

Noise Action Plan (NAP) 2018- 2023

Consultation responses and actions

Introduction

How we manage noise at Edinburgh Airport is an extremely important part of our commitment to the communities around us. Our 5-year Noise Action Plan (NAP) sets out our plans to address those noise issues and reduce the noise impact on local communities. As part of preparing this plan, we carried out a six-week public consultation which helped shape our NAP for the next five years.

The following document provides a summary of the consultation responses and how they influenced our Final NAP 2018 – 2023. In response to the feedback provided by the public, six new actions were added to our action table within the final document

- Night noise, we will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
- We will carry out community-based noise surveys during the summer months to further our understanding of the noise climates under our flight paths.
- We will commission LAeq summertime contour maps and subsequent database of eligible properties every two years.
- We will launch a noise and track keeping system on our website that allows the public to investigate and monitor flights themselves and make enquiries or complaints about our flight operations.
- We will provide noise insulation grants to schools who fall within our 63db or greater noise contours and work with Local Government Planning Departments to ensure that all new build schools within 63db and greater contours are built to relevant building acoustic standards
- We will review our Noise Complaints Policy to ensure it is relevant to our complainants. We will continue to publish this policy on our Noise Lab and reference this in our Community Newsletter to ensure that those who want to complain, know the process. We will also log all complaints relating to aircraft operations and publish the statistics quarterly

Consultation design

Online survey:

- Hosted by Progressive Partnership
- Self-completion
- Automatic feedback of results
- Consultation was open to the public from 20th February 2018 - to 13th April 2018
- Respondents were also given the option to complete the survey by paper

Questionnaire:

- Comprised 33 questions
- Gathered demographic information
- Questions on: degrees of affect by noise, importance of initiatives, responses to the draft NAP
- Included text boxes where respondents could input their thoughts on: main issues with noise, the draft NAP and other initiatives they think EAL should undertake.

Overview of Findings

- 223 responses - 210 Individuals, 3 Stakeholders, 10 Elected members
- The draft NAP received fairly high ratings for detailing reason, explaining policy and depth of technical detail. With approximately half (46%) of the sample rating it as good or excellent for technical detail and over half (57%) rating it as good or excellent for detailing the reason.
- Respondents were engaged with the NAP draft consultation document. 65% said it had enhanced their understanding of noise at Edinburgh Airport.
- Individual initiatives proposed in the NAP all scored an importance rating of over 4.42 out of 5.
- Access to tools such as contour maps, noise mitigations scheme, continuous climb and descent, complaints and the noise and track system all scored 4.29 or above for usefulness.
- It is clear that the consultation attracted those who were affected by noise, with 86% of the sample saying they were acutely or somewhat affected.
- Those most likely to be acutely affected by noise were aged up to 44 (65%) and 60+ (55%).
- There were no significant differences across other groups i.e. those with illness, gender or flying profile.
- The top three problems relating to aircraft noise were: overflying, night flights and flights taking off.
- The top three types of noise experienced were: night noise, daytime noise, and sleep disturbance.

The following pages show the topics raised by respondents, along with example verbatim comments, and the response from the airport to the comment. They are listed in no particular order.

This is broken into three areas:

- **Noise Issues** - We asked respondents to 'Describe the main issues you have with noise'
- **Surprises** - We asked respondents if there was anything surprising in the NAP
- **Additional actions** - We asked if there were any additional actions that they thought we should be taking to control the noise impacts

Noise Issues

We asked respondents to 'Describe the main issues you have with noise' (individuals only):

