft that the new carriers are using. I do register noise complaints but some days (weekends especially) it is impossible to log every horrible flight and so my single complaint often applies to 8 or more take-offs. I therefore think your use of "number of noise complaint" as a metric is too loose. The responses to emails are only about whether the flight was on course but that I not what I am complaining about. Many people will just give up complaining and your metric will tend to show an "improvement" when none is experienced in reality. Therefore, unless you produce a suitable method of reporting noise disruption per-flight, such as an easy-to-use app, you cannot reasonably say whether or not you are meeting noise criteria based on number of complaints.</p>	
Positive comment	<p>I am glad that action 13 will be put in to place and maintained.</p> <p>The noise abatement procedures are important for the health and wellbeing of residents under the flight path.</p> <p>"m fully supportive of the extension. Good for the local economy.</p> <p>Yes, it is important to have a noise free time at night.</p> <p>I have read all the documents, without understanding all the points, but it makes interesting reading.</p> <p>I am sure all is being done to restrict noise, a difficult issue!</p> <p>Nothing to do with noise but, living in Bitterne East region, we do have a lot of pollution fallout from the aircraft.</p> <p>S9 Excellent implementation of best practice</p> <p>if you do indeed put into practice all of these measures then the community will feel more involved and more able to approach with concerns. It will become a partnership with each sides opinions being valued and noted, instead of an imposition ie were going to do this whatever you may say.</p>	We are happy to hear positive responses to the proposals in the NAP.

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>All of these measures are good, if you do indeed keep to them and do not just play lip service to the environmental concerns. I really like the electric idea but you will need batteries and invertors for storage, its not just the panels.</p> <p>I really do hope you strive to achieve this.</p> <p>This is good if the developers take on board the ideas, it is widely known that putting solar roofs onto new builds would help the environment , but because it is not a government legislation it does not happen.</p> <p>Totally agree with this.</p> <p>I am pleased that you intend to 'bring noise reduction and being a responsible neighbour to forefront'. It is really important that you do so.</p> <p>Points 11 and 14 will make improvements to the level of noise generated by the airport.</p> <p>I am looking forward to reading news that may help us regarding noise.</p> <p>Looking forward to the noise insulation scheme and hope it helps many including me.</p> <p>Pleased to see improvements to reduce ground noise. Our day starts with the engines running.</p> <p>Pleased to see positive developments.</p> <p>Action 23. I am relieved to see that the airport does not yet have active plans to increase flights at night time.</p>	
Noise outdoors / in garden / with open windows	<p>I do't believe there is sufficient detail re what you are going to do to stop the negative impact the planes will have. Even now when in the garden or indoors with the windows open I ca't hear other people talking or the TV when a plane goes overhead.</p> <p>Para 6.1.5 talks about 'improving public outdoor spaces' and measures to promote the use of these spaces. There is no detail here. Making these places look pretty won't help the fact that they are going to get noiser so how will you improve them if not by providing free ear defenders!?</p> <p>Para 6.1.5: There is no detail here. It is hard to see how 'improving public outdoor spaces' is practical without measures to reduce the noise from aircraft flying over them, which is set to massively 21ccommod with the runway extension.</p> <p>And our peaceful Riverside park needs to be kept as peaceful as possible for the health and wellbeing of the local community.</p>	<p>Measures to improve public outdoor spaces are currently being developed as part of the Health Strategy, which will be adopted by 2023. The Health Strategy is a new action and the details of the strategy are currently being developed. Development of the Health Strategy is part of the legally binding Section 106 agreement and progress will be monitored through the Airport Consultative Committee, the minutes of which are publicly available.</p> <p>The Noise Action Plan sets out several actions to reduce aviation noise that will benefit outdoor areas, such as encouraging the use of quieter aircraft and limiting the number of scheduled flights during the night. The airspace change proposals consider noise in outdoor areas including parks & gardens and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs).</p> <p>The modelling that forms the basis of the noise contours presented in the NAP results in</p>

Theme	Comment	Response
	How does this make my garden a pleasant place to be? It used to be not interrupted by noisy planes a few years ago.	<p>predictions of outdoor noise levels. The summer day period is used to determine eligibility for the noise insulation scheme because people are more likely to have their windows open. Properties eligible for the noise insulation scheme will undergo an assessment, which considers the effect of open windows and whether ventilation would be effective. This has been clarified in the NAP.</p> <p>Change made to NAP Section 6.1.6</p>
	How does insulation this let me have windows open and sit in garden?	
	I have your incoming aircraft 500 feet directly above my back garden, which is more than a nuisance in summer when I'm enjoying the garden, entertaining friends there, and have the house windows open. Conversation has to stop for tens of seconds while your aircraft approach, pass overhead and continue on to the airport. It is a distressing level of noise.	
	From the research I have read, the noise will increase where I live by 3dB (51dB to 54dB). Which as an engineer I know is double the level. I fail to see how my garden can be insulated from noise.	
	Whilst I appreciate that some home owners will receive financial support for insulation, that will not help during the summer months. Also, the enjoyment of their gardens by local residents will be impacted and with it their quality of life, which cannot be compensated for. Speaking on a personal level, my garden is the place to which I retreat for relaxation, peace and positive mental health and I can achieve none of these during busy flight times.	
	There is a fundamental contradiction between promoting open spaces for outdoor activity and massively increasing noise levels as a result of the runway extension.	
	1. Your attempt to mitigate noise outdoors is laughable. Just be honest.	
	Good insulation is vital for all new-build housing and existing stock, for reasons which go beyond aviation noise. Our house was built in 1988. It already has double-glazing, and in some rooms triple-glazing. Even with all windows closed and with music playing we always hear aircraft. We have stopped sitting in our garden, and doing any gardening is rendered stressful by the noise of aircraft.	
	All the insulation in the world will not help us in the peak summer months when we are more likely to be outside and have doors and windows open. I now dread the summer months and the interruption of my daily life by noise so loud that I can't hear the radio or TV or have a conversation	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>The proposed noise action plan 2023-2028 completely overlooks, except in the most superficial way, the impossibility of mitigating against the effects of noise increases on people in the outside environment (gardens, parks, schools) and at times of the year when windows cannot be kept shut.</p> <p>The proposed noise action plan 2023-2028 does not properly acknowledge the impossibility of mitigating against noise pollution that will be suffered by people outside, for example in gardens, parks and schools, and by people inside when buildings are insufficiently soundproofed or when windows need to be open for ventilation, something that has become even more important in this time of pandemic.</p> <p>I am outside of the Noise Insulation Scheme area (Bitterne Park) and even before the runway extension I am woken up every morning by the extremely loud first planes and cannot watch TV with windows open due to the noise during the day/evening. How are people affected by the noise supposed to use their gardens or open windows in the summer? How are children at the local schools supposed to study? The noise has a detrimental effect on so many people.</p> <p>There is no mention of what effects a houses construction might have on noise levels with a residence though of course having a window open would negate this.</p>	
Request for more frequent reporting / further detail on how target will be achieved / penalties	<p>Very woolly. Where is the actual detail of what you are going to do to adhere to the frameworks?</p> <p>No tangible detail. 2050 is a good few years off, you should have an action plan for each year & should be publishing this.</p> <p>Yet again, no substantial detail explaining how you are going to achieve any of this. Lots of lovely promises but no substance & very little in the way of how measurement of these high level targets will be achieved.</p> <p>Without the interim 'steps', dates & measurements your aspirations are meaningless.</p> <p>Also, is there actually any incentive for you to meet these targets or disincentive for failing to meet them?</p> <p>This section also states that in future you will provide the previous year plus 3 years of modelled predictions. Why haven't you done this already so we can see the likely numbers of people to be impacted in 2022-24?</p>	<p>The measures set out in the Section 106 agreement are legally binding and will be monitored through the Airport Consultative Committee, the minutes of which are publicly available.</p> <p>We will report on progress against the actions in the NAP annually through the Annual Noise Monitoring Report. The contents of the Annual Noise Monitoring Report are detailed in Section 6.7 of the NAP. The report will be reviewed by the Airport Consultative Committee, the Noise Forum and Eastleigh Borough Council. The NAP itself is updated every 5 years, as required by Defra.</p> <p>In response to these comments, we will commit to publishing a noise report on our website annually. The report will include details of our annual performance on noise and noise contours from the annual noise modelling. This new commitment has been added to the NAP.</p> <p>Change made to NAP – new action 5</p>

Theme	Comment	Response
	There are no penalties for this if the airport does not comply. And “reasonably practicable” is insufficient commitment. This should be a stronger commitment to noise minimisation within a larger area, including the areas affected by takeoff, landing and circling pre-landing which include large densely populated residential areas.	
	2050! How is that going to help anybody? You need firm interim targets, otherwise it will be kicked down the track until suddenly in 2049 whoever is running the airport admits it can't be done. With noise set to massively increase by 2033 you need to come forward with a plan to reduce noise by that date. Exactly how are you going to 'work with' your partners in Sustainable Aviation? Relying on the aviation industry to sort this for you doesn't fill us with confidence. It's an industry that has already failed to meet almost all its carbon reduction targets, why should we believe it will do any better on noise?	
	Action 11 is ridiculous. What kind of a deadline is 2050? And why would you measure from 2000 unless you are trying to cover up a recent or planned fall off in progress towards the goal. What is the milestone for 2025?	
	Re Action 11 Frankly, your setting yourselves a target of 65% of 2000 noise level by 2050 is a bit of a joke, isn't it? – since that target is so very remote. (If, at my place of work, I told my employer that I was determined to meet an important target though I might not get round to it for 28 years, I don't think I'd be in the job for much longer!) You set no interim targets and specify no strategy for hitting that far-flung 2050 target and, as result, you give yourselves a 28-year period in which you need not worry about rising noise levels. (Perhaps in the late 2040s, you just might start feeling little bit under pressure to act perhaps; but then, of course, it won't be you who has to worry about it, as the authors of this plan, and the airports current management will be long gone by then, and no longer there to be held accountable for the meeting of that target—or failure to meet it.) So I'm afraid the setting of this so-very-distant target seems meaningless. If you said instead that you'd cut noise by a certain percentage by 2025, and another percentage by 2030, and so on, then those would be meaningful targets. So I'd strongly suggest you do that instead.	

