

# Non-Aviation Focus Group – Record of Discussion

---

<b>Project Title</b>	Exeter Airport Airspace Change Proposal
<b>Client</b>	Exeter and Devon Airport Ltd
<b>Purpose of Meeting</b>	Stage 2 Design Options Focus Group (Non-Aviation)
<b>Date of Meeting</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> December 2021
<b>Held at</b>	Exeter Airport
<b>Present</b>	<p>██████████ Airport Consultative Committee (ACC)</p> <p>██████████ Aylesbeare Council</p> <p>██████████ Exeter City Council</p> <p>██████████ Cranbrook Council</p> <p>██████████ Exeter Airport Managing Director</p> <p>██████████ Exeter Airport Air Traffic Services Manager</p> <p>██████████ Exeter Airport Management Systems Coordinator</p> <p>██████████ Osprey CSL</p> <p>██████████ Osprey CSL</p>
<b>Via Microsoft Teams</b>	██████████ Exeter City Council

## Glossary

---

Acronym	Meaning
ACC	Airport Consultative Committee
ACP	Airspace Change Proposal
CAP	Civil Aviation Publication
SID	Standard Instrument Departure

## Meeting Summary

### Item

#### Opening introductions

██████████ welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance. He then provided an introduction which described the purpose of the Focus Group and outlined the current operations at Exeter Airport, including the impact of the current Covid-19 pandemic and the expected operational recovery. ██████████ then described the reasons why Exeter Airport is seeking an airspace change before ██████████ provided further information on the Civil Aviation Publication (CAP) 1616 process and described the comprehensive list of options that had previously been shared with stakeholders.

#### Open Forum Discussion

Comment – there are plans to develop and expand the village of Ottery St Mary [6 miles east of the airport]. The village is currently overflowed by arrivals to Runway 26, the dominant runway direction, so would like Runway 08 departures to avoid the village to avert excessive impact. The proposed Standard Instrument Departure (SID) to the east could include a 'kink' to the south to avoid the village and make more use of open countryside.

Question – how does the airport intend to consider the local development plans that are being updated currently?

**Our Response:** the comprehensive list of options was sent to the local planning departments for comment, and we will continue to engage with these departments as the Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) progresses.

Comment – there was an issue with all of the proposed SIDs from Runway 26 due to the likely impact on the City of Exeter, in particular the noise impact. It was discussed whether aircraft turning over the city or extending to the west of the city would create a greater noise impact. It was stated that on departure, a set climb power is selected so the noise from the engines would be the same in either case. However, if aircraft turned, the rate of climb would decrease. If aircraft extended west before manoeuvring, this could result in an increase in speed (with flap retraction) and a reduced rate of climb. It was commented that the perception of people on the ground is that aircraft that are turning make more noise than an aircraft flying straight ahead.

Question – which profile is quietest for residents of the city? If the rate of climb is decreased, will it be noisier when turning and would the increase in power flying straight ahead also create more noise.

**Our Response:** detailed analysis of the environmental impact of proposed flight procedures has not been conducted at this stage but would be carried out during Stage 3 prior to full consultation.

Comment – from the attendees' perspective, it would be difficult to justify a SID to the west if it meant aircraft would fly over the City of Exeter. The current procedures have minimum

**Item**

impact on the city. Creating a noise footprint over the city is not what the airport should be trying to achieve.

Question – aircraft departing to the east will have further track miles to fly if extending to the west. Is it possible to have different departures that can be used at different times or for aircraft departing in different directions?

**Our Response:** different options for different directions can be considered. The use of individual routes at particular times would need to be investigated further.

Comment – what the public want and what the airport wants is the same. The ability for aircraft to be programmed to fly a glide descent from 35,000 feet to landing at the airport. This is the most economic method and has the least noise impact. Anything that intervenes, such as stray aircraft, will cause arriving aircraft to increase power, thereby increasing noise. Everyone has a vested interest in arrival procedures giving minimum impact to people on the ground. The proposed transition options are sensible and economic and are good for the people on the ground.

The departure procedures for Runway 26 would not create a harmonious relationship between the airport and the local community due to the impact they would have on the city.

**Our Response:** point noted.

██████████ closed the meeting by thanking the participants for their attendance and contribution. All parties agreed that it had been a very useful and productive discussion.