

Friday 1st November 2019

East Midlands Airport: Future Airspace Research – Workshops

Melanie Nicholls – Director, Head of Qualitative Research

Natasha Ward – Senior Research Executive, Qualitative Research

YouGov[®]

Report structure:



Slide 3: Background, sample & method



Slide 6: Perceptions of the draft design principles



Slide 63: Final thoughts

Background, sample and method

Background, aims and objectives

- As part of Government proposals to modernise the way UK airspace is managed, East Midlands Airport (EMA) will soon be undertaking an extensive process of engagement and consultation with stakeholders and local communities. Over the course of the next few years EMA will bring together NATS, the CAA and other airports to shape the airspace design on which it will formally consult (likely in 2020). Before this, it will be important to speak to individuals, organisations and groups that have an interest in the airspace around EMA to provide feedback on principles that will be used to redesign the airspace, as part of the overall programme.
- The research will seek to capture feedback from a range of interested parties to ensure that EMA has a clear understanding of the views of all its major stakeholder groups, and that the design principles that emerge are properly understood and fit for purpose. This will set the foundations of the future airspace work.
- The key aims and objectives of the research are to:
 - Ensure that EMA have complied fully with the requirements of the CAAs CAP1616 process regarding engagement in Stage 1B.
 - Ensure that EMA has a strong understanding of the views of its stakeholder groups, to inform the subsequent stages of design and development.
 - Ensure that the design principles that emerge are properly understood, are consistent with the statement of need, support operational requirements, and allow EMA to continue to grow safely and efficiently.
 - And, ensure that the design principles that emerge are checked and validated with stakeholders from the focus groups with a proper understanding of the associated impacts, via a second phase of workshops.

Sample and method

- YouGov conducted 1 x 2.5 hour workshops with stakeholders, identified by EMA. The workshop took place on 28th October, and comprised a range of stakeholders. The stakeholder group specification is outlined below.

General Public / Aviation / ICC / Elected reps / Business stakeholders

- **15 x respondents, split across the following stakeholder groups:**
 - General public – all living in the 4 quadrants surrounding the airport
 - ICC – all members of the Independent Consultative Committee
 - Aviation – Or directly affected on- / off- airport stakeholders
 - Elected reps – all members of district, local and parish councils
 - Business – all in regional / local business / development / environmental organisations

Draft Design principles review

Eleven draft Design principles were shown to stakeholders

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE A



Safety must take precedent over all other factors. Flight paths must be safe and cannot increase risk to airspace users, the airport or communities on the ground.

6

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE B



Any changes must align with the broader national airspace modernisation strategy, comply with national, international and industry regulations and legislation, and align with current and future ACPs in the FASI-North and FASI-South areas.

7

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE C



New flight paths must ensure the continuation of services offered today and meet any future demand, in keeping with local and national planning policy, and the Government's policy on 'making best use' of airport capacity.

8

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE D



Flight paths should be designed to futureproof our airspace. They cannot be bound or constrained by existing arrangements, although current ways of flying should be assessed and, where appropriate, retained.

9

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE E



Flight paths should, where possible, be spread out to avoid undue concentration of aircraft activity and share any noise impacts.

10

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE F



Where flight paths have to overfly communities, we will consider existing noise in the local area, and will avoid flying over areas with relatively low ambient noise where it is practical to do so.

11

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE G



The most sustainable flight paths that limit and, where possible, reduce emissions and impact on the environment should be implemented.

12

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE H



Flight paths should seek to limit and, where possible, reduce noise disturbance to communities - especially at night.

13

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE I



Our airspace should be open to all users; however priority will be given to airport air traffic over other airspace users, except for emergency aircraft.

14

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE J



The latest navigational technology and most modern flying techniques should be utilised to improve route accuracy, reduce noise and reduce emissions.

15

Future Airspace Programme
DESIGN PRINCIPLE K



Flight paths should, where practical, avoid areas that are especially sensitive to noise.

16

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE A



Safety must take precedent over all other factors. Flight paths must be safe and cannot increase risk to airspace users, the airport or communities on the ground.

Design principle A is seen as a logical inclusion: safety is crucial for air travel, and it's key for any redesign

- **Overall, this is seen as an important principle**
 - For most, this is an obvious inclusion – safety is paramount, and it should be at the core of any redesign
 - Many see this as a strong statement from EMA, setting out their intent to take a 'safety first' approach to new routes
- **The implications of this are broadly understood**
 - Most can understand the implications for airspace users, the airport and communities on the ground: their safety is being assured
 - However, individuals comment on risk, which seems to be negatively framed (i.e. 'cannot increase risk')
- **However, there are some questions about the finer details**
 - Some (Aviation) question what 'airspace users' means in this context – does this also include GA, or is it focused on commercial?
 - There are also some questions about what 'safe' means in this context, and how it is assessed as it stands.

Draft Design Principle A

“Safety must take precedent over all other factors. Flight paths must be safe and cannot increase risk to airspace users, the airport or communities on the ground.”