Theme	Comment	Response
	The promise (action 11) to reduce "oise'to 65% of 2000 levels by 2050 – a target too far in the future to be meaningful, and without any strategy for how to get there, nor any interim targets.	
	The timescales need to be more specific, and more definite dates given.	
	Action 11: 2050 is 28 years away and many people about to suffer the increased noise from the runway extension may not even be here then to experience the benefits. There must be interim targets, eg 30% reduction by 2030, 50% by 2040. There should also be a strategy to explain how this reduction is to be achieved. Relying on unspecified future technologies is not acceptable, especially since there is a trade off between reducing 26ccommod carbon emissions and reducing the noise they make.	
	Action 11: 2050 is so far in the future (in the absence of an actual strategy for implementation) that it is virtually meaningless. It will give no comfort to the 46,000 people who will by 2030 experience significantly more noise than in 2019. There must be interim targets, eg 30% reduction by 2030, 50% by 2040. Please also clarify whether this target is for a reduction in total noise, not noise per ATM or noise per passenger.	
	1. There should be earlier targets set for noise reduction, well before 2050 and a published strategy for this	
	Action 11 – reducing noise to 65% of 2000 levels by 2050 – is too far in the future to mean anything – and it doesn't have any plan or interim targets.	
	Action 11 – reducing noise to 65% of 2000 levels by 2050 – is too far in the future to mean anything – and it doesn't have any plan or interim targets.	
	Action 10 relies on 'differential charging' to encourage airlines to use quieter aircraft but please just ban noiser aircraft. You can tell airlines which type of aircraft are allowed to take off from Southampton so band the loudest ones.	
	Action 11 – reducing noise to 65% of 2000 levels by 2050 – is too far in the future to mean anything – and it doesn't have any plan or interim targets.	
	Reducing noise to 65% of 2000 levels by 2050 is way too far in the future to mean anything. Anyway, you should have a progress plan with targets.	

Theme	Comment	Response
	Reducing noise to 65% of 2000 levels by 2050 is too far in the future to mean anything, and it needs targets.	
	The timescales need to be more specific, and more definite dates given.	
	Reducing noise to 65% of 2000 levels by 2050 is too far in the future to mean anything and anyway you must have stepping stone targets. I was born in 2002 so will be 48 by then – more than half my life time away.	
	Para 6.7 Why are no models of the next 3 years 28ccom included, as promised for the future? We appreciate that Defra has required you to use the 2021 figures, but these are misleadingly low.	
	Action 11 – 65% reduction in perceived noise by 2050 relative to 2000. 2050 is a long way away! Also the runway extension will massively increase noise relative to 2019. For this to mean anything we need interim targets for reductions by 2030 and 2040. Please also clarify that this target is for a reduction in total noise, not noise per flight or noise per passenger.	
	Action 11 – reducing noise to 65% of 2000 levels by 2050 – is too far in the future to mean anything – and it doesn't have any plan or interim targets.	
	How is it possibly going to take you until end of 2023 to set up your nose website????? If it takes you this long to do this how can we have any faith in you meeting any other target?	
Noise insulation scheme	Noise insulation schemes need to be offered to large areas of Southampton boroughs including Bitterne Park, TownHill and Midanbury	<p>The NIS will be available to all homes, care homes and schools that existed on 1 June 2021 and are or become situated within the 60dB 16-hour summer day LAeq noise contour area. The noise contours will be updated and published annually by the airport. Following an assessment of the property, the scheme covers the full cost of noise insulation, including ventilation if deemed to be effective. Details of the Noise Insulation Scheme are outlined in Section 6.1.6 of the NAP and further details are provided in the Section 106 agreement. This document will be made available on a dedicated webpage for airport planning in due course – this has been added to the NAP. Progress of the noise insulation scheme is monitored through the Airport Consultative Committee, the minutes of which are publicly available.</p> <p>Change made to the NAP Section 6.1.6</p>
	Point 22 could reduce the impact of noise generated by flights to/from the airport and should be extended to all properties that will see increased noise pollution levels over the next 10 years as highlighted in the recent planning application for the runway extension	
	A noise Insulation scheme... how is this going to work for every home which is going to be negatively impacted by this expansion? It's just more waffle to make people think you care and are doing the right thing. Money is being put before well-being and the environment as per usual—are any of the Tory party investing in this BS?!	
	You say the majority ie 64% of flights take off to the south, we should have more help with noise.	

Theme	Comment	Response
	When and how will the Noise Insulation Scheme to mitigate noise for residents most affected by aircraft noise be made available?	
	It is ridiculous to limit the affected population to that within the noise contour. Those who live close to Southampton General Hospital will be particularly affected by air ambulance flights, while Coastguard and Police operations often mean a helicopter flying (and frequently hovering in a fixed location) at low level over the River Itchen, outside the stated contours.	
	If we are not on the noise contours presumably we won't be offered noise insulation for our house. We already have to pause conversations or TV when planes come over. Bitterne Park secondary school needs to not have extra noise flown over them each day.	
	Good to encourage good acoustic design. However I notice the noise insulation scheme will only benefit those closest to the airport. Many more people are affected by noise.	
	For all the waffle, for me, my property will be subjected to twice as much noise energy and I do not fall into the compensation area.	
	Will developers and people extending their homes have to pay for these extra measures?	
	I have just had triple glazing installed will you be offering to fund that?	
	Sound insulation area is not large enough and obviously this would not help in summer months when windows are open and people should be able to enjoy outside spaces.	
	How will action 22 be implemented?	
	I want to know what happens if the noise insulation scheme fails to protect homeowners— hell I was just distracted by another really noisy one going overhead— lost my train of thought lol.	
	6. So, no specific policy exists regarding noise insulation?	
	The wording suggests that there is no actual noise insulation policy in place yet. There is no detail in this section. There is neither time frame, nor funding details. This leaves the affected community effectively unprotected.	
	Only a small number of people will be offered compensation.	
	6.1.6 It appears you are developing a noise insulation policy which goes on average noise levels now, not on the noisiest days or in the future.	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>These are separate issues - encouraging good acoustic design is not the same as lobbying ECC "and "seeking to influence policy". The latter is what commercial organisations do, but the public cannot be expected to endorse it.</p> <p>There is no noise insulation scheme for residents badly affected by noise in Winchester. And we should be able to converse outside as well as in.</p> <p>The noise insulation policy is great for those who will get it – which according to the tables in section 5 is zero households! Even if more people do get it when you get around to predicting future years as promised, it won't help them if they want to sit out and enjoy their gardens.</p> <p>What specifically is the noise insulation scheme mentioned in point 22? Is it fencing?</p>	
Runway extension	<p>The purpose of the runway extension may be to attract more airlines, but the reality of this is that it will attract the larger, noisier planes in significantly larger numbers than previously, meaning that noise will be commensurate to a much larger extent than the increase in number of passengers would imply.</p> <p>Quoting the fact that ICAO has banned the noisiest aircraft is presumably meant to reassure us. But the larger, noisier planes you intend to attract in much greater numbers with the runway extension are not banned, and you evidently have no plans to reduce noise 'at source' by limiting the numbers to these noisier (but not banned) aircraft that can use Southampton.</p> <p>The misleading claim that aircraft 'ave become 75% quieter over the past 50 yrs is presumably meant to reassure us and obscure the fact that the change in fleet mix after the runway extension which swamps any improvements in average aircraft noise.</p> <p>Section 2.4 should acknowledge that the planned runway extension will change the mix of and quantity of aircraft using the airport at that the larger aircraft you are trying to attract will increase the noise impact on the local community. Seem relevant to a noise action plan. You talk a "out viability" a lot in relation to the extension but fail to mention that this development will increase the noise impact on surrounding areas. Be honest.</p> <p>para 2.4 notes that the runway extension is needed to attract more airlines. In fairness you should admit here that the result of this will be a fleet mix change to include many more of the noisier planes than previously. This is a very significant change in noise (135%) for a 50% increase in passengers.</p>	<p>The justification for and impacts of the runway extension, including the effect of any noisier aircraft on the contours, has been scrutinised through the planning process which included a period of public consultation. The noise contour cap detailed in Section 6.1.2 is based on the scenario assessed during the runway extension planning process and will ensure that future noise impacts can be no worse than those assessed as part of the planning application.</p>

