

# Focus Group 2 - Minutes

---

<b>Project Title</b>	Liverpool John Lennon Airport Airspace Transition Project
<b>Client</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Purpose of Meeting</b>	Design Principles Focus Group – LJLA Consultative Committee and Noise Monitoring Sub Committee
<b>Date of Meeting</b>	27 September 2018
<b>Held at</b>	Red Rum Meeting Room, Hampton by Hilton Hotel, Liverpool John Lennon Airport
<b>Present</b>	<p>[REDACTED] LJLACC representing Helsby Parish Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] Vice Chair LJLACC and Chair NMSC and Disability Representative</p> <p>[REDACTED] NMSC representing Liverpool City Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] NMSC representing Wirral Council</p> <p>[REDACTED] Liverpool John Lennon Airport</p> <p>[REDACTED] Air Traffic Services Ltd</p> <p>[REDACTED] Osprey CSL</p> <p>[REDACTED] Osprey CSL</p> <p>[REDACTED] Osprey CSL</p>
<b>For Information</b>	N/A
<b>Copies to</b>	[REDACTED] LJLA
<b>Classification</b>	
<b>Osprey Reference</b>	71137/031
<b>Issue</b>	Issue 1

This document is of UK origin and has been prepared by Osprey Consulting Services Limited (Osprey) and, subject to any existing rights of third parties, Osprey is the owner of the copyright therein. The document is furnished in confidence under existing laws, regulations and agreements covering the release of data. This document contains proprietary information of Osprey and the contents or any part thereof shall not be copied or disclosed to any third party without Osprey's prior written consent.

© Osprey Consulting Services Limited 2018



## Meeting Summary

Item	Action
<p><b>Opening introductions</b></p> <p>██████████ welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance. He then provided an introduction which described the purpose of the Focus Group. ██████████ then provided further information on the requirement for Design Principles in the CAP 1616 process.</p>	
<p><b>Appropriateness of Level</b></p> <p>██████ described the requirement to scale the process by assigning a level to the Airspace Change Proposal (ACP). He stated that Liverpool John Lennon Airport (LJLA) considered that this ACP would be Level 1. ██████ gave the attendees the chance to express their opinion on the appropriateness of the level chosen.</p> <p>██████████ asked if there was a definition of a ‘populated area’ in terms of the description of a Level 1 Change of Airspace Design as this is the sort of question that would be asked by members of the public that he represents.</p> <p>█████ stated that there is no precise definition of a populated area in terms of CAP 1616 but that any area that has people living there can be defined as populated, be it sparsely or densely populated, and that the area around LJLA that could be affected by this ACP should be regarded as populated.</p> <p>██████████ asked what the consequences of a Level 1 or a Level 2 being assigned to this ACP would be.</p> <p>█████ explained that it would affect the amount of work required for the process in terms of effort, engagement and participation. ██████ reiterated that LJLA considered that this ACP would be a Level 1, which is the highest level of change in terms of the amount of work required to support the process.</p> <p>█████ explained that CAP 1616 was more rigid than CAP 725, in terms of flexibility. However, CAP 1616 allowed the CAA some latitude to be flexible in scaling the process. The CAA could allow a reduced level of engagement at various parts of the process where it was anticipated there would be no impact as a result of the change; for example, routes over sea. The level of engagement, and use and type of Focus Groups, utilised by LJLA at this stage of the process was appropriate for the ACP being considered.</p> <p>There were no disagreements to the consideration that this ACP would be a Level 1.</p>	
<p><b>Potential Route Preferences</b></p> <p>█████ described the different options to consider when choosing Design Principles for potential route preferences.</p> <p>██████████ commented that if the proposal is based on the same number of aircraft movements the impact of noise should be no worse for</p>	