Topic	Example of verbatim comments	Edinburgh Airport comment or action added to NAP 2018-2023
Late night flights (keep me awake) (No noise restrictions for Edinburgh Airport at night)	It doesn't seem like the noise of the planes landing stops at night. It can be very loud depending on the weather conditions and it sometimes feels like the planes are much closer to the house than they really are. At times it prevents me from going to sleep right away as I keep hearing one plane after another.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Low flying planes	Mainly the noise of aircraft flying overhead after taking off. Sometimes the aircrafts are low and so noisy it wakes us up and can be picked up on the baby monitor!	To reduce the impact of noise on communities we fine aircraft which exceed our permitted noise levels (page 11 of the NAP). Within 'Section 04 Existing Noise Management' we detail how Continuous Climb Departures (CCD) are used to ensure aircraft gain altitude as swiftly as possible to reduce the number of those on the ground impacted by our operations
Early morning flights (some wake me)	Flights around 6am wake me up	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Dalgety bay / Aberdour	Too many flights over Dalgety Bay. It is a town of 10,000 people. Flights should be routed over the Forth and countryside less populated areas. Noise pollution is getting really bad with more and more flights and earlier and later creeping into the night.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Increased flights / Increased frequency	I have lived in my present home for 8 years. I have noticed a significant increase in number of flights flying over my house during the daytime, late evenings and early mornings. The flights appear to be in a tight turn and climb and as a consequence they are lower and louder than previously.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will carry out community-based noise surveys during the summer months to further our understanding of the noise climates under our flight paths.
Flights over highly populated areas instead of Industrial estates or open land/ sea	Requests to develop landing paths over the River Almond with a later left, then right turn have been largely ignored. School lessons are also frequently affected by the noise of landing planes.	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Noise (Unspecified)	The noise is intrusive and affects my [and my partners] quality of life.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will carry out community-based noise surveys during the summer months to further our understanding of the noise climates under our flight paths. To reduce the impact of noise on communities we fine aircraft which exceed our permitted noise levels (page 11 of the NAP).

Spoils the outdoors / Working in my garden	Too noisy, Disturbed sleep, Gardening is not as pleasant, cannot plan to sit in conservatory, Can't open windows	To reduce the impact of noise on communities we fine aircraft which exceed our permitted noise levels (page 11 of the NAP). This issue is mitigated and managed with in Section 04 existing noise management – CDAs/ CCDs and 1b of the action table.
Noise (Relating to taking off)	Very loud during take-off. Waking kids. Waking me. Disturbing life in general.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Planes outside of normal flight path (Wind changes/ re-routing)	Flights when landing being diverted to fly over South Gyle at times between 23:30 and 24:00	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Unhappy about new flight path	The flight path is being changed, my whole house has been shaking ever since	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Health Impact	My health is suffering due to stress. When trying to relax outside plane noise overhead makes me tense up and my blood pressure goes up	To reduce the impact of noise on communities we fine aircraft which exceed our permitted noise levels (page 11 of the NAP).
Noise (related to turning)	Take off noise and the planes bank left, across forth, directly around our home, almost 360 degrees	To reduce the impact of noise on communities we fine aircraft which exceed our permitted noise levels (page 11 of the NAP). Within Section 04 we detail how Continuous Climb Departures (CCD) are used to ensure aircraft gain altitude as swiftly as possible to reduce the number of those on the ground impacted by our operations.
Inadequate funding for noise proofing	The grants towards windows and insulation are completely inappropriate vs the increasing number of flights	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will commission LAeq summertime contour maps and subsequent database of eligible properties every two years. We will continue to benchmark our noise mitigation and compensation measures with other comparable airports. We propose to compare noise contours and the number of people exposed with other airports to understand if other noise mitigation schemes have been more successful.
Pollution	There is also a significant deposit of dirt emanating from the aircraft engines exhaust which covers the exterior of our apartments.	Air quality is detailed within the NAP and the actions we take are detailed with in Section 06 page 18.
Vibration	Early morning and late nights - house literally shakes at times.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Noise (Relating to landing)	Most of our noise disturbance is caused by aircraft directly overhead at low altitude on their final approach.	Within Section 04 we detail how Continuous Descent Approaches (CDA) are used to ensure aircraft descend in a gradual and continuous approach