Theme	Comment	Response
	Para 6.2 notes that aircraft have become 75% quieter over the past 50 yrs. This rather glosses the fact that the runway extension will lead to a massive increase in numbers of the noiser aircraft, and I think you should be more honest about this here.	
	I cannot emphasise enough that existing aircraft noise is often intolerable. If the runway is extended, the larger and noisier planes which at the moment fly not fully-laden will be able to take a full complement of passengers, and they will become the norm rather than the exception.	
	It seems pointless to me that "you will establish objectives 1-6 if you are intending to increase the number of flights by noisier aircraft, e.g. E190, 737 and A320.	
	There is a claim that aircraft are becoming quieter, but that is not the case if they are bigger.	
	The jets that have replaced Flybe's turbo-props are much louder. The older planes were quieter.	
	Para 6.2: Claiming that aircraft have become 75% quieter over the past 50 yrs is really misleading given the impending change in fleet make up following the runway extension which will lead to a large increase in numbers of the noiser aircraft.	
	We welcome your intention to 'bring noise reduction and being a responsible neighbour to forefront' but we feel that there is little in the action plan that makes these more than warm words, especially given the massive increase in noise to come from the runway extension.	
	We welcome your intention to 'bring noise reduction and being a responsible neighbour to forefront' but we feel that there is little in the action plan that makes these more than warm words, especially given the massive increase in noise to come from the runway extension.	
	There is no proof that the airport would not be viable without this change Eastleigh should not have final approval as not affected by noise or pollution as only the airport building is in Eastleigh. The runway take off and landing affects Southampton and Winchester area. The noise is currently more than previously experienced and much pollution.	
	I expect all the strategy groups, Health strategies, and health and wellness boards are just an exercise in checkbox ticking and produce no real benefits to communities at all. In the end, Eastleigh Council and Southampton Airport, against the wishes of Southampton and Winchester City councils, have decided to run larger, louder aircraft and potentially much more frequently than	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>at present, and after you have decided to do that, an Action Plan is meaningless.</p> <p>The p"le "...extending the runway by just 16"le-tes,... " does not give any indication of associated increase in noise disturbance levels.</p> <p>Local communities need to be consulted properly. All residents need to be given proper information on the runway extension timescale, as the implications will affect everyone's lives.</p> <p>This claim that the airport's runway length is no longer suitable for modern airline fleets is questionable. London City Airport, which has a shorter runway than the one at Southampton Airport, welcomes planes like the Embraer E2 which has a longer range, is modern and is quieter.</p> <p>The noise cap was set at the maximum predicted noise for the expected 3mppa, so while it is good that you intend not to exceed it, please don't imply it is a tough target or will offer any real mitigation for people under the flight path.</p> <p>It is very clear from this section that the whole plan to increase SIA runwa34ccommodateo accomodate larger aircraft is coming from Central Government, so SIA have little ultimate control over aircraft noise. Even though EBC have included aircraft noise reduction they are beholden to the whims of government. Personally I believe that AMS is a strategy to move congestion at the London Airports to the regional ones. The government think it is cheaper and less controversial to do this rather than expand Heathrow and Gatwick.</p>	
Runway extension	<p>I have absolutely no objection to emergency service helicopter (or other) movements at any time of day or night, despite the fact that these can be highly intrusive and disturbing. I would hope that "emergencies" can cover all air ambulance operations, not just those operated by the formal emergency services.</p> <p>However, I would hope that all such helicopter operations are included within the annual budget of 7500 total.</p> <p>A strict limit of 7500 helicopter "ligh's per year - 20 flights per day seems excessive.</p> <p>7500 helicopter flights per year gives an average of 20 per day, which seems like a lot of flights.</p> <p>Why on earth do you need to allow yourself 15 scheduled helicopter flights between 6-7am? This is 1 every 4 mins and we don't see that many during the rest of the day. Helicopters are particularly annoying because they fly over a wider area than the usual take-off path for planes.</p>	<p>The limit of 7,500* helicopter movements is a planning requirement that has been in place for many years and the actual number of helicopters movements is a small fraction of this number. In 2021 there were a total of 144 helicopter movements including emergencies. The number of helicopter movements are reported regularly to the Airport Consultative Committee, the minutes of which are publicly available.</p> <p><i>*The 7500 limit does not include emergency movements</i></p>

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>7500 helicopter movements a year seems excessive. That is over 20 a day!</p> <p>21 helicopter flights a day seems to be a high limit. This is if they fly every day. Realistically the number of flights a day could therefore be much higher</p> <p>The number of predicted flight movements for aeroplanes is also vastly more than mentioned by some sources. Meaning noise will be constant through the available time limits</p> <p>Helicopter noise is an increasing problem, and I am astounded that the high figure of 144 helicopter movements in 2021 accounts for only 1% of all movements.</p> <p>Similarly 7,500 helicopter movements pa seem a lot-it is about 20 every day, on average. How many training flights involving aircraft familiarisation are there pa?(6.13).</p> <p>Please see earlier comments on helicopters.</p> <p>6.1.3: The number of permitted daytime helicopter flights seems excessive. The proposed limits for helicopter flights are not "restrictive".</p> <p>6.1.1: The number of permitted helicopter flights seems excessive.</p>	
Justification for airport growth	<p>Southampton Airport does not need to attract more airlines to be viable, this simply increases the airport profits at the expense of the local community.</p> <p>2.4 On Sunday 4th September there were 33 schedule flights from the airport plus any private planes. This shows clearly that there are aircraft available for the existing runway, and not the sign of a airport about to go out of business.</p> <p>The commercial justification of the runway extension and airport expansion in section 2.4 is inappropriate in a document concerned with noise impact. It would have been "possible" to decide not to go ahead with that expansion, which would have undoubtedly reduced the effect of aircraft noise on the local population.</p> <p>You say 'Although the noise generated by an airport cannot be eliminated, we are conscious that it is important to reach a balance that allows growth while...' I fundamentally disagree that it is axiomatically important for this airport to keep growing. I'm sure it is desirable to the business shareholders, but it is not by any means a universal value to be set out as underlying and unquestionable context for the Noise Action Plan. An expansion of air travel is absolutely not an unquestionable good in the context of the climate crisis.</p>	Justification for the expansion of the airport through the runway extension was set out in detail during the planning process. The application decision was subject to judicial review and the decision to approve the runway extension was upheld.