Item	Action
<p>some but could be worse for a lot more and that noise could increase or decrease in any particular location.</p> <p>█ stated that the profiles flown might change as a result of the proposal, and that where aircraft currently fly level flight they generate a certain noise footprint. The new procedures could have an incremental slope profile that could improve the noise footprint over some areas.</p> <p><b>Design Principle: Vertical dispersion within the profile</b></p> <p>█ commented that as the tracks flown are likely to be more concentrated laterally due to the improvement in navigation, the concentration vertically could be reduced by planning dispersion into the vertical profile of the new procedures.</p> <p>█ stated that from a design perspective many options were possible. He stated that lateral dispersion could be achieved by designing several tracks, or the design could incorporate a single track that would concentrate traffic flow.</p> <p>█ explained that there will be constraints on the new procedures as all arrivals have to be lined up on the runway centreline by a certain range.</p> <p>█ asked for clarification as to whether the outcomes of this Focus Group were to inform national policies and procedures or whether they are very localised.</p> <p>█ explained that the purpose of this meeting was not a consultation but an engagement with stakeholders local to LJLA who could provide an input to the design of the new procedures for LJLA. He is aware that lots of people will have lots of different opinions and these will all be considered and fed into a matrix that will help to decide the most sensible and appropriate solution.</p> <p>█ asked if the aim of the Focus Group was to determine what questions should go into the full consultation.</p> <p>█ stated that it wasn't and that it was about how LJLA go about designing the new procedures and what factors are important to local stakeholders. The output from the questionnaires and Focus Groups will form the Design Principles that will themselves inform the design of the route options for further consideration.</p> <p>█ added that these design options will then be appraised by LJLA to form a short list that will be put forward for formal public consultation.</p> <p>█ stated that the Design Principles should be specific to issues that arise in the area local to LJLA.</p> <p>█ added that there is a perception that aircraft can fly down the River Mersey, away from populated areas and do a 'handbrake turn' and land. He reiterated that the way aircraft line-up for the final approach is not going to change but the finer points of where the aircraft start to feed into that final approach could.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>■ asked if there were any areas that should be considered as sacrosanct and should be avoided, at least below 2000 feet (ft) above ground level (agl).</p> <p>■ commented that from a Council’s point of view and their public’s perception, any change in flight procedures at the airport increases the possibility of more flights, and in particular night flights, from the airport.</p> <p>■ stated that the change is not about increasing the number of flights or changing the infrastructure at LJLA but about modernising the airspace for 21<sup>st</sup>-Century operations, making it more efficient and protecting capacity.</p> <p>■ stated that it was important to stress that any change in the flight profiles, including a vertical change, would change the noise levels experienced by the public.</p> <p>■ added that the changes should be regarded as invisible infrastructure and that it is a change that needs doing regardless of any growth or decline in the amount of traffic using the Airport.</p> <p>■ stated that in his experience as chair of the NMSC, people believe that aircraft fly more economically the higher up they are on procedures, so they save money and produce less CO<sub>2</sub>.</p> <p>■ agreed but stated that at the minute, aircraft are unable to get to these operating heights efficiently due to the complexity of the airspace systems lower down.</p> <p>■ replied that people are only interested in the noise created when aircraft are held lower than they need to, and that noise will be the main factor that the public will object to when the proposal goes to public consultation. ■ stated that noise should be distributed up as much as possible.</p> <p>■ asked ■ to therefore confirm if he was stating a preference for continuous climb profiles as a Design Principle.</p> <p><b>Design Principle: Continuous Climb profile</b></p> <p>■ stated that the main principle to consider would be noise.</p> <p>■ commented on noise concentration and wondered whether it is acceptable for fewer people to get all the noise and what that level of noise is. Does there come a point where expansion, or for other reasons, means that this burden of noise becomes unacceptable to the few and alternative options should be considered. ■ acknowledged that this was a very difficult decision to make and that he did not have a clear opinion on the solution at this stage.</p> <p>■ asked what the solution to the problem of the noise would be and whether to spread or concentrate the noise. ■ added that the responses need to be appropriate for individual situations, so attendees need to decide what needs to be done locally.</p> <p>■ commented that aircraft noise can be hardly noticeable against background noise.</p> <p><b>Design Principle: Use background noise to hide aircraft noise</b></p>	