All understand the inclusion of this principle, and feel that it reflects earlier conversations on the topic

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- All – across stakeholder groups – can understand the inclusion of this principle.
- Stakeholders recognise the importance of safety in air travel, and they expect safety to be at the core of any redesign of airspace.
- Many feel that this reflects earlier conversations in the focus groups, where safety was a ‘given’ for stakeholders.

Draft Design Principle A

“Safety must take precedent over all other factors. Flight paths must be safe and cannot increase risk to airspace users, the airport or communities on the ground.”

For most, Design principle A is felt to be simple and clear, but small changes to content / language would make it even more so

Clarification / extra information

- Many want to know more about the industry standards – the principle *assumes* they are adequate – but they want this to be ensured.
- Some want more information on what ‘safety’ includes here, and specific details on how safety is assessed.
- There are also calls for a definition of ‘airspace users’, especially amongst Aviation reps.

Changes to language

- Language generally works well, as it’s clear and simple, but small changes are requested:
- There’s potential to add ‘**all**’ to ‘**airspace users**’ to make it clear that GA is also included here.
- Individuals would welcome the use of ‘**should reduce risk**’ instead of ‘**cannot increase risk**’, which is felt to be stronger.

"Well, it's common sense. You can't have planes crashing into each other or dangerous on the ground."

"You just need to know what, I suppose, the current risk assessment is."

"I totally agree with the statement, or the aims. The only problem is that I know of 2 incidences, quite recently, where this has not been the case."

"I think it's common sense. In my industry, safety's number one, above everything else"

"It should include everybody who uses the airspace, not just commercial."

"That would seem to have gone without saying, and I would assume that anyone planning something like this would give safety precedence."

"I would agree with that comment. Safety seems to be paramount and should not be compromised."

"Having so many students in that area, you would want safety to be absolutely paramount. Students can make mistakes, so you want to minimise the impact that those mistakes have."

"It would be good to have in it that, where possible, it should reduce risk."

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE B



Any changes must align with the broader national airspace modernisation strategy, comply with national, international and industry regulations and legislation, and align with current and future ACPs in the FASI-North and FASI-South areas.

As EMA must align changes with national strategy and other airports, Design principle B makes sense

- **All agree that this is a key principle to include**
 - Stakeholders understand that EMA needs to ‘plug into’ neighbouring airspace / airspace above 7,000ft, so this makes sense
 - Many see this as an important way to future-proof airspace
 - However, individuals do call out whether dovetailing with other airports will stifle innovation / impact the extent of changes that can be rolled out
- **The implications of this are broadly understood**
 - Most can understand the implications of this – EMA will need to consider other bodies in any changes that are made
 - However, some feel that EMA will have to consider many other airports in the process – both those in FASI-N and FASI-S – which could be a challenge
 - Individuals ask whether EMA will have to compromise routes, in order to integrate with other airports
- **However, ask for clarification on key points**
 - There are calls for more details on the strategy, regulations and legislation
 - There is also opportunity to explain more technical language (e.g. ACPs / FASI-N / FASI-S), which requires explanation at present

Draft Design Principle B
“Any changes must align with the broader national airspace modernisation strategy, comply with national, international and industry regulations and legislation, and align with current and future ACPs in the FASI-North and FASI-South areas.”

Stakeholders understand the inclusion of this principle: EMA must look at the bigger picture before making changes

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- Stakeholders recognise the importance of this principle: EMA cannot make changes that will negatively impact other airports, or the airspace above 7,000ft.
- And for many, its inclusion is seen as mandatory, given the requirement for changes at EMA to satisfy national, international and industry regulations, and legislation.

Draft Design Principle B

“Any changes must align with the broader national airspace modernisation strategy, comply with national, international and industry regulations and legislation, and align with current and future ACPs in the FASI-North and FASI-South areas.”

The language / content broadly works well in Design principle B, but small changes would be welcome

Clarification / extra information

- There are calls for summary information on current legislation and international standards, for context.
- Some also question how EMAs plans can align with future ACPs, when these are an 'unknown', so this could be clarified or re-phrased.

Changes to language

- Language is felt to be clear, though this can be honed in places:
- **'ACP'** is understood when explained, but this should be defined for ease.
- While **'FASI-N and FASI-S'** are understood with explanation, this could be spelled out more clearly in the copy.

“If that dovetailing means that there is not an ability to innovate as much as you want to, you could be hamstrung a little bit.”

“It all seems inevitable, because it’s got to fit in with the rest of the airspace around it.”

“We can have this vision of change, but I think ultimately, the bigger players will influence whatever final decision you have.”

“I think, to me, reading a statement like that, it’s not quite clear what the strategy is for modernisation and if the changes align to that, that’s great, but I don’t know what exactly are they aligning to.”

“My group was very concerned that we should try and make sure that things were futureproof. Okay, you can’t guarantee what will happen in the future, but you can predict trends.”

“I think it would be clearer...using shorter sentences and less commas.”

“The challenges are that it potentially can change what’s happening now. So, lots of people not being happy with it in certain areas.”

“Abbreviations. I’ve already forgotten what ACP stands for.”