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>Whilst cleverly expressed as a reduction 'As well as a cap on the number of annual passengers (starting at 2.4 million and increasing to a maximum of 3 million from 2029)' this actually sets out a 25% increase in the next 7 years. I find this ambitious growth plan extremely troubling in the context of the climate crisis. However, I am pleased to see that 'For the first time this cap is directly related to aircraft noise rather than passenger numbers and will limit the noise that can be generated by the airport' as the absolute noise rather than noise per passenger is definitely a more relevant metric.</p>	
	<p>You say 'Although the noise generated by an airport cannot be eliminated, we are conscious that it is important to reach a balance that allows growth while...' But I don't think you've explained why growth of the airport would be a good thing. Your shareholders might want that. But there is every reason—including the climate crisis it will exacerbate—to think that the concerns of these self-interested individuals are running counter to those of many, many other people's, including your own children and grandchildren.</p>	
	<p>Your claim that the expansion is critical to the viability of the airport, without providing any evidence for this other than that it is no longer suitable for today's modern airline fleets. If you can only exist by attracting larger planes, which at the moment cannot take off if fully laden, then perhaps you should consider your business model. regional connectivity is more than adequately saved by rail and road networks. Your claims about jobs have consistently fallen far short of your projections for decades.</p>	
	<p>One must question whether the 'growing demand for aviation' referred to in this section should be so simply accepted as an incontrovertible fact. Respondents cannot help but feel that, in proposals such as these, there is an undeniable sense in which this first section is stating 'this is what is going to happen, and this is the best we can do to make up for the fact that the noise is going to negatively affect so many lives in so many long-lasting ways'. This kind of inevitability of outcome from the outset works to persuade against participation, particularly when participation is made so difficult and time consuming.</p>	
	<p>The 'growing demand for aviation' referred to in this section is highly questionable when clearly we have recognised that there is a climate emergency, to which airlines are contributing.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
Reporting – area isn't shown within contour	on the map I cannot see Shirley, we too have airplanes flying over our gardens during the day. Sometimes they are louder than others but you don't seem to have mapped that.	<p>The contour levels and metrics displayed on the contours maps in the NAP are defined in the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations (2006). The lowest contour levels shown are based on level at which adverse effects to noise begin to be observed on a population level (LOAEL). Noise from individual aircraft may still be audible outside of the contours. A wider range of metrics including N65, N60 and overflights will be used in the ongoing airspace change proposals (see Section 2.5) to ensure noise from individual events is taken into account.</p>
	6.7 I am looking forward to seeing the predicted noise contours and hope we are included (Atlantic Park View)	
	Once again, large numbers of people outside the contours stated have a justifiable interest in the proposed information provision and actions.	
	I note that you do not propose reporting on your work with the Sustainable Aviation Group. That seems unfortunate at best.	
	Again, the assumption that only those within the 51dB contour are affected/interested is ridiculous.	
	Once again, why claim only small areas are affected by these issues?	
	We live beyond any of the mapped contour lines, yet our sleep is disturbed, and we oppose any noise increase due to the longer runway.	
	In addition, I see the maps do not cover Bitterne Park, an omission which I think out to be rectified as a consequence of this consultation.	
Choice of noise metric	Overstates the benefits of the airport, makes no reference to the declining numbers employed at airports in the future due to increasing automation, doesn't reference the impact on residents particularly those beyond the mapped Eastleigh area.	<p>Metrics and assessment periods used in the NAP are mandated in the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations (2006). Average summer day contours will be included in the annual noise report.</p> <p>A wider range of metrics including N65, N60 and overflights will be used in the ongoing airspace change proposals (see Section 2.5) to ensure noise from individual events is taken into account.</p>
	The LAeq,T (equivalent continuous sound level) metric is an inappropriate concept to use. I was not woken this morning by and average night time noise but by a single plane which flew overhead. The LAeq,T is an attempt to mislead the public into believing the airport is controlling nuisance noise, which they are not doing because it is not the average noise which is the nuisance.	
	The maps use average noise and not individual bursts of aircraft sound. I was not woken this morning by and average night time noise but by a single plane which flew overhead. The maps mislead the public into believing the airport is controlling nuisance noise, which they are not doing because it is not the average noise which is the nuisance.	
	Noise metrics need to be taken over the areas of all landing, take-off operations, these metrics and test must involve Southampton areas.	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>4.1.2 If you measure the aircraft noise from our garden on a clear sky on Saturday or Sunday, this will give a clearer measurement of noise as opposed to over 92 days, when weekdays are not so bad.</p> <p>You have chosen to use LAEQ and LDEN measures but why not LMAX? Measures which average noise over a period are less useful when assessing the changes likely result from changing the fleet mix to include more of the noiser aircraft, because it doesn't take account of the fact that the most annoying aspect of these planes is their actual noise. You only need one loud plane to wake you up (and this is already happening at weekends to people in Southampton who live outside the 51dB contour). The noiser planes interrupt conversation over a much wider area than the quieter ones. Also there is no mention here of the WHO guidelines.</p> <p>Why not give tables/contour graphs for the number of occasions on which people will experience noise above a certain level, since it is the louder aircraft that cause most annoyance and disturbance? It may not be a commonly used measure but it would give us some idea of what we are facing as the fleet mix changes. The planning application did give some maps of N65 but it didn't indicate how many of these '65dB events' were in fact 70dB or even 75dB.</p> <p>I believe the way that noise is measured and averaged into contours over lengthy time periods in no way represents my actual experience of living under the flight path in Bitterne Park. If you were to have monitors measuring real time noise then that would provide a more accurate representation of what I, and children in the local schools, experience as the larger planes take off over us. This would demonstrate, I believe, that you have already breached bearable noise levels by allowing E190s to take off and land here.</p> <p>Peak noise nuisance events eg individual aircraft flying overhead, need to be addressed in this plan</p> <p>NO FLIGHTS 23.00 - 06.00 Throughout the document there are references to the 16 hr contour, yet this phrase allows flights over 17 hrs, negating the remainder of the document. The period 06.00 - 07.00 is the most sensitive. Is this a deliberate fudge?</p> <p>Reference is frequently made to the Average Summer Day noise contour (e.g. 6.1.2 Noise Cap and 6.16 Insulation Policy) however the contour is not included in the section of the report with the other noise contours.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
Electric aircraft	electric aircraft are years away	<p>"Electric" has been changed to "electric and hybrid electric" aircraft in action 14. Purely electric aircraft are expected to be suitable for short haul flights for 6 passengers whereas hybrid electric aircraft are expected to be suitable for regional flights with certification foreseen within the next 3-5 years. Our means to support development will adapt as we grow our understanding from the operators who use the airport.</p>
	Electric aircraft - really for regular flights soon?	
	Action 13: electric aircraft are a side show. If you really expected these to make a difference at Southampton you wouldn't need the longer runway, they will never be big enough to need it because of the weight of batteries required. Current electric planes take less than a dozen people and the idea they can replace the A320 by 2050 is utterly faniful.	
	12. Electric passenger planes are a way off. Please note earlier comment regarding a possible trade off: As gains become more marginal in future, the potential requirement to trade off emissions and noise performance is likely to increase.	
	Action 12 is in the right direction but exceedingly vague. It would be better to hear something specific about how the airport will 'encourage' the development of electric aircraft - by active investment, or preferential pricing, or how to apply action 14 in a way that also prepares for electric aircraft charging needs, for example.	
Request for further information on Noise Forum	Point 12- Electric planes will only ever be able to replace the smaller aircraft, not the larger jets the runway extension aims to attract, and for electric planes there would be no need for a longer runway.	<p>Requirement to establish a Noise Forum is out-lined in detail in the S106 agreement, further details of which can be found in Appendix 6 of the S106 agreement. This document will be made available on a dedicated web-page for airport planning in due course - this has been added to the NAP (https://www.southamptonairport.com/planning). The objectives of the Forum are to improve communication between the Airport, communities and other stakeholders; promote greater understanding of noise; better understand the impact of noise on residential communities; consider practical ways impacts can be mini-mised; and, review and report annually on the NAP and NIS.</p> <p>Change made to NAP Section 6.1.7</p>
	6.1.7 A much more robust commitment at this stage needs to be made as to the structure, powers (if any!) and membership (e.g. elected members of which councils)	
	Items 1-4 are not due to be operative until 2023, and there are no details about how residents can get involved eg in the Noise Forum. Will these bodies have any power, or will they just be a waste of people's time, as nothing will change?	
	Will the Noise Forum have any effective power?	
	Will the Noise Forum have any actual power and control?	
	Action 9 – It is recommended that the Noise Forum Terms of Reference are amended to reflect the role detailed in new Action 9.	
	6.1.7 - The Noise Forum, it is recommended that this body monitor both the Noise Action Plan and Airspace Change Proposals. It should take into account noise-related health issues from the Health Board, and report to the ACC.	

Theme	Comment	Response
Airspace change	Your action plan doesn't state explicitly how it will address DP9 – avoid overflying densely populated, again Southampton boroughs are not mentioned.	The airspace change proposal is subject to separate consultation and consenting process. Responses relating to the airspace change proposal will be fully analysed and considered as part of the ongoing airspace change proposal.
	In section 2.5, it is not clear whether the potential for new flight paths apply to all aircraft or only those over 5700 tons / jet powered. I understand one possible benefit to operators of the new schemes would be curved approach paths, which might be particularly attractive for the training schools which operate the Twin Star and Diamond Star aircraft in this area - neither of which are jet-powered or above 5700kg.	For information on the ACP and guidance from the Civil Aviation Authority on noise metrics, please refer to their guidance document: CAP1616 and the CAA's Airspace Change Portal https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/
	Action 19 – "seek to develop a design that minimises and reduces where possible total adverse effects." Please ensure that noise reduction is given maximum priority.	To access the latest information on Southampton Airports ACP, please visit our dedicated web page https://www.southamptonairport.com/about-us/airspace-change-programme/
	It isn't clear from the information you have provided on airspace modernisation so far what priority you are noise among all the other 'design principles'. It should be one of the top priorities!	
	2. One cannot help but wonder whether it is sensible for a 'Government to task the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) to develop the UK Airspace Modernisation Strategy (AMS) to describe the changes that the industry should make to meet the growing demand for aviation in a safe, efficient and environmentally sustainable way.' Such centralisation inevitably overlooks the needs and concerns of individual areas. The Airspace Change Proposal references in section 2 employ a circularity of argument which is quite astonishing - seeming to imply that it is centrally managed by the CAA, owned by Southampton Airport, concerned with and also separate to the Noise Action Plan. The 4 bullet pointed DPs are each oxymoronic in their own way. For example: the best way to 'minimise, and where possible reduce, the total adverse effects on health and quality of life from aircraft noise' would be to not increase the size of aircraft and regularity of flights. Were this a proper consultation that would be an option for the respondent to consider. DP9 – avoid overflying densely populated residential areas, national parks, AONBs, noise sensitive buildings and other areas prized for tranquillity - no other British airports overfly two cities as Southampton Airport does - here there is no option so why postulate that this is a principle used in the development of your airspace design? 'DP11 – ensure that aircraft operating at Southampton Airport climb and descend continuously to/ from at least 7000ft' This does not even make sense.	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>Sections 6.1.5 6.1.6, 6.1.7</p> <p>Generally, this is a very unsettling time for the local community which is affected by the airport runway extension plan. Definite information on the airport's plans are scarce, which adds to the difficulty of the situation. It would be helpful to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have more information on the timescale and to know more about the flightpath/ airspace changes and how these will impact different areas under the flightpath 	
Climate emergency and biodiversity	<p>There is very little point in trying to "greenwash" your actions when increasing air traffic significantly increases CO2 emissions and further adds to the climate emergency.</p> <p>Personally I hope that there will be a huge drop in demand for flights (very likely with the huge cost of living rise and far more business being conducted on-line).</p> <p>I understand the airport is a business with the aim of making money.</p> <p>However, to not make any mention of the concerns of a large section of the local & international population re the impact on the climate, including local wildlife, means you are ignoring a large part of the picture. I appreciate this is a noise action plan but, while this is annoying to say the least, the excessive noise is not going to kill us.</p> <p>Where is your climate & local wildlife protection action plan?</p> <p>We all know air travel has to decrease (along with a lot of other things we enjoy) if we are going to save the planet & have somewhere to live in the future. Acknowledging that changes are necessary should be part of all of your action plans.</p> <p>Not to mention the thought of the greenhouse gas emissions and pollution. The best way to reduce noise is not to have more, and bigger aircraft in the first place. Which handily also doesn't contribute to the climate and ecological crisis.</p> <p>Land use and planning. Eastleigh is supposed to be environment champion but are happy to cut down trees that are needed by the environment and accept increased noise and pollution. How is this acceptable.</p> <p>Improved public spaces in areas affected by aircraft noise will still be affected by aircraft noise. The 'improvements' in Marshall Copse have turned a previously wild area vital for wildlife and flora into a manicured park.(6.1.5)</p>	<p>Our sustainability strategy sets out how the Airport will balance the economic and social benefits of aviation with our climate change responsibilities. The strategy can be found here: https://www.southamptonairport.com/about-us/sustainability/</p> <p>The carbon emissions and impacts on biodiversity are considered as part of the airspace change process.</p>