		with engine power cut back to reduce the number of those on the ground impacted by our operations.
No fly zones	Was there not a no-fly zone over the dockyard as they are building the new aircraft carriers?	No action added in relation to this comment
Eastbound flights (Runway 6) Arriving from the East (runway 24)	On Easterly departures aircraft overfly our house. Ever increasing noise from flights landing from the east.	Within Section 04 we detail how Continuous Descent Approaches (CDA) are used to ensure aircraft descend in a gradual and continuous approach with engine power cut back and how Continuous Climb Departures (CCD) are used to ensure aircraft gain altitude as swiftly as possible to reduce the number of those on the ground impacted by our operations.
Alternate runway	I work in the Gyle and use of the alternative runway affects us at night in particular. Flights appear very low and quite suddenly overhead.	Runway 30/12 has now been decommissioned
Older / larger planes making more noise	Old, noisy (+ dirty) jets - E.G. Ryanair, EasyJet.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Affects property value	House prices will come down even more	No action added in relation to this comment
Comments related to Stats/ Maps in NAP report not correct/unrealistic	I am aware my property does not appear in your noise contour maps and I am curious as to why this is the case.	The noise contouring produced for Noise Action Plans is determined by UK and EU regulations and legislation as detailed within Section 05 of the NAP.
Safety concerns	Just recently a large piece of ice fell from a plane in London narrowly missing a person. What would a piece of ice do to a gas storage tank???	Out with the scope of the NAP
No issues / Not impacted	I do not really have a problem as it is something anyone experiences living near an airport, and after a time you just "Zone" out of it, after all the airport has been there longer than I have.	No action added in relation to this comment
Disruptive to schools	School lessons are also frequently affected by the noise of landing planes.	Our noise mitigation and management for all properties within our contours is detailed with in the NAP. No separate action added in relation to this comment
Path created on old census data	Current flight path over population area, not as 2011 census, but at current population level plus projected to consultation limit noise levels and altitude of fly over vary greatly in differing weather conditions.	The population data within our NAP is provided by the Scottish Governments consultants. Our Insulation Scheme is on par with that of other UK airports and follows current UK government legislation and guidelines
Using airbrakes	It is particularly bad, and very alarming, in the evenings when pilots select or deselect their air brakes right above your house	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.

Noise issues – We asked respondents to ‘Describe the main issues you have with noise’ (organisations and elected members):

Topic	Example of verbatim comments	Edinburgh Airport comment or action added to NAP 2018-2023
Late night flights (keep me awake) (No noise restrictions for Edinburgh Airport at night)	The area covered by Dalkeith and District Community Council lies under the course taken by the majority of aircraft arriving to land on runway 24. Because of vectoring and other factors this is not one clearly defined path, but a spread of courses flown at varying heights. Sometimes the noise is relatively unobtrusive, but at others, especially at peak times, there can be a constant background noise of aircraft engines, even making its presence felt inside with doors and windows closed. Perhaps most annoying is when pilots apply or release air brakes directly over a house, especially in the evening. This very sudden and very loud noise is quite alarming, and residents in one sheltered housing building have commented quite strongly about the effect it has on them.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes. Within Section 04 we detail how Continuous Descent Approaches (CDA) are used to ensure aircraft descend in a gradual and continuous approach with engine power cut back and how Continuous Climb Departures (CCD) are used to ensure aircraft gain altitude as swiftly as possible to reduce the number of those on the ground impacted by our operations.
Unhappy about new flight path	The greatest concerns range around uncertainty as to what the noise will be in the future with the new flightpath.	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Noise (Relating to landing & taking off)	On *current* flight paths many (but not all) of landing and take offs are disruptive enough to prevent conversation outside or on the phone inside	Within Section 04 we detail how Continuous Descent Approaches (CDA) are used to ensure aircraft descend in a gradual and continuous approach with engine power cut back and how Continuous Climb Departures (CCD) are used to ensure aircraft gain altitude as swiftly as possible to reduce the number of those on the ground impacted by our operations. Mitigation measures are listed in Table 9.
Flights over highly populated areas instead of Industrial estates or open land/ sea	The control and reduction of noise from increase in aircraft over heavily populated areas must be a priority consideration	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Early morning flights (some wake me)	Particular issues are the increase in night flights and the large number of flights between 06.00 and 08.00 arising from aircraft using the airport for overnight parking	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Noise (Unspecified)/pollution	Marked increase in CCO operations and overflying/vectoring off established routes since 2015 has caused - and continues to cause - significantly more noise, disruption and emissions than previously experienced.	Action to mitigate against this is detailed within Action 1b of Table 9.
Low flying planes	In addition, the 'Tutur1C' flightpath trial highlighted the intrusiveness of low overflight in quiet rural areas.	Action to mitigate against this is detailed within Action 1b of Table 9.