Item	Action
<p>█ described the CAP 1616 process that would follow this stage of the proposal. The Design Principles would be used to design a number of Design Options that would then be subject to analysis to select the most suitable options. At this stage it is important to remember that some of these routes could be excluded because of factors over which LJLA have no control. The short list of options would be looked at in more detail, including producing noise contours, before the most suitable option is selected.</p> <p>█ asked when do these options get dovetailed with other airports.</p> <p>█ stated that this would occur at the procedure design stage.</p> <p>█ added that Manchester Airport will also need to introduce new procedures, again because the ground-based navigation systems are due to go out of service. LJLA is ahead of Manchester in this airspace change process and any new procedures will need to dovetail with Manchester’s existing and future procedure designs.</p> <p>█ emphasised that the aim of the meeting was to produce Design Principles for LJLA.</p> <p>█ explained that, in general, aircraft approaching the Airport will be below 4,000 ft agl when they are closer than 12 miles and below 6,000 ft agl when they are closer than 20 miles. Outside 24 miles from the airfield, the aircraft will generally be above 7,000 ft agl, where noise will be less of a factor. Attendees were asked to think about where their local areas are, in terms of these distances from the Airport.</p> <p>█ added that individuals should also consider the airframe noise generated by the aircraft as they are configured to land against the noise generated by the engines. There is a delicate balance between an aircraft being configured appropriately in time to land, against the need to execute a go-around which would generate a penalty in terms of time, fuel and emissions. The point at which an aircraft needs to be configured to land safely is not going to change as a result of this ACP.</p> <p>█ stated that routing traffic over industrial areas would be an obvious principle. █ agreed with this, adding that there would already be a higher noise background in these areas so that the noise of the aircraft wouldn’t be as noticeable. █ added that routing over motorways or major roads with high traffic volume, and therefore high ambient noise, would be preferable. █ stated that routes should avoid areas such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, bird sanctuaries and park land. █ asked if it would be preferable to route over residential areas rather than these parkland areas; █ replied that people value areas like this where they can spend time with their families.</p> <p><b>Design Principle: Route over industrial areas</b></p> <p><b>Design Principle: Route over motorways and major roads</b></p> <p><b>Design Principle: Avoid places where the public go to enjoy days out i.e. AONB, parkland, bird sanctuaries</b></p>	

Item	Action
<p><b>Design Principle: Route over residential areas rather than parkland areas</b></p> <p>█ commented that people would be more concerned about the noise generated by aircraft than they would be about the emissions generated by them. █ would like to see as little noise as possible generated over populated areas and that any penalty in emissions should be saved in other ways. Moving routes over the Irish Sea, away from the Wirral, and flying along the River Mersey, even if this meant longer routes, would be preferential. █ commented that people wanted cheap flights, but █ added that savings could be made in other ways, possibly Airport Passenger Duty (APD). █ stated that the issue of APD was not in the scope of this Focus Group.</p> <p><b>Design Principle: Route over the water (Irish Sea/River Mersey)</b></p> <p><b>Design Principle: Longer journeys (more emissions) rather than generating noise over populated areas</b></p> <p>█ reiterated that from his perspective the routes planned should spend as little time as possible over residential areas, even if this means longer journeys. Designs should follow areas where background noise was already generated by industrial areas or roads. Designs should avoid areas used by the public such as parks and other leisure areas. █ agreed with █ on these principles.</p> <p>█ commented that consultation is a valuable part of the process in justifying decisions taken and asked if more Focus Groups were planned.</p> <p>█ stated that there were 3 Focus Groups in total; this one for the LACC and NMSC following invites to all members of these committees. █ also stated that airline operators and other aviation stakeholders had already attended a similar event and that a further event was planned for public officials.</p> <p>█ asked where he should go for concerns raised by members of his local community. █ added that representatives should be specific and ask 'What is your concern'. █ added that the process is still at an early stage and that nothing will change until the proposal has gone through the full process, including public consultation.</p> <p>█ asked who LJLA were hoping to get the principles from and that if they had greater diversity in the Focus Groups, then they would get a greater diversity of ideas. █ asked if LJLA had considered including business leaders or groups such as the Rotary Club within the Focus Groups.</p> <p>█ stated that LJLA were engaging with a range of people who were considered key stakeholders.</p> <p>█ asked if it would be possible before the launch of the public consultation that documents could be reviewed with respects to access for those with a disability so that different formats could be considered to allow access for all.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>█ stated that publication of documents will be done by the CAA via the online portal, but recognised that this was an important point to consider to ensure access for all.</p> <p>█ asked if anyone had any further comments or opinions to add and thanked the attendees for their input before closing the meeting.</p>	

### Summary of Design Principles

No	Design Principle
1	Vertical dispersion within the profile
2	Continuous Climb profile
3	Use background noise to hide aircraft noise
4	Route over industrial areas
5	Route over motorways and major roads
6	Avoid places where the public go to enjoy days out i.e. AONB, parkland, bird sanctuaries
7	Route over residential areas rather than parkland areas
8	Route over the water (Irish Sea/River Mersey)
9	Longer journeys (more emissions) rather than generating noise over populated areas