Theme	Comment	Response
Need for more pro-active measures	Activity all geared to “after the event” ie on-going monitoring and public management.	<p>We seek to be a responsible neighbour and to minimise the impact of aircraft noise on the local community within the framework established by national and local government. The Noise Action Plan is an on-going process. Several new pro-active actions have been introduced including the noise insulation scheme, noise forum, noise cap, and community health and wellbeing fund. In response to the comments received through this consultation, we have committed to publishing an annual noise report which will report on progress against these actions as well so the annual noise contours.</p> <p>Change made to NAP – new action 5 & link to 2050 goals added to NAP (see https://www.southamptonairport.com/planning/section106/)</p>
	Ditto	
	Ditto	
	Ditto	
	Ditto	
	The seems do not contain any concrete actions to reduce the level of noise generated by the airport or it's impact	
	I am intrigued by your 'visionary noise goals'(11). Please tell us what they are. As in other sections, there is a lot about encouraging and influencing.	
Mistrust of contour maps	<p>The noise contour map is extremely narrow and despite the figures quoted in this section, that are probably beyond the understanding of the average person, it appears to be a "smoke and mirrors" policy to</p> <p>a) limit the number of residents and organisations that will qualify for sound insulation</p> <p>b) disregard the genuine concerns of residents outside this very narrow corridor who will be very much affected by increased volume of flights and noise.</p> <p>Already SIA has been allowing larger noiser jets to use the airport. The increase of weekend British Airways flights has resulted in a huge increase in noise. I have an allotment in the Midanbury area and it is not possible to carry on a conversation there when these aircraft are operating (usually a Saturday morning). Presumably this is to assess the reaction of residents to this noise.</p>	<p>All noise modelling for the Noise Action Plan is undertaken using a validated noise model (ANCON). An overview of how the ANCON modelling process works can be found on the CAA's website: https://www.caa.co.uk/consumers/environment/noise/features-of-the-ancon-noise-modelling-process/</p>
	Whilst SIA have gone to great lengths in this document to stress the validity and accuracy of the CAAs strategic noise mapping, it must be noted that CAA is a QUANGO and therefore ultimately responsible to HM Gov. The CAA have merely come provided statistics to comply with the government's agenda.	
	There is little point in producing reports and data on aircraft noise when increased air traffic and accompanying noise is a fait de complis. The data will be produced by SIA and not an independant organisation so no data will be published that will cause air traffic and noise to be reduced. Ref point 7 does this mean that only people living and/or working within this contour can make a valid complaint?	

Theme	Comment	Response
Need for more pro-active measures	The pollution fugues do not seem to accurately reflect reality. Noise pollution has a huge effect on mental health. Having to stop conversations every time a flight comes or goes is not reasonable.	
	Your noise contour maps are inaccurate, passenger aircraft are below 1000ft in Bitterne Park, Town Hill and Midanbury areas, the aircraft must be below 500ft when travelling along Hillside Avenue. Regular aircraft landing have been over Bitterne Park - Newton, Ash Tree, St Catherine's roads.	
	25. Your noise contours are incorrect, suggest you visit areas in Bitterne Park, Midanbury, Town Hill. Noise doesn't stop at a contour and spreads far and wide.	
Routes over specific areas	Doesn't mention takeoff and landing and circling route, which covers densely populated Winchester.	The objective of the Noise Action Plan is to set out the actions we are taking to reduce aviation noise as a whole. The noise modelling conducted to create the noise contour maps take all routes into account. Any proposed changes to individual routes will be addressed through the Airspace Change Process.
	Doesn't address takeoff, landing and circling route, which covers densely populated Winchester.	
	Doesn't address takeoff noise, landing noise, circling noise affecting Winchester. This should be limited, mitigated, reduced.	
	Aircraft often circle twice over Winchester as they descend, instead of descending on a single continuous course. This means double the noise pollution.	
	Only references the airport location and nature of surrounding area, not of the flight paths for takeoff and landing which affect the whole Itchen Valley including Winchester.	
	Section 2.3, the sentence about the south seems to stop at the M27. You are missing a huge area of Southampton housing that is affected by current flight activities and new proposed flight activities. You labour the industrial areas of Eastleigh but forget about Southampton, especially Midanbury, Bitterne Park et, again 64% of flights will be to the south which has substantial housing and will be directly affected about noise.	
Lack of action beyond government policy	We do not feel the noise plan really brings noise reduction and being a responsible neighbour 'to the forefront' but rather, that (apart from the extension of the insulation scheme to the 60dB contour) is basically limited to government guidance and the Section 106 agreement. In particular a commitment to reducing the numbers of the noiser aircraft, especially at weekends when most people wish to enjoy their gardens, would indicate that you really take your responsibility to overflow communities seriously.	Many of the actions in the NAP go beyond government policy including the noise cap, Noise Forum and Community Health and Wellbeing Fund. The requirements of the Section 106 were developed and agreed at a local level.

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>We do not feel the noise plan really brings noise reduction and being a responsible neighbour 'to the forefront' but rather, that (apart from the extension of the insulation scheme to the 60dB contour) is basically limited to government guidance and the Section 106 agreement. In particular a commitment to reducing the numbers of the noiser aircraft, especially at weekends when most people wish to enjoy their gardens, would indicate that you really take your responsibility to overflowed communities seriously.</p> <p>I cannot take much confidence in a plan which relies to such an extent on doing things which are legally binding. I would expect an organisation which really was a "good neighbour" to want to go well beyond mere legal obligations.</p> <p>It is not clear from this document in what way you are 'bringing the focus of being a responsible neighbour and minimising noise to the forefront', rather than little more than the bare minimum following government guidelines and requirements of the section 106. Especially since you are about to unleash a huge increase in noise following the runway extension.</p> <p>Action 21 - I find it extraordinary that someone felt a need to promise that the airport would seek to 'influence policy where appropriate'. Obviously you will do this, and it seems highly unlikely that influence will be in the public interest. If you wish to hold yourself to higher standards than policy dictates, there is no need to influence the policy.</p> <p>The statement that you wish to remain "a good neighbour to local residents" presumes that you are currently a good neighbour, yet there is no evidence provided to support such a contention (eg analysis of complaints, survey of residents' attitudes / concerns).</p> <p>Similarly, the paragraph beginning "The airport will be a responsible neighbour" states that the context will be the "framework established by national and local government". That is, you have no intention of going beyond legislated / statutory requirements. For example, I am sure many residents would prefer a definition of "night" which explicitly curtailed flights after 2200 (or even 2100) and before 0700.</p>	
Lack of action beyond government policy	<p>The biggest noise disturbance is from ageing aircrafts like ATR'a and Q400's</p> <p>The biggest noise is when trying to enjoy one's garden and some ATR comes over that's as noisy as an old Lancaster bomber.</p>	Noise from specific aircraft types and any future changes to the fleet mix will be taken into account in the annual noise modelling and the annual noise performance report.