“FASI-North’ and ‘FASI-South’, to me, is saying that they might be different, when they shouldn’t be. It should be a nationwide thing.”

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE C



New flight paths must ensure the continuation of services offered today and meet any future demand, in keeping with local and national planning policy, and the Government's policy on 'making best use' of airport capacity.

Principle C makes sense on the surface, but more information is needed for respondents to fully understand the impact

- **Stakeholders can see the rationale for this principle**
 - Many see the need to make best use of airport capacity and agree that runway capacity should be used effectively
 - Stakeholders can see the commercial benefits of EMA and realise it provides an important local service – in terms of leisure / business flights, and freight
 - They also understand that EMA will have to comply with Government policy
- **The implications of this aren't clear**
 - While respondents understand the rationale here, they question what is meant by 'making best use' – if this means increased volume of flights, then many worry about the noise and emissions impact in future
 - In contrast, if it means flights can be concentrated into fewer hours each day, there could be a reduction in disruption to local communities
- **There are questions around the content**
 - While it makes sense to comply with Government policy, many ask what this actually involves – some also note that policy is changeable, so plans should look beyond this where possible
 - Others comment that 'future demand' is difficult to assess, and want assurance that EMA will not use this as a carte blanche to grow exponentially

Draft Design Principle C
“New flight paths must ensure the continuation of services offered today and meet any future demand, in keeping with local and national planning policy, and the Government's policy on 'making best use' of airport capacity.”

While many have further questions about Design principle C, they can understand why it has been included

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- Regardless of whether stakeholders are familiar with current policy or not, they understand that EMA needs to comply with Government policy, making this a logical inclusion in the shortlist.
- Many can see why there is a need to consider future demand, however they are unclear on what this means in practice.

Draft Design Principle C
“New flight paths must ensure the continuation of services offered today and meet any future demand, in keeping with local and national planning policy, and the Government's policy on 'making best use' of airport capacity.”

Clarification would be welcomed in Principle C – respondents want to understand what this means for people on the ground

Clarification / extra information

- There are calls for clarification around the term ‘capacity’: some see this as more aircraft while others see this as increased throughput.
- Many want to know more about Government policy – what is incorporated, and will it change?
- A majority want to understand what ‘best use’ means – many raise concern over what this will look like in terms of noise and emissions.

Changes to language

- Language is broadly understood, but there are calls for clarification:
- ‘**Best use**’ needs to be defined, as does ‘**capacity**’, which many currently struggle with.
- Some ask for ‘**future demand**’ to be qualified (e.g. ‘attempt to meet...’), to reassure those concerned about increased volume.

“How do you determine best use of airport capacity? I’m not sure about that. I mean, I personally think East Midlands Airport can increase its capacity greatly, if it had a proper transport system.”

“What type of flight paths they’ll have, is it people going on holiday? Is it transporting goods? What time of day is it?”

“I’ve got no idea what the government’s policy of making best use is”

“That’s going to change with every government, whether that be national or local. So, you really need to look beyond that to say, ‘Actually, what’s not just government policy, what’s the best use of airport capacity full stop.’”

“It’s too vague a statement. It needs to be more factual. That’s my opinion.”

“Your background statement said that the driving force was not to increase volume, but that is all about increasing volume. It says ‘meet any future demand’, which is open-ended and very dangerous.”

“If that meant you could handle 30 flights an hour, rather than 15, if that meant that what you had was half the amount of time of flights coming in, that would be great. If it meant that you doubled the number of flights, that would be bad.”

“One thing that does strike me is the tension that we currently have, nationally, in terms of meeting climate change objectives.”

“You could qualify that by putting ‘attempt to meet any future demand’ or ‘consult on meeting future demand’, but you can’t just have ‘shall meet future demand’.”

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE D



Flight paths should be designed to futureproof our airspace. They cannot be bound or constrained by existing arrangements, although current ways of flying should be assessed and, where appropriate, retained.

Design principle D is generally supported, however the phrasing should be refined to avoid confusion

- **Stakeholders think that this makes sense**
 - In line with focus group discussions, a majority see the need to design a number of new routes ‘from scratch’
 - Many are clear that the airspace as it stands is no longer fit for purpose, and see this as an important opportunity to create a more efficient system
 - Stakeholders realise that routes will be designed to balance efficiency, noise and emissions, and agree that in some cases old routes may need to be retained
- **The implications aren’t immediately obvious**
 - The statement as it stands seems confusing, almost a contradiction in terms, and some can struggle to understand the implications
 - In starting with a blank slate, it seems that all possible options would be assessed including existing routes, making the final statement ‘current ways of flying’ feel redundant
- **Some raise questions as a result of this**
 - A minority call for clarity around the meaning of ‘future-proofing’ – it is a vague term when the future is somewhat difficult to predict – and difficult to visualise

Draft Design Principle D
“Flight paths should be designed to futureproof our airspace. They cannot be bound or constrained by existing arrangements, although current ways of flying should be assessed and, where appropriate, retained.”