Increased flights / Increased frequency	The control and reduction of noise from increase in aircraft over heavily populated areas must be a priority consideration.	Action to mitigate these issues are detailed within Actions 1 to 2 of Table 9.
Lack of noise monitoring stations	I would also add that noise monitoring locations, capability, provision and information must be made more transparent going forward	Action added to Table 9, point 2. We will launch a noise and track keeping system on our website that allows the public to investigate and monitor flights themselves, and make enquiries about our flight operations
Eastbound flights (Runway 6) Arriving from the East (runway 24)	There is considerable noise from aircraft arriving to runway 24 at low altitude directly over Cramond. Any conversation outside has to be suspended and even within houses there is very audible disturbance. This happens in 79% of air traffic movements because of the prevailing westerly winds	This issue is mitigated and managed with in Section 04 existing noise management – CDAs/ CCDs and 1b of the action table.
Disruptive to schools, health Impact, affects property value	Following the TUTUR trial and proposed changes to airspace use, many of my constituents have expressed their concerns over the potential negative effect of aircraft noise on their quality of life, health and wellbeing, sleeping patterns, children’s education and property values	Action to mitigate these issues are detailed within Actions 1 to 2 of Table 9.
Dalgety Bay / Aberdour	The constituents I represent (Aberdour to North Queensferry) have a wide range of issues. The greatest concerns range around uncertainty as to what the noise will be in the future with the new flightpath.	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Using airbrakes	Perhaps most annoying is when pilots apply or release air brakes directly over a house, especially in the evening.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.

Surprises

We asked respondents if there was anything surprising in the NAP:

Topic	Example of verbatim comments	Edinburgh Airport comment or action added to NAP 2018-2023
Disregard for environmental impact	Extent of areas looking to fly over and disregard to environmental and negative noise impact.	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Unable to reach link to attachment / Map	I was surprised that the link to the document was broken.... 404 - File or directory not found.	No issues were found with the document links at the time of consultation
The assumption that you cannot hear sound with double glazing.	That you think that most houses still have single glazing. I hear plane noise with double glazing and loft insulation. More houses	Our Insulation Scheme is on par with that of other UK airports and follows current UK government legislation and guidelines

That daily living is not affected by noise.	are being built where we live so do we blame the builders for not building sound proof houses?	
Amazed at short consultation deadline	The fact it was issued mid-March with a consultation deadline of 2nd April.	The NAP consultation ran from 20 th Feb 2018 – 13 th April 2018
No response to 'Continuous ascent concept'	Still no response to the failing of the Continuous Ascent concept in respect to banking aircraft which new flight paths tested and propose exhibit. in reality this is not so much a "surprise" as past showed little regard for practical issues with expansion plans and impact on the local community, favouring more the impact on the Profit and Loss and Balance Sheet of the Airport business.	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Lack of publicity	The actual lack of publicity around this	The NAP consultation was extensively advertised in local media, online via social media, and via radio.
Night Flying regulations used instead of common sense	Your focus on the letter rather than the spirit of noise regulations. The impression I get from the document is that because night flying aircraft may not breach relevant statutory night flying noise limits, their impact is zero or negligible. The reality is that although they may not breach such limits, night flights are EXTREMELY disruptive and intrusive, disturbing and waking residents from sleep at what should be a completely quiet time.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Lack of clear maps	Lack of clear maps	The noise contouring produced for Noise Action Plans is determined by UK and EU regulations and legislation as detailed within Section 05 of the NAP.
No reference to previous report summary or objectives	No-one has proof read it before issue - it is full of half complete sentences and plain errors It is impossible for any member of the public to understand a) what if anything the previous 5-year plan achieved - it should have contained a summary of what all of these supposed 'outcomes' actually amounted	Comments noted and will be considered during the production of the next NAP
Other	You talk of its Noise Management Board which does not exist. You mean its noise advisory board. There is a big difference between advice and management	Noise Management Board amended to EANAB within final document.
A number of inaccuracies / Old data used	A number of inaccuracies contained in this document. Far too much detail with over-elaborate presentation. Hate to estimate the cost of the preparation and printing of this document.	The population data within our NAP is provided by the Scottish Governments consultants. The noise contouring produced for Noise Action Plans is determined by UK and EU regulations and legislation as detailed within Section 05 of the NAP.
Written but with not much relevance. Deliberately wordy to avoid transparency	It had to be written without saying anything of relevance	Comments noted