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>Living under the flight path means that I am acutely aware of changes you are already making which make life less pleasant here in Bitterne Park. In particular, the use of E190s by British Airways for European flights has become a real noise nuisance and does not bode well for the future.</p>	
	<p>You offer in evidence to support the statement that "Aircraft manufactured today are generally much quieter than they have been in the past" the single fact that the A320neo is 2-6dB quieter than the original A320. Those figures would certainly make a difference to the contour plots if they applied to the mix of aircraft using the airport in the last five years versus those which use in the next. However, the original A320 was introduced in 1984, decades earlier than the Embraers which make up a significant proportion of the current traffic, while the A320neo only came into service in 2016. I do not feel a noise reduction rate of 0.7 to 2dB per decade is likely to make much difference to the noise I experience from airport operations in the next five years!</p>	
	<p>It is not meaningful to compare the aircraft which have started operating recently to older models. It would be more meaningful to compare the newer jets with, for example, the Dash 8s.</p>	
	<p>4.1.1 says the airport has got quieter over time. It says that A320neo is quieter than A320. Assuming these are the BA jets, they are still noisier than any other scheduled aircraft flying out of SOA, so I cant see how its getting quieter.</p>	
Health Strategy / Community Health and Wellbeing Fund	<p>To know in what ways you might envisage a Health Strategy and airport community health mitigation fund might work. Sadly, it smacks of tokenism, with a suggestion of compensating for damage caused. It would be better that damage to health was avoided in the first case, especially given the pressure under which the NHS finds itself.</p>	<p>The Health Strategy and Airport Community Health and Wellbeing Fund are new actions, the details of which are currently being developed. The objectives of the strategy are detailed in Section 6.1.5 of the NAP and in the Section 106 agreement. Further details will be provided via our webpage as the strategy develops.</p> <p>The £100,000 figure quoted in the Section 106 agreement is an initial community health and wellbeing contribution to be used by the Council to establish the Airport Community Health and Wellbeing Fund.</p>
	<p>An Airport Community Health and Wellbeing Board - Seriously? Any funding specifics here?</p>	
	<p>6.1.5: Health Strategy and airport community health mitigation fund This is an admission of the harm that noise causes, an admission of its negative impact and an admission that in going ahead with the runway extension it is acknowledged that people's physical and mental health will be adversely affected. There are no concrete proposals for 'how to improve public outdoor spaces in areas affected by aircraft noise', probably because there are none. Nor is there any information on funding or deadlines.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>Outside spaces are of no help if noise pollution prevents them from being safe or enjoyable. Not inflicting noise pollution on people would be far better than 'taking measures to promote the use of public outdoor spaces for outdoor recreation and physical exercise which can lead to improved mental health'.</p> <p>There is reference to the 'monitoring of health impacts with a focus on noise related health impacts and sufferers of asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; and how this monitoring can be used to improve the measures within the Health Strategy'.</p> <p>Since these negative impacts are being acknowledged, it would seem a madness to be embarking upon a plan whose impact will inevitably lead to a greater financial and workload strain on the NHS.</p>	
	<p>Para 6.1: Although the promised £100K for the Community Health Mitigation Fund sounds like a lot compared with the '2000 people' in the 51dB contour (a 2021 figure which must already be substantially higher), the planning application predicted that 46,000 people would be in this contour by 2030. Government guidance on the economic impacts of noise on health, wellbeing, productivity and the natural environment https://www.gov.uk/guidance/noise-pollution-economic-analysis would suggest that the economic impact of 46,000 people exposed to an additional 3dB LAeq,24h could amount to £2m per year.</p>	
	<p>You have quoted the noise contours for 2021: fair enough if this is what DEFRA requires. But there is no need to repeatedly quote these figures in the rest of the document as if (eg) only '2000' people will benefit from the health and wellbeing fund when it is quite clear that the number in this contour is already larger than this and the predictions in the planning application suggest it will rise to 46,000. This is important because the £100k for the fund looks a lot more impressive when divided by 2000 people, but it is little more than £2 a head when 46,000 are affected.</p>	
	<p>Para 6.1: Although the promised £100K for the Community Health Mitigation Fund sounds like a lot compared with the '2000 people' in the 51dB contour (a 2021 figure which must already be substantially higher), the planning application predicted that 46,000 people would be in this contour by 2030. Government guidance on the economic impacts of noise on health, wellbeing, productivity and the natural environment https://www.gov.uk/guidance/noise-pollution-economic-analysis would suggest that the economic impact of 46,000 people exposed to an additional 3dB LAeq,24h could amount to £2m per year.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>You have quoted the noise contours for 2021: fair enough if this is what DEFRA requires. But there is no need to repeatedly quote these figures in the rest of the document as if (eg) only '2000' people will benefit from the health and wellbeing fund when it is quite clear that the number in this contour is already larger than this and the predictions in the planning application suggest it will rise to 46,000. This is important because the £100k for the fund looks a lot more impressive when divided by 2000 people, but it is little more than £2 a head when 46,000 are affected.</p>	
	<p>6.1.5 The health impacts monitored should be broad, rather than focussing on respiratory conditions. They should include other indicators of physical health and mental health in children and adults, educational attainment in children and societal impacts such as crime and antisocial behaviour. There is an evidence base linking all of these factors to noise pollution.</p>	
	<p>6.1.5 We would like to see greater reference in section 6.1.5. (e.g. the third bullet point) to the monitoring of health inequalities, in addition to health impacts.</p>	
	<p>Actions 1 - 9 seem admirable and thorough, but what we really need is genuine assurances that our quality of life will not deteriorate due to future development of the airport.</p>	
	<p>A more appropriate health strategy would be to reduce the use of aircraft, helping to reduce the impact of noise related health problems as well as climate breakdown!</p>	
Trade-off between noise and sustainability	<p>Para 6.6 noise and sustainability notes there is a 'careful balance to be struck' between carbon reduction and noise. But in the case of SOU, carbon emissions are small compared to bigger airports, but noise impacts are not. More people are affected by noise than most of the much larger UK airports and per passenger, Southampton is probably the noisiest airport in the country. Sustainability is important but noise is so serious an issue at Southampton that it must take priority.</p>	<p>We recognise that in the future there may be a trade-off between noise reduction and sustainability. As detailed in Section 6.6 the Government confirmed, via the 2017 Air Navigation Guidance, that up to 4000ft the Government's environmental priority is to minimise the noise impact of aircraft and the number of people on the ground affected by it.</p>
	<p>Para 6.6: This is a NOISE action plan, so why is sustainability being discussed except to warn that it might limit what you will do to minimise noise impacts? Of course carbon reduction is important, but because Southampton is a small airport the carbon emissions are also small in relation to bigger airports. This is NOT true of the noise impacts, which are greater than many much larger UK airports. For this reason we believe minimising noise impacts must take priority.</p>	

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>An additional concern is the trade off between low-noise and low- carbon designs, as follows:</p> <p>The CAA summed it up like this : Concerns in relation to climate change, carbon dioxide emissions, and local air quality could also have an impact on noise performance.</p> <p>Although there is not a direct correlation, and noise performance has previously been reduced alongside emissions reductions, as gains become more marginal in future, the potential requirement to trade off emissions and noise performance is likely to increase...the Sustainable Aviation Noise Roadmap²² for example, highlights that there are two conceivable paths for future aircraft design, low-carbon designs and low-noise designs. Whilst low-carbon designs may be quieter than existing aircraft, they may not be as quiet as low noise designs.</p> <p>Simply stating that the planes that will be operating will be quieter than those that have been in operation is simplistic. There are wider implications, such as this. At a time of climate emergency, which is one of the most pressing concerns to face us, this surely cannot be ignored.</p> <p>I should also be interested to know how the newer planes compare with planes that have previously operated from the airport, rather than with older models of the same plane that may never have flown in or out of Southampton since many of them appear louder and the quality of noise is more disruptive than of some of the planes that we have been used to in the past.</p> <p>more weasel words: 'careful balance between noise and carbon emissions'. In their response to the planning application EBC Health noted that the amount of noise at Southampton is 'excessive' for the size of airport and number of passengers, compared with other UK airports. Nobody made this same claim for the carbon emissions relative to other airports. Southampton is may be the only airport where noise impacts should outweigh carbon impacts in setting priorities.</p>	
Consultation process	<p>The legal and policy framework recommends working with the local community but the airport is simply putting out feedback requests like this which are constantly ignored and then driving its preferred options through the planning stages with the help of corporate lawyers and again at the expense of the local community.</p>	<p>Consultation on the NAP has followed Defra guidance which requires that we engage with the Airport Consultative Committee as a minimum. We have exceeded this requirement by making the draft NAP available for public consultation for an additional period of 8 weeks. We have provided responses to comments received and made updates to the NAP where appropriate.</p>

