

ID	What organisation do you represent?
1	Leeds Bradford Airport Support Group
2	Skyhigh skydiving
3	Crosland Moor Airfield (Huddersfield)
4	Harrogate District Chamber of Commerce
5	City Airport Ltd (Manchester/Barton)
6	Individual
7	Retired private individual
8	None
9	Ministry of Defence
10	LEDHAM PARISH COUNCIL
11	The four Gliding Clubs in the Vale of York viz:- York (Rufforth West); Yorkshire (Sutton Bank); Wolds (Pocklington) and Burn Gliding Clubs
12	Dales Hang gliding and Paragliding Club (DHPC)
13	Self
14	Pennine Soaring Club
15	Resident
16	None
17	Local resident
18	Independent submission: former ACC member
19	North West Leeds Transport Forum
20	MAG Manchester Airport
21	Leeds City Council Inner North West Community Committee
22	Bramhope & Carlton Parish Council
24	Menston Parish Council
25	Climate Action Menston
26	None
27	Ford
28	Regional Soaring Airspace Group (RSAG)
29	ATCSL/ Liverpool Airport/ Doncaster Airport
30	Liverpool John Lennon Airport
33	ARARA (Ash Road Area Residents Association) I am the chair and have been asked to reply on behalf of the group
34	Ryanair
36	Jet2.com

It is possible that, during the options development phase, flightpaths may be identified that have a lower potential environmental impact and greater efficiency. These flightpaths may of course im...

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Avoid affecting new people

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Avoid affecting new people

Avoid affecting new people

Avoid affecting new people

No comment

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek to reduce environmental impact and improve efficiency while prioritising the safety and health of all communities and other airspace users.

Avoid affecting new people

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Avoid affecting new people

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Avoid existing communities, not just new developments. It is essential that existing communities be p[rotected by adherence to the SID which is agreed and not permitting unnecessary deviation.

Seek options that reduce environmental impact

From a Manchester Airport perspective we would wish flightpaths to not adversely impact our operations.

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

We wish to reduce environmental impacts but are aware that there are many different environmental impacts. This question is confused. We do not consider that CO2 is a significant issue here as the flight route does not significantly change the overall CO2 emissions. We are however concerned about the toxic emissions (eg NOx and particulates) and the noise. We feel that these should be reduced overall, we do NOT prioritise avoiding impacting new communities as we consider it important that people in some areas are not differentially damaged.

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

It may be possible to concentrate or merge flightpaths in such a way that the environmental impact is always concentrated in certain areas (perhaps because the route is more efficient or affects l...

Concentrate

Concentrate

Don't know

Disperse

Concentrate

Concentrate

Concentrate

Disperse

No comment

Concentrate

Flight paths that ensure an agreed maximum exposure (less than the statutory limit) to noise is never exceeded for any individual or community.

Concentrate

Concentrate to reduce number of people affected

Concentrate

Disperse

Disperse

Flight paths should always be monitored and detailed reports provided for purposes of accountability. The structure of the questions already limits accountability

Whilst the better option would be to disperse, currently around 880% of departures are from Runway 32 over Menston and Burley. The argument for this is based on "the predominant wind direction" and is completely specious. Dispersal is the better option but future PBN-based SIDs must follow the specified route, not disperse within the swathe in contravention of CAA stipulation.

The aim should be to minimize the overall exposure of people to aircraft noise(exposure being defined as the total number of person-exposures). We understand that, while "dispersal" may be fairer, it could increase the number of people adversely affected and would require more resources to be deployed to properly monitor the ongoing impacts.

No comments. N/A as an airport stakeholder.

Disperse

Disperse

Disperse

Disperse

Disperse

Concentrate

Concentrate

Concentrate

Disperse

Don't know

Built-up areas (i.e. densely populated Areas)	Rural Areas (i.e. sparsely populated Areas)	Areas of Tranquillity (e.g. National Parks)
---	---	---

1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
3. Least Important	3. Least Important	3. Least Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	3. Least Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
1 - Most Important	2. Important	3. Least Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
1 - Most Important	2. Important	1 - Most Important
1 - Most Important	2. Important	3. Least Important
3. Least Important	2. Important	1 - Most Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
2. Important	1 - Most Important	1 - Most Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	3. Least Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	3. Least Important