Design principle D is a logical inclusion and reflects calls for a ‘blank slate’ in earlier discussions

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- While on the surface the principle seems confusing, once unpacked, the approach makes sense and the potential benefits are clear to stakeholders.
- All recognise the opportunity to modernise airspace for the long-term, and agree that an unconstrained approach is appropriate, so this principle makes sense.

Draft Design Principle D
“Flight paths should be designed to futureproof our airspace. They cannot be bound or constrained by existing arrangements, although current ways of flying should be assessed and, where appropriate, retained.”

Honing the phrasing of this principle could make it clearer and much easier to digest

Clarification / extra information

- Many say that the current structure of the principle overcomplicates the issue, as it combines two statements which seem contradictory.
- The addition of *'although current ways of flying should be assessed and, where appropriate, retained'* confuses stakeholders the most.

Changes to language

- Language is generally clear, but small changes can be made:
- There's scope to reassess **'future-proofing'** as this can seem vague.
- Many call for the phrasing to be re-worked, to make it easier to read.

“When the present airspace was designed, it was designed around certain climb rates, and things like that, which are totally obsolete now.”

“Well, starting with a blank piece of paper sounds good.”

“When we were talking about this, we agreed that the plans and the way it works now were designed a long, long time ago, and they’re now obsolete.”

“I think there’s a way to do both, but it’s not very clear from the statement. I can see how people can be confused reading it.”

“The preamble acknowledged an openness to looking at new methods...this statement reverts back, it says the old routes should be retained, where appropriate. Why doesn’t that say ‘should be assessed and, where appropriate, replaced’.”

“It sounds like a contradiction in terms to me.”

“You can understand it, what they’re trying to say, it is working. So, go and look at that [existing routes], and keep the bits that do work, but they need to make some changes.”

“You’re starting from scratch, but you’re also reviewing current plans and then taking the best elements forward, and saying, ‘we’ll consider those when designing the new plans.’ That’s probably the better phrase.”

“Streamlining it would make the whole operation more efficient, reduce travel times, reduce flight times, which could potentially decrease the environmental impact. I think that might be one of the driving forces for this change.”

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE E



Flight paths should, where possible, be spread out to avoid undue concentration of aircraft activity and share any noise impacts.

While Design principle E is understood, noise impacts are viewed differently depending on stakeholders' own experiences

- **The principle is broadly understood**
 - Noise is a key concern for those living near to / under flight paths
 - Those most affected are keen to see a reduction in noise, especially at night – to them, spreading out of the impact seems a fair course of action
 - However, those living in areas currently unaffected by noise struggle to see the benefit of spreading out flights
- **Implications for emissions / efficiency are questioned**
 - For many (those less affected by noise), this is not seen as a priority, as noise falls behind factors such as efficiency and emissions
 - Many are also quick to caution that spreading out flights is only positive if there is a large reduction in noise impact – negligible differences would not justify disturbing areas not currently overflowed
- **Many raise questions about implementation**
 - Height of over-flying, time of day, location (urban or rural) all need to be taken account of when putting this principle into practice – it's a complex challenge

Draft Design Principle E
“Flight paths should, where possible, be spread out to avoid undue concentration of aircraft activity and share any noise impacts.”

While stakeholders understand the logic behind this, they are split on whether they agree or not

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- While stakeholders can understand the inclusion of this principle, NIMBY-ism is at play, with those impacted by aircraft noise seeing this as the best way to share the burden.
- However, others question whether the potential implications – on emissions, communities on the ground, efficiency – justifies this.
- The key consideration for this principle is whether the benefit to some justifies the impact on others.

Draft Design Principle E
“Flight paths should, where possible, be spread out to avoid undue concentration of aircraft activity and share any noise impacts.”

The principle is clear, but more detail is needed to help this to cut through effectively

Clarification / extra information

- More information is called for about the frequency at which flights would go over communities when spread out.
- Spreading out of noise is seen as less of an issue in urban areas with high ambient noise, but if spreading occurs over more rural communities, some say this would be a point of contention.

Changes to language

- Language generally works well in this principle, and there are no calls for change.

“My concern would be that it depends how infrequent they would be over each area, because does it mean that just more people would get annoyed?”

“I think rural communities can be affected. I think the higher an aircraft flies, the less you hear it. So, the significant issue for me would be low-level flight paths.”

“To me, it seems instinctively fair just to share out the load.”

“What I’m saying here is you should try living in other places and try to sleep through the night, when DHL are delivering the overnight parcels.”

“I can see the logic in having it as a principle, but it wouldn’t be one of my highest priorities.”

“It says where possible it should be to avoid undue concentration of aircraft activity. I think it should just be concentrating on what’s the most efficient way.”

“I disagree [that noise isn’t an issue], because I have to listen to it.”

“Giving more people noise, rather than fewer people with noise, but it won’t be the same amount of noise.”

“I think it just depends on times of day, numbers. If we are going to spread out what there is now, then possibly people will be okay with that.”

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE F



Where flight paths have to overfly communities, we will consider existing noise in the local area, and will avoid flying over areas with relatively low ambient noise where it is practical to do so.

Design principle F shows consideration for communities, but some are concerned for built-up areas at night

- **Stakeholders can understand the inclusion of this**
 - Respondents agree that quieter areas are likely to be affected most by overflying, so ambient noise should be considered when assessing new routes
 - However, the language here is softer than in other statements and seems to some to offer a 'get out clause'
- **Some question the implications of this at night**
 - While the principle makes sense during the day, many argue that ambient noise at night is much lower
 - Arrangements should take this into account in order to ensure communities in built-up areas are not disproportionately affected at night
- **Some question how this fits with Principle E**
 - Some feel this principle overlaps with the previous one – a minority worry that having too many noise-focussed principles during assessment will give noise a greater weighting over other principles – could these be combined?
 - A minority also question whether flying over busier areas would have safety implications.

Draft Design Principle F
“Where flight paths have to overfly communities, we will consider existing noise in the local area, and will avoid flying over areas with relatively low ambient noise where it is practical to do so.”

Respondents see the logic behind Principle F, but want reassurance that impact will be assessed at different time points

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- A majority of stakeholders understand the need to consider the levels of ambient noise in areas overflown, and understand its inclusion.
- They are in agreement that areas of low ambient noise are likely to experience greater impact than areas with high background noise.
- However, distinction must be made between ambient noise during day and night time hours.

Draft Design Principle F
“Where flight paths have to overfly communities, we will consider existing noise in the local area, and will avoid flying over areas with relatively low ambient noise where it is practical to do so.”

While stakeholders can see the logic behind this principle, more detail would provide further reassurance

Clarification / extra information

- While respondents support this principle in theory, this is (for a majority) based on the assumption that night and daytime impact will be assessed differentially to reflect changing levels of ambient noise – clarification is required.
- There are also questions about how safety fits in here, if communities are to be flown over (in case of disaster).

Changes to language

- Language is generally clear, but small changes can be made:
- Using **'will consider'** and **'where it is practical'** seems non-committal to some, and there are calls for the language to be stronger.

“What I’m saying is even some cities, and Derby’s quite a busy place during the day, but at night, there’s not a sound.”

“You’re not going to be affected as much at midday as you would be at midnight.”

“If the aim of this is to be more efficient that might not be the best way to do it. You might sort of appease one group of people but then completely miss the point of what you’re trying to do.”

“There are 3 or 4 which are about noise. If you’ve got [principles] which go against each other... then you say, ‘Because of E and F we are flying over here.’ Should they be combined together so that you can’t then play one off against the other.”

“It’s logical to consider noise and populations. I’m not sure I agree with just avoiding rural areas. You need to consider time of day. You need the decibel readings. It’s very different at 3 o’clock in the afternoon compared to 3 o’clock in the morning.”

“We’re going to avoid low-ambient noise areas and go over areas that are relatively high and not worry about it.’ I know the statement says ‘unless it gets unacceptably high’, but that’s a very broad principle.”

“It seems to me to make sense. If you’re in a major city you’re never going to notice it between the police sirens, student parties, stag dos, hen dos. It’s going to go underneath the radar.”

“What about overall safety? Surely if anything does happen, which it does very rarely, fortunately, it’s far better to crash into fields than houses.”

“It’s a good statement in general but when it says ‘we’ll consider existing noise in the local area, we will avoid flying over where it’s practical to do so’. You could consider it and say, ‘Yes, that’s not that practical, we’ll just carry on.’ It’s too vague.”

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE G



The most sustainable flight paths that limit and, where possible, reduce emissions and impact on the environment should be implemented.

With emissions a key issue for many, Design principle G is an important inclusion

- **All agree that emissions should be included here**
 - The impact of aircraft emissions on the environment was a key theme in focus groups – and stakeholders are clear that this issue should be considered
 - However, many are surprised that sustainability and emissions are only mentioned in one principle whereas noise is included in multiple principles
 - Some also feel this should be ‘a given’, and are looking for a stronger statement from EMA, with stronger language
- **There’s a conflict between noise / emissions implications**
 - While respondents support the principle, they note that it is likely to mean more direct routes – this could mean flying over communities or areas with low ambient noise, which is a conflict
- **Some question the terms used in this principle**
 - Some question what ‘sustainable flight paths’ means in practice, while others would like to see emissions defined for clarity
 - Others also wonder whether noise is included in ‘impact on the environment’

Draft Design Principle G
“The most sustainable flight paths that limit and, where possible, reduce emissions and impact on the environment should be implemented.”

This principle is a logical inclusion – emissions are a key issue for many and must be considered in the redesign process

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- Respondents agree that this is an important inclusion in the shortlist – it’s a key topic that needs to be addressed.
- Emissions were discussed in depth in previous sessions, and it remains a priority for many – stakeholders agree that a separate principle for the issue is warranted.

Draft Design Principle G
“The most sustainable flight paths that limit and, where possible, reduce emissions and impact on the environment should be implemented.”

Respondents agree with the principle, but clarification of the key terms would help to fine-tune it

Clarification / extra information

- Some want more information about what sustainability looks like in the context of Aviation – does it simply mean more direct routes?
- Emissions could also be clarified – it is unclear whether this refers to CO2 or other by-products, while some also note that noise could be included in environmental impact.

Changes to language

- Language is generally clear, but tone and content could be honed:
- **'Emissions'** needs to be defined for clarity.
- There are also calls for **'sustainable flight paths'** to be unpacked further.
- **'Must'** and **'will'** could replace **'should'** to make this a stronger statement.

“We absolutely must be reducing emissions where possible. If we’re going to fly, we need to try and take a route that reduces emissions where possible. It’s got to happen.”

“Can I clarify what does it mean by reduce emissions? How is it quantified in the sense of aviation?”

“The changes that could be made locally in terms of the flightpaths will have a miniscule impact on the total emissions from the whole flight. It’s an extremely small impact...the proper way to reduce emissions is to reduce the number of flights.”

“It’s the only time the word ‘sustainable’ has been in the principles.”

“The principles are getting slacker as we go through. We’ve now got the word ‘should’ in there, instead of ‘must’ and ‘can’.”

“Where it says impact on the environment, do you think that’s taking into account noise?”

“It is contrary to what the other two principles were saying. ‘Let’s spread it out, give everybody a little bit,’ or should we have it more sustainable, which reduces emissions.”

“If you’re using flight paths which reduce emissions, you’re talking about very direct flight paths...you’re going to be overflying areas that haven’t been flown before, so noise in a wider area.”

“Sustainable flight paths, I’m not quite sure what they are. I understand the concept of sustainability, but I don’t know what a sustainable flight path is.”

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE H



Flight paths should seek to limit and, where possible, reduce noise disturbance to communities - especially at night.

Design principle H is felt to make sense, and the reference to night noise suggests that EMA is taking the noise challenge seriously

- **Overall, this is seen as an important inclusion**
 - This principle shows a clear consideration to neighbouring communities who are currently impacted by noise
 - The inclusion of night flights in this principle is key: this is a challenge for local residents, and it's being explicitly addressed
- **The implications of this are broadly understood**
 - The potential for reduction in night noise is clear and is welcomed
 - However, some question how this will play out in reality, i.e. to what degree will it be limited / reduced?
 - Individuals also note that a reduction in night noise might not be compatible with a reduction in emissions – and these factors need to be balanced
- **However, some questions do emerge**
 - Stakeholders ask for some points to be qualified, for example what constitutes 'night' flights here, for clarity

***Draft Design Principle H**
“Flight paths should seek to limit and, where possible, reduce noise disturbance to communities – especially at night.”*

With the impact of noise on communities a key concern, the inclusion of Design principle H makes sense

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- Stakeholders understand the premise of this, and the rationale for its inclusion.
- For those living close to the airport, noise is a key challenge, which they want to see being tackled head on.
- This principle is seen to acknowledge / address the disturbance that EMA can have on communities – particularly cargo night flights.

Draft Design Principle H
“Flight paths should seek to limit and, where possible, reduce noise disturbance to communities – especially at night.”

Small changes to content and language will make this cut through more effectively

Clarification / extra information

- While there's positivity at the inclusion of 'night flights' respondents want to know that this means – is it 11:00 until 7:00? Or midnight until 6:00?
- There are also some calls for details on what 'limit' and 'reduce' mean in this context.
- Individuals (general public) want more details on how noise will be measured, for clarity.

Changes to language

- Language is felt to be simple and clear, but there is opportunity to hone it:
- There's some kick back at the use of 'soft' language here (e.g. '**where possible**' and '**can**' vs. '**must**') – stronger language is desired
- Individuals ask to remove '**limit**' and replace it with '**not increase**' to strengthen the statement.

“East Midlands Airport is a major distribution centre, parcels come in and out, packages, all your deliveries, all your DHLs, all your Amazons. You don’t want to try and stop moving things around.”

“I like the ‘especially at night’ bit. In terms of noise reduction in the day, I think it’s a nice goal, but the other factors are more important to me.”

“If this are increasingly in capacity in respect to handling, you can still be limiting it and trying to keep as little as possible.”

“I put ‘Totally agree, let me sleep’.”

“We need to define what actually we mean between limit and reduce, how is that defined.”

“What does ‘night’ mean? Is that 11:00 until 7:00? Is it midnight until 6:00?”

“We may need to find a compromise with cargo providers because they contribute massively to the economy that they’re serving.”

“We’ve gone from ‘must’ to ‘can’ to ‘where possible’.”

“A general point in terms of noise, are we talking decibels or how long it goes on for?”

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE I



Our airspace should be open to all users; however priority will be given to airport air traffic over other airspace users, except for emergency aircraft.

Design principle I is felt to be common sense: airport air traffic and emergency aircraft should take priority

- **Overall, this is seen as a sensible inclusion**
 - All agree that it makes sense for airport traffic to take precedence over other airspace users, given that they make up the bulk of traffic
 - There is positivity at the prioritisation of emergency aircraft here, given the important role that they play
 - Many feel that this reflects the current airspace situation at EMA
- **The implications of this are clear and understood**
 - Stakeholders can see how this will impact commercial / emergency aircraft, allowing them to make use of the airspace as / when needed
 - However, some Aviation reps note that this may impact GA – airspace is already congested, so increasing CAS could result in more crowded airspace, making it more challenging for GA and leading to more infringements
- **However, some call out for clarification on key elements**
 - There are some calls for clarification around key terms (e.g. airspace users and emergency aircraft), which need to be better defined

Draft Design Principle I
“Our airspace should be open to all users; however priority will be given to airport air traffic over other airspace users, except for emergency aircraft.”

All understand the inclusion of this principle, and feel that it reflects earlier conversations on the topic

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- All stakeholders understand the rationale for including the principle, and those involved in the focus groups recall discussing this topic.
- Most see this as a 'common sense' approach to the use of airspace: prioritising commercial craft and emergency craft is logical.
- Some (esp. Aviation), however, note that this is how EMAs airspace is currently managed, so this keeps the status quo.

Draft Design Principle I

“Our airspace should be open to all users; however priority will be given to airport air traffic over other airspace users, except for emergency aircraft.”

Small changes to content and language will make this cut through more effectively

Clarification / extra information

- There's a need for the term 'emergency aircraft' to be clarified – does it mean air ambulance or aircraft in distress? This should be explicit.
- Some (esp. Aviation), ask what impact this will have on 'other airspace users' – will it be more challenging for GA to use this airspace? More information is needed to reassure.

Changes to language

- Language is felt to be simple and clear, but some terms can be further defined:
- There's scope to define '**emergency aircraft**' for clarity.
- As in previous principles '**other airspace users**' can be made more explicit.

“That’s the principle we’ve always had. The airspace around East Midlands Airport is governed and ruled by East Midlands air traffic. For a lot of people, this is a no-fly area unless you’ve got specific reasons.”

“If you were going to totally stop them from flying from a particular airstrip, that would be a major impact. This is saying they don’t care.”

“It seems like a very clear statement and it seems right. Obviously you’re going to give priority to airport traffic if you’re an airport.”

“Is that classed as an emergency situation, if an aircraft has to divert for other reasons? He’s got a problem with an engine... We’re fixated on emergency aircraft being the air ambulance. It could be other air emergencies.”

“I think this is just a statement because this is what’s already happening and I don’t see any reason why we need to change it.”

“If it’s open to all users people would know it’s there. I think it’s important if you do open it up to all users there will be a better sort of synergy between commercial operators and private operators.”

“It would be useful to know what impact that has on all the airspace users, to what extent they are prohibited.”

“I don’t know where the word ‘emergency’ starts and finishes.”

“I would be interested to see if anyone disagrees with it unless they own an aircraft.”

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE J



The latest navigational technology and most modern flying techniques should be utilised to improve route accuracy, reduce noise and reduce emissions.

Stakeholders agree that new technology will be key for futureproofing airspace, and can therefore see the value in Design principle J

- **This principle is seen to be an important inclusion**
 - Using the latest technology is seen as a natural step forward
 - Stakeholders agree that technology should be embraced in airspace redesign
- **Most can understand the implications of this**
 - Stakeholders can see the benefits of this – using the best technology to ensure a more efficient use of airspace
 - Individuals note that this could have a positive impact on safety, as the most up-to-date technology is likely to be the safest
 - However, some ask how easy this would be to enforce in reality, and see pushback from some airspace users (e.g. GA and smaller commercial lines) due to the costs involved
- **Many question some of the more technical points**
 - Stakeholders ask for some technical terms to be explained (e.g. latest navigational technology, modern flying techniques) to aid comprehension

Draft Design Principle J
“The latest navigational technology and most modern flying techniques should be utilised to improve route accuracy, reduce noise and reduce emissions.”

This is seen as a logical addition to the design principles – new technology will help to future-proof airspace

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- Embracing new technology is seen as a key part of the airspace modernisation programme, so the inclusion of this principle is understood.
- New technology will contribute to the future-proofing of airspace, ensuring a more efficient use of airspace, now and in future.

Draft Design Principle J

“The latest navigational technology and most modern flying techniques should be utilised to improve route accuracy, reduce noise and reduce emissions.”

The language / content broadly works well in Design principle J, but additional information about technical terms is requested

Clarification / extra information

- There's a demand for more information on the 'latest navigational technology' – who determines this? Is it being used already?
- Some (general public) question whether this technology is for aircraft or other airport systems, which could be clarified.
- Individuals (Aviation) note that other factors impact noise and emissions, beyond technology.

Changes to language

- Language broadly works well, though there are calls for small changes:
- Stakeholders ask for '**latest navigational technology**' to be defined.
- There is also some confusion about '**modern flying techniques**' so this needs to be explained.

“You’d think that it would support principle A about safety, the newest technology.”

“It would be nice to know what they actually mean by ‘navigation technology’ and ‘modern flying techniques’. That’s quite vague.”

“I’m curious what will happen to planes using the airspace of East Midlands Airport. Will they all be compliant with the latest navigation technology? How will it be enforced?”