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>The Foreword and the rest of the document do not seem genuinely consultative. We are invited to 'Have our say' and yet the document simply states what will be done, and is set out in a way that makes it difficult to follow or to respond to. If it were really a consultation, it would be easy to follow, would give a clear explanation of the issues and would enable residents to express their concerns. It would invite them to have a proper say in a matter which affects their lives, and their children's lives, deeply. It does not feel like a consultation in which trust and understanding are being built. Far from it.</p> <p>Again, the consultation seems deliberately opaque.</p> <p>SIA have attempted to persuade the public that management of aircraft noise is safe in its hands. This is a fallacy as all is ultimately controlled by HM Gov and even European legislation. This consultation is a tick box exercise. In summary, the government want the regional airports to take more air traffic and SIA has to comply, but as a business sees it as a way of paying a greater dividend to shareholders and therefore is a willing player, whilst the lives of residents of Townhill Park, Bitterne Park and Bitterne will be blighted.</p>	
Impact of noise on schools	<p>We live outside the contours shown on the maps and we have a child at Bitterne Park secondary school, both our house and the school already have a lot of noise from aircraft, an increase in aircraft will adversely impact our child's learning (teachers already pause when planes go over, and we have to pause conversations at home too.)</p> <p>Sections 3.3.2 / 3.3.3/ 3.3.4:</p> <p>My children attended Bitterne Park School, which is directly under the flightpath, and were aware of aircraft noise, which could be considerable. Research shows that it can have a detrimental effect upon children's learning and ability to concentrate, which as someone who has been a part of the teaching profession, is something to which I can attest. Schools are under increasing financial pressure. I assume that the school will be offered adequate financial support to become soundproofed and that the installation and running of air conditioning will also be financed for when windows cannot be opened during summer months?</p> <p>Having been involved in education, I would be interested to know how any provision can be made to compensate for loss of quality of outdoor learning (P.E, environmental work etc) where</p>	Noise impacts on sensitive buildings (including schools) are considered as part of our noise modelling. Our noise insulation policy requires that we offer acoustic insulation to noise-sensitive buildings, such as schools, exposed to levels of noise of 60 dB L _{Aeq,16h} or more. We will continue to monitor policy requirements with respect to schools and any relevant best practice guidance from the CAA and update our noise mitigation strategy where necessary.

Theme	Comment	Response
	<p>teachers have to struggle to make themselves heard because of aircraft noise from a proposed increased number of flights.</p> <p>Airport noise compensation: There is particular concern for children, in schools under the flightpath. The noise pollution is expressed as an average. The effect of the noise from a succession of jet flights within a short time is not considered.</p> <p>Your 'Proposed Noise Insulation scheme' cannot address the effects of noise pollution and nuisance on the outdoor learning environment and school sports field activities.</p> <p>How can it address the necessity of having windows open in school classrooms, school halls and exam halls during the warmer months? An alternative such as air conditioning is not only costly to install and run but is also damaging to the environment.</p>	
Inclusion of WHO 2018	<p>I was disappointed that the WHO's 2018 document "Noise Guidelines for the European Region" does not feature in your framework. While it does not have the legalistic status of the other documents cited, it should surely have been referenced, if only to justify its exclusion from consideration? I note the Consultative Committee queried this point, and I regard your justification in response as inadequate. Even if the UK government regards the recommendations as unjustified, the Airport would be at liberty to take note of them should it have a real wish to be a good neighbour.</p> <p>I note that you have committed to produce a "Health Strategy", which - I assume - will take no account of the opinions and recommendations of the World Health Organisation?</p> <p>3.3.4 – Thresholds for assessing noise impacts – this refers to current UK policy with which the draft plan complies, however the World Health Organisation (WHO) brought forward tighter guidelines in its report 'Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region 2018' for eg 45 dB Lden, as opposed to the current 51 dB Lden. There would be merit in considering how the current and future operations compare to this tighter criteria. It is recommended that the Noise Group consider this.</p>	<p>The NAP follows UK Government noise policy. The Government has stated as part of its draft Aviation Strategy: 'The government is considering the recent new environmental noise guidelines for the European region published by the World Health Organisation (WHO). It agrees with the ambition to reduce noise and to minimise adverse health effects, but it wants policy to be underpinned by the most robust evidence on these effects, including the total cost of action and recent UK specific evidence which the WHO report did not assess'.</p> <p>The WHO guidelines themselves state that 'data and exposure-response curves derived in a local context should be applied whenever possible to assess the specific relationship between noise and annoyance in a given situation'. The 51dB L_{Aeq,16h} LOAEL for day-time used in the NAP is derived from exposure-response curves derived from a UK study. For the NAP, the LOAEL values for aircraft noise exposure are set by Aviation Policy at 51dB L_{Aeq,16h} for day-time and 45dB L_{Aeq,8h} for night-time. These policy thresholds take precedence over the WHO recommendations because they are formally incorporated in UK Policy.</p> <p>It is important to note that the guidelines do not set threshold for significant health effects and do not set limits or caps. It is also important to note that many of the actions in the NAP are implemented to reduce noise in its totality, so will benefit those in the 45dB L_{den} and 40dB L_{night} contours referenced in the WHO guideline.</p>

Theme	Comment	Response
Noise cap extending beyond ACP	Para 6.1.2 talks about the noise cap being legally binding. During the planning application it was claimed that the noise cap couldn't be extended past the airspace modernisation. I am pleased to see that this paragraph indicates it will outlast the modernisation process but it would be really good to have this clarified.	<p>The status of the noise cap post airspace change is detailed in the Section 106 agreement. This document will be made available on a dedicated webpage for airport planning in due course - this has been added to the NAP. In the event that a new airspace design is adopted, the Council and the Airport shall agree an alternative cap or noise control which reflects the revised airspace.</p> <p>Change made to NAP Section 6.1.2</p>
	Action 25 implies noise cap will continue post airspace change. Please make this clear.	
	Action 25 implies legal noise cap will continue post airspace change. Please make this clear.	
Noise from ground operations	I am also concerned by the inclusion of a number of sources of noise which could be reduced without making any impact on the significant noise experienced in Bitterne Park: ' Our Noise Action Plan therefore also covers aircraft taxiing to and from stands and engine testing carried out within the airport perimeter. ' Following on from the language in the foreword and executive summary, this reads like a disingenuous attempt to build in a couple of quick wins to allow the airport to trumpet some reductions whilst in no way mitigating the effects on people living under the flight path or trying to enjoy some tranquil nature in Riverside park.	<p>We recognise that noise from ground operations generally has a smaller impact than air noise. It is not a requirement to report on ground noise, however it is a source of noise that could have impacts if not controlled, therefore we implement measures to avoid this.</p>
	Also while I applaud your concern to minimise noise from aircraft taxiing to and from stands and engine testing, please don't allow this to distract you--or anyone else--from the key issue, which is the noise from aircraft taking off and landing at the airport. Cynics might worry that you have included mention of the former sources of noise so that you will be able to claim you have reduced overall noise if you address those, while leaving unaddressed the key source of noise--that from aircraft taking off and landing at the airport. If I were to come and rev my motorbike all night outside your house, I don't think you'd be much comforted if I did reduced my overall noise by turning my walkman off.	
	Removal of all diesel ground power units is essential to maintain a reduction or limit on noise from the airport. These ground power units are quite noisy but also add to the pollution from the airport. However the on stand ground power units from a power grid have to be robust and reliable with up to date technology to ensure these don't become unuseable to the point where the diesel ground power units will have to be used instead.	

Theme	Comment	Response
Noise from private aircraft	7. Why are you not looking at the effects of noise from private aircraft?	Private aircraft are included in the restrictions and are taken into account in the noise modelling.
	Are there limits on private jets? These are some of the noisiest.	
	6.1.4 Private aircraft as well? Does that mean that that awful yellow Guernsey mail plane won't be allowed to fly anymore? Really noisy.	
Noise monitoring	In addition to the caps and bans on noisy aircraft there needs to be a limit set for maximum acceptable decibels at all points on the map so that noisy aircraft can be identified and rerouted where appropriate,	A policy will be developed to deploy noise monitoring in locations to supplement the track keeping systems. The locations, metrics and objectives of the noise monitoring will be developed in the policy in consultation with the Community Noise Forum.
	I should like to have one of your sound analysts, together with an independent sound analyst, measure the noise of your incoming aircraft from my back garden in daytime to see whether it exceeds a LOAEL of 51 dBAeq, 16 hr. If it does, what do you propose to do by way of a solution?	
	We need proper transparency about where the noise monitoring is going and what will be done with the information. The noise contours for Winchester don't include the holding pattern flights despite the fact that these contribute to the overall aircraft noise experience by people there. Measurement here would confirm this omission.	
	Para 6.7 It is good that you intend to predict what's coming in the future based on modelling but will the noise measurements mentioned in section 7 be used to inform and improve the modelling?	
Trade-off between number of flights and quieter aircraft	Section 4.4.1: Even if aircraft are getting quieter, if the number of flights increases, there is no noise benefit.	The noise modelling conducted to produce the noise contour maps takes into account both the number and noise emissions of the aircraft.
	Bigger airport means more flights - all this is pointless waffle	
	See earlier comment. The best way to reduce noise is not to have more frequent, larger aircraft. Even better would be to have fewer aircraft, which handily would also avoid exacerbating the climate and ecological emergency.	
	Aircraft may well be less noisy than in the 1960s, but there is much more air travel than 60 years ago, and the aircraft flying over our home can hardly be described as quiet.	
	The level of noise is compounded by the number of flights. More flights will mean more noise in general. This is compounded when there are several jet planes coming in to land in quick succession. If you want to minimise the impact of noise, you need to disallow the introduction of larger planes.	

Theme	Comment	Response
Use of 2021 contours	I don't understand why 2021 has been used as a point of comparison with 2016, given that you acknowledge that aviation was severely curtailed due to the pandemic.	<p>We have discussed the impact of Covid with the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) who provide guidance on Noise Action Planning. They have confirmed that we must still model 2021 despite the reduced traffic as a result of Covid. We recognise that 2021 is heavily impacted by Covid and propose to leave the previous 2016 NAP online as a point of comparison.</p> <p>Changes to the noise contours as traffic returns to pre-covid levels will be reflected in the annual noise modelling. In response to these comments, we will commit to publishing a noise report on our website annually that will include noise contours from the annual noise modelling. This new commitment has been added to the NAP.</p>
	5. The tables show noise levels during 2021 - in the middle of the pandemic. It is not appropriate or relevant to use these measures to indicate anything.	
	Is any of this data meaningful, given that it is taken from 2021, during the middle of the Coronavirus pandemic? It seems neither useful nor reliable.	
	I appreciate the fact that your statutory reporting requirements mean that you need to give full data for 2021, despite that being unrepresentative due to Covid effects. It is regrettable that, despite the comments of the Consultative Committee, you did not choose to provide 2016 data for comparison purposes. I can only conclude that such inclusion would have been unhelpful to your presentation.	
	Section 5 and contour maps Appendix A – Albeit DEFRA requires the Airport to model 2021 data, there should be greater reference to and inclusion of data and contour mapping from 2016 (or a more recent but prepandemic year). The NAP is a public document and it is important that there is helpful data for the lay reader to understand the likely (postpandemic) extent of noise and noise impacts.	
	2021 was severely affected by the covid lockdowns and the inability to travel. I would suggest any comparisons of noise levels between this year and another would be meaningless.	
Concentration vs dispersion	If the plan is for planes to follow a more streamlined route so a smaller area is impacted I think this would make it far worse and more concentrated for those people than having planes come in over a wider area.	Changes to flight paths are not part of NAP. Any changes to routes will be assessed as part of Airspace Change Process which will include a separate public consultation period (see section 2.5).
	If you support the concentration of the flight path into a narrower band then those of us directly affected will have miserable lives.	
Noise from Southampton Docks	Noise from the Airport is conflated with noise from other sources, principally Southampton Docks.	As highlighted in Section 2.1, noise from the Solent Freeport and Navigator Quarter are outside the scope of the Noise Action Plan, which is defined by the government's requirements.
	Southampton Dock noise is the dominant noise stressor, both in terms of volume, and 24 hour duration. Concern should be with substantially reducing the environmental effect of the sea port, without which, further mitigation of noise from the airport is of little effect.	
	S23 See comments regarding 24hr operation of container port	

Theme	Comment	Response
Communication - Consultation on ground running times	On point 13 will these times be decided in consultation with the local community?	There are currently no plans to change the times of ground running operations.
Compensation	Will residents be offered any compensation for the increase in noise expected from increase traffic?	Compensation is available through the noise insulations scheme. Please see Section 6.1.6 for details.
Definition of densely populated	I note that DP9 mentions the avoidance of overflying densely populated residential areas, etc. What is the definition of 'densely populated'? Where I live in Bitterne Park is, to my mind, densely populated (46.8 people per hectare according to UKcensusdata.com).	There is no formal definition of a densely populated area in the context of airspace change. We use population density heatmaps to present population data visually and post-code level population data to calculate the population within each contour.
Don't understand comment!	Possibly short sighted taking account of potential of electrically powered regional aircraft working with major hub airports	It's not clear what this comment is referring to. As set out in Action 14, we will encourage the development of electric and hybrid electric aircraft and consider the noise implications of future aircraft technology.
Noise from drones	What about drone activity? The public have been told that commercial use of drones, eg for Amazon deliveries, is to increase considerably in the future. Will these drones operate out of Southampton Airport? If not, out of which hub will they operate? They, too, are very noisy.	There are no firm plans at present for drone operations from the airport but we are open to considering opportunities for how the airport can fit into the future of air mobility. The noise impacts of any future plans would be strictly assessed.
Noise from low flying aircraft / close to the airport	<p>Your noise mitigation measures do not stop the noise we suffer from low-flying aircraft.</p> <p>Of course what affects me are aircraft flying over head, so only No. 11 would benefit me and that has a really long time frame. It is meaningless for the next 5 to 10 years</p> <p>This is mainly waffle, as to monitoring routing flights would have to be severely off course as I am so close to the runway for this to affect me.</p>	The actions set out in the NAP seek to minimise aircraft noise as a whole, including noise from low flying aircraft. The altitude of aircraft operations is taken into account in the noise modelling that is conducted to create the noise contours. Our noise insulation scheme is available to properties within the 60dB L _{Aeq,16hr} summer contour.
FlightPath 2050 target	Please also clarify that this target is for a reduction in total noise, not noise per flight or noise per passenger.	The FlightPath 2050 target is for a 65 per cent reduction in noise emissions by airborne aircraft relative to year 2000 levels.
Rounding of population counts	Section 5 results of noise mapping – numbers of households affected are quoted to the nearest 100, when the current plan (2018 -2023) quotes these to the nearest 50. The number of these falling within Eastleigh or Southampton Council boundaries is not distinguished.	This is standard industry practice and in line with CAA guidance which specifies population to be rounded to the nearest 100.
Employment	Statements about jobs being affected has no place or relevance in a Noise Action Plan, its only use is for poor justification.	As per Government noise policy, noise impacts are balanced against economic and social benefits.
Typo	By the way, on page 37 the approx. cost of staff is listed as £90,00. - a typo?	<p>This should read £90,000 and has now been fixed in the document.</p> <p>Change made to Appendix B</p>

Theme	Comment	Response
Use of solar panels	<p>I'm really pleased about your steps to limit night time aircraft movement and are continuing on from what is already happening. I am glad you are going to fund changes in infrastructure such as insulation of some buildings, and some improvement in green spaces.</p> <p>I am also glad you are using electric points instead of diesel to reduce aircraft taxiing. Will you be using solar panels to generate the electricity? this too would help reduce your carbon impact and also work towards a lower carbon target and would be more sustainable.</p>	100% of the electricity used by the airport comes from renewable sources.
Reduction of noise by 75%	The mention that aircraft have reduced their noise output by 75% in 50 years is misleading, since 75% equates to either 3dB or 6dB depending on what is actually being measured. 75% sounds like a substantial amount, but it is not in this context.	Reducing the noise produced by aircraft is an important part of minimising aircraft noise as a whole. The reductions in aircraft noise achieved by the aviation industry over the last 50 years have led to a significant reduction in the impacts of aircraft noise. Looking at the four largest UK airports, despite an additional 93,190 (+9.8%) aircraft movements there has been a reduction of over 127,000 (-31.6%) people included within the 57dBA $L_{Aeq,16\text{ hr}}$ noise contour between 1998 and 2011.
General negative comments	<p>I am not against the airport closing. Noise levels need to be under control, as along with many other issues relating to extending the runway.</p> <p>I think this is a load of waffle to get your own way and you don't plan to take action, and actually can't take any action to stop the noise disturbance for those of us in your flight paths. More runways/bigger airport means more flight and more noise. Gatwick and Heathrow are very easy to get too, and I can't see why you want to make Soton airport larger.</p> <p>This is just all pointless. If it was worth doing why is it not happening now?</p> <p>Pointless - do any of you actually live in a property on a flight path? Do you have any idea how noisy it is currently? Do you not care about the environment?</p> <p>Utterley inadequate. It's too noisy as it is and you're going to make it worse. How are you going to monitor impacts on health? How are you going to log complaints? Response within 5 days? An automated one presumably. 5 days is easily enough time to cause major stress to people through noise. How are you going to improve outdoor spaces "with a focus on noise-related health issues" when getting people outside will expose them to MORE of your noise pollution?? How will you actually deal with complaints? Would you, for example, stop a particular kind</p>	<p>We seek to be a responsible neighbour and to minimise the impact of aircraft noise on the local community within the framework established by national and local government. Management of noise is an on-going process. Several new pro-active actions have been introduced including the noise insulation scheme, noise forum, noise cap, and community health and wellbeing fund. In response to the comments received through this consultation, we have committed to publishing an annual noise report which will report on progress against these actions as well as the annual noise contours.</p> <p>Change made to NAP - new action 5</p>

Theme	Comment	Response
	of aircraft from using the airport if there were complaints? I don't think so! So what's the point? As already mentioned, the night-time hours are inadequate.	