Disregard for local residents (Priority is money)	The document is designed to gain support for change, not to prioritise the needs of the public affected by the airport's current and planned operations.	Comments noted. No action added in relation to this comment
Concerns over night-time flying hours	An apparent failure to consider, let alone address, the issue of night flights and the resulting noise/sleep disturbance	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Failure to explain flight paths (over certain areas and not others)	I couldn't believe that the route along the River Forth had been dismissed as the obvious first choice	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Flight paths over certain areas not addressed clearly / or in any detail (Dalgety/Aberdour/Fife)	The majority of the plan does not relate to areas such as Dalgety Bay and surroundings (which has barely any aircraft noise 2/3rds of the year and then high concentrations the remaining 1/3rd - this is due to the averaging of the noise which is a method which is increasingly being called into question by various stakeholders as it does not adequately acknowledge the impact on communities such as ours).	The noise contouring produced for Noise Action Plans is determined by UK and EU regulations and legislation as detailed within Section 05 of the NAP.
Lack of relevant noise monitors / Studies (including RNAV)	That the only fixed noise monitors are not near the flight path over my town and so you cannot possibly measure if you have exceeded the noise limits. All the noise data relating to my town is based on simulated data and not real-world data. This invalidates your statements regarding having a noise policy and being fined for exceeding noise levels at particular times of the day.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will carry out community-based noise surveys during the summer months to further our understanding of the noise climates under our flight paths. To reduce the impact of noise on communities we fine aircraft which exceed our permitted noise levels (page 11 of the NAP).
Unconvincing findings in report	Most of the data in my opinion and the figures are wrong. Where did the data come from and how old is the data that you have used for this study?	The population data within our NAP is provided by the Scottish Governments consultants. The noise contouring produced for Noise Action Plans is determined by UK and EU regulations and legislation as detailed within Section 05 of the NAP.
NAP not allowing for changes for management of noise. Very little evidence given / areas missing	That Edinburgh Airport continues to pursue expansion of flight numbers whilst massaging both the noise and emissions issues.	The population data within our NAP is provided by the Scottish Governments consultants. The noise contouring produced for Noise Action Plans is determined by UK and EU regulations and legislation as detailed within Section 05 of the NAP.
NMB Not yet involved in NAP / No time given to consider statements	I was surprised that although there is a reference to the newly formed Noise Management Board it played no part in producing the proposed NAP nor did it know about this consultation.	EANAB were provided with the draft consultation documents one week before its release to the general public and submitted a response,
Unconvincing findings in report	It also surprises me that the airport has not used best practice studies as its guide to amelioration of the undesirable impacts of its operations. Even the CAA has recommended less conservative	Comments noted. No action added in relation to this comment.

	considerations of noise. This leads to further mistrust of the integrity and sincerity of the airports aims.	
Night Flying regulations used instead of common sense	However, given the NAP acknowledges information from the UK Government that indicates communities become significantly annoyed by aircraft noise above 57 Leq (Leq being the level of hypothetical steady sound) dBA, what can EA do to reduce noise levels below current voluntary thresholds?	Our plans for the mitigation of noise are detailed within the actions table (Table 9) of the NAP.
Failure to explain flight paths (over certain areas and not others)	No mention of the effects and mitigation of the current application for future flight path changes.	Page 4 of the draft consultation booklet – ‘Foreword from our Chief Executive’ details why ‘future flight paths’ are not part of this NAP.
Concerns over night-time flying hours	The draft NAP does not include any proposal to avoid departures from EA between 23:00 and 07:00 - as required/recommended by a number of international organisations in order to avoid serious adverse impact on the health of those residents whose sleep is regularly disrupted by late night/early morning flights.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.

Additional actions

We asked if there were any additional actions that they thought we should be taking to control the noise impacts

Topic	Example of verbatim comments	Edinburgh Airport comment or action added to NAP 2018