“If you’ve got the latest technology and techniques, then safety would benefit. There would be a lot of investment required here. Are the government going to invest in this?”

“When does the latest navigation technology stop? Is somebody going to review it in five years’ time and say, ‘It’s not the latest anymore. You’re going to have to start doing this now.’”

“The flying techniques actually directly improve route accuracy, route tracking and accuracy. Whether you reduce noise and you reduce emissions depends...I think they perhaps tried to write too much in there.”

“We’re talking about a plan that’s going to be in place for a long time...It might be a problem for the next five years, but if you’re designing to futureproof...if you don’t do it now, you’re going to have a problem.”

“This is like the analogy you used with petrol engines and electric cars. It will happen over time, but I don’t think anyone can force an airline to spend millions of pounds on a new airplane.”

“I think this is happening organically.”

Future Airspace Programme

DESIGN PRINCIPLE K



Flight paths should, where practical, avoid areas that are especially sensitive to noise.

While Design principle K has value, many have questions about how it would work in practice

- **Most can see how this will work in theory**
 - Avoiding areas sensitive to noise is seen as a positive addition in theory, however, many question how this would work in practice
 - As a result, most see this as lower priority than other core principles
- **However, there are some questions about the implications**
 - While they're positive about avoiding areas sensitive to noise, it does raise the question of which areas will be overflown instead (e.g. urban vs. rural)
 - This could also feed into safety – would overflying areas less sensitive to noise have safety implications, i.e. if an aircraft went down over a heavily populated area
- **There are some questions about the finer details**
 - Some comment that 'sensitive to noise' can mean different things to different people – with some people naturally more / less sensitive to this
 - There are calls for details on how areas 'sensitive to noise' would be determined in this context
 - Others also question whether this conflicts with Principle E (spreading routes)

Draft Design Principle K
“Flight paths should, where practical, avoid areas that are especially sensitive to noise.”

Stakeholders understand the inclusion of the principle, which reflects earlier conversations in the focus groups

Is this a logical addition / does it make sense?

- All – across stakeholder groups – can understand the inclusion of this principle.
- However, many struggle with the practicality of this – how easy will it be to avoid such areas in reality? How would this impact overflying of urban / rural areas?
- Many are keen to see more information (in the consultation stage) to assess the value of this principle more effectively.

Draft Design Principle K
“Flight paths should, where practical, avoid areas that are especially sensitive to noise.”

There are calls for additional information, and clarification in some areas, to help this to cut through

Clarification / extra information

- Most are looking for context / clarification on what noise sensitive areas are, as these can be defined differently by different people.
- Some want to know whether these noise sensitive areas will be rural / urban; urban areas are expected to have more ambient noise.
- Some question what is meant by 'especially' sensitive to noise, which can be clarified.

Changes to language

- Language is generally clear, though some would like some changes to be made:
- The use of '**where practical**' could be reassessed. Some are unclear on what this means, while others see it as a 'get out clause'.
- '**Noise sensitive areas**' need to be defined, so that they can understand what types of areas fall into this category.

“Potentially some kind of compromise would have to be made. What that compromise is, I don’t know. It’s quite a tricky one as you’re not going to be able to please everyone with it.”

“Do you purposely avoid built up areas? If that falls out of the sky the last place you want it is in a highly populated area.”

“It seems to be pointing out that they’ll include this in the thinking but they’re not going to make it paramount, which seems reasonable.”

“What we said about time of day matters for that. It might be that one area is sensitive at night and another area is sensitive in the day.”

“What is the definition of areas especially sensitive to noise?”

“They could put examples though of the types of things to avoid.”

“‘Sensitive to noise’ I think of the peaks or something like that. That’s all rolling open fields. In my head sensitive to noise means open spaces but surely that’s where we want them to fly if you’re complaining about noise where you live.”

“It says ‘avoid areas’ as opposed to ‘limit traffic’ or ‘reduce traffic’.”

“Environmental changes based on sensitivity. If you spill some oil on the road, it doesn’t cause a problem. If you spill some oil in a river, it causes a big problem. Who determines what is sensitive?”

Final thoughts

Final thoughts

1

Stakeholders understand the inclusion of the design principles in the short list, though there are mixed views on Design principle E (spreading routes), depending on stakeholders' own experiences.

2

There's broad positivity at the inclusion of noise- and emissions-focused design principles, though those less affected by noise note that they seem weighted more towards noise than emissions.

3

While principles are generally understood, there are calls for content to be clarified / honed in places (e.g. definitions of 'making best use', 'capacity' and 'latest technology') to aid comprehension.

4

On the whole language is clear, although phrasing can be addressed in some cases. Design principle D is felt to be quite complicated to understand, and could be re-structured for clarity.

5

Stakeholders comment on the change in tone across principles – stronger language / tone used in Design principles A-C could be applied elsewhere to strengthen sentiment.

Friday 1st November 2019

East Midlands Airport: Future Airspace Research – Workshops

Melanie Nicholls – Director, Head of Qualitative Research

Natasha Ward – Senior Research Executive, Qualitative Research

YouGov[®]