1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important

1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
1 - Most Important	2. Important	2. Important
1 - Most Important	1 - Most Important	1 - Most Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
3. Least Important	2. Important	1 - Most Important
2. Important	3. Least Important	1 - Most Important
1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important

1 - Most Important	3. Least Important	2. Important
3. Least Important	2. Important	1 - Most Important

Are there any specific areas or noise sensitive buildings you would like us to be made aware of where overflight should be avoided if possible?
No
Flying below 16k of Shotton Airfield Dh6 2nh
No
No
No change to existing routes
No
No
No
No
Areas of intense aerial activity such as the Vale of York
Yes
No
Trough of Bowland, Ribble Valley
Yes
No
The assumption is made in the questionnaire that a single solution is possible. We already know that the airport justifies variation by detailing exceptions. All aircraft movements must be monitored and their impact reported
The villages of Menston and Burley-in-Wharfedale, which are currently being overflown in breach of the existing NPR/SID. If flights adhered to the existing SID, only about a dozen properties would be subjected to noise whereas the current policy of declaring the "swathe" the same as the SID leads to intrusive levels of noise.
The Leeds General Infirmary
No comments. N/A as an airport stakeholder.
No
This requires a set of categories of noise sensitive buildings to be ranked. Outdoor summer drama and music events should be avoided. Difficult to define at present as such activities are in abeyance. Temple Newsam and Kirkstall Abbey have hosted events in the past.
The village of Menston
Menston
No
No
Areas of Intense Aerial Activity (AAIA) & Areas of Intense Gliding Activity (AIGA)
No
No
schools, hospitals, care homes.
No

Some airports have sought opportunities to build into the system known periods of relief from the adverse effects of aviation noise. These known or scheduled periods are known as 'Respite' p

Don't mind

Yes

Don't mind

Don't mind

Don't mind

Don't know

Yes

Yes

No comment

Yes

No

No

give night time respite to as many people as possible (eg by overflying rural areas instead). Respite afforded to one built up area at the expense of another may be "fair" but will increase the total number of people affected in a given time period and so increase total annoyance and sleep loss.

Don't mind

Yes

Don't know

Again. This looks like genuine consultation But it is not

Yes

Give night time respite to as many people as possible (eg by overflying rural areas instead). Respite afforded to one built up area at the expense of another may be "fair" but will increase the total number of people affected in a given time period and so increase total annoyance and sleep loss.

No comment. N/A as an airport stakeholder.

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

No

Yes

Don't mind

Respite would help to share out the misery but our priority would be dispersal including over areas of lower population . It is critically important to maintain or improve compliance with existing noise abatement principles.

Don't mind

Importance of Safety – The airspa Overflight – The new procedures : Noise Footprint – The new procees Tranquillity – Implementation shc Emissions and Air Quality – The n Operational Requirements – The i					
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Agree
Agree	Agree	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Neutral	Strongly agree
Strongly agree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Strongly agree	Neutral
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Agree	Neutral
Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Agree	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Agree	Neutral
Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree
Strongly agree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Neutral
Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral
Neutral	Strongly disagree	Agree	Strongly disagree	Neutral	Neutral
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree		
Neutral	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Neutral
Strongly agree	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Neutral
Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Neutral	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Neutral	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree
Strongly agree	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Neutral
Strongly agree			Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral
Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Strongly agree	Strongly disagree		Neutral	Neutral	Strongly disagree
Strongly agree	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Agree					Agree

Airspace Dimensions - The airspace dimensions shall be defined by the design shall be					
Airspace Availability – Sufficient c		Airspace Complexity – The airspace complexity shall be		Aircraft Category – The new process	
Equipment and Approval – The new					
Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Agree	Neutral	Agree	Neutral	Agree	Agree
Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree
Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Neutral	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Agree	Neutral	Agree
Agree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Neutral
Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Strongly agree	Neutral	Strongly agree		Agree	Agree
Strongly agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Agree	Neutral	Neutral
Strongly agree	Disagree	Agree	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Agree	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Strongly disagree	Neutral
Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Neutral	Strongly disagree
Disagree	Agree		Strongly agree	Agree	Agree
Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Agree	Neutral	Neutral
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Neutral
Agree	Neutral		Agree	Agree	Disagree
Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree
Disagree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Disagree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree
Agree	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral		Neutral
Strongly agree	Agree		Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree
Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree

Arrival Transitions – The arrival tr	Departure Procedures – The Stan	Approach Procedures – The Instr	Coordination – The new proced	Cost of Change – The new proced	Operational Cost – Provided it do
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Neutral	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Agree
		Agree		Neutral	Agree
Agree	Agree	Neutral	Neutral	Disagree	Agree
Agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Neutral	Neutral	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Agree	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Agree	Neutral
Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Agree
Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Agree	Neutral	Neutral
Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Agree	Neutral	Neutral	Disagree	Agree
Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Neutral	Neutral	Agree	Neutral	Strongly disagree	Neutral
Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree
Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral
Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Neutral	Strongly agree	Neutral	Strongly agree	Neutral	Neutral
Neutral	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	Agree
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly agree	Neutral	Neutral	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral
Strongly agree	Neutral	Neutral	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Neutral
Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree
					Agree
	Agree		Neutral	Disagree	Agree
Neutral	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Agree
Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree
Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree		

AMS Realisation – This ACP must : PBN – The new procedures should

Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Agree
Agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Strongly agree
Neutral	Agree
Neutral	Neutral
Neutral	Neutral
Agree	Agree
Agree	Strongly agree
Neutral	Agree
Agree	Agree
Neutral	Neutral
Neutral	Neutral
Strongly disagree	Neutral
Strongly disagree	Strongly disagree

Disagree	Strongly agree
Neutral	Neutral
Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Strongly agree

Strongly agree	Strongly agree
Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
Strongly disagree	Strongly agree
Agree	Agree

Agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Agree

	Strongly disagree
Agree	Strongly agree
Agree	Agree

Have we missed anything that should be incorporated as a Design Principle?
Not sure
No
No
No
Not sure
No
No
No comment
Not sure
The 'Yes/' 'No' response requirement renders many of the questions 'leading'. A more open format would be more transparent.
Yes
Not sure
Clearly safety is a primary concern, but the needs of those flying outside of ATC oversight need to be recognised. Paraglider and hang glider pilots may not have access to radio transponders or airband radio. All efforts should be
Not sure
Accountability. Also the consultation is already fundamentally skewed to permit non compliance
Not sure
The principles should ensure continuance of the longstanding requirement that all departures should be on RW32 and all arrivals should be on RW14 unless it would be unsafe to do so. This is the most effective way to minimise the number of people affected by aircraft noise and so it is somewhat alarming that there is no reference to it in the draft design principles published In September 2021. The requirement is clearly stated in the EGNM pages of NATS'
No
An important design principle, noticeable by its absence from the Draft Design Principles published by LBA in September 2021, should be that the airspace change should in no way weaken the existing noise abatement procedures which were specifically designed to protect residents of the main built up area near LBA. These procedures are clearly stated in the EGNM pages of NATS' Aeronautical Information Service Document (ie the pages relating specifically to LBA). They include a general requirement that aircraft operators "shall ensure at all times that aircraft are operated in a manner calculated to cause the least disturbance practicable in areas surrounding the airport" and the more Most of the design principles are clearly sensible principles. Asking respondents to rate them is the equivalent of asking respondents to agree to a statement that "Virtue is Good and Vice is Bad". The parish council planning committee after review said that they agreed with them all - as principles. The real problem comes when a further detailed stage of design shows that one design principle is in conflict with another. It is not clear how this rating of DP 3 should be stronger - "Must reduce" the noise footprint. That enforceable area should also be widened. Similarly, in DP5, it should be "seek to reduce the growth in aircraft emissions..." In DP7, all options from this CAP1616 DP3 Noise footprint needs to be re-worded to "must reduce". DP5 Growth in aircraft emissions needs to be reworded to "must reduce". DP6 must be reworded to include the needs of stakeholders. DP7 must allow for all options
No
Not sure
Too many DPs, more emphasis on the needs of other users of airspace - see our supplementary PDF submission
No
The LBA ACP should work holistically with other ACP sponsors to enable improvement for all.
We note with concern that the design principles are only asking us to take into account the number of people who are overflown. We consider that the number of flights, or the amount of nuisance per person /household are of equal if not greater importance than the number of people, ie repeated exposure is more damaging than occasional exposure. This weakness in drafting means that this questionnaire is unable to generate useful information.
No
Only the questions with a response are deemed applicable to Jet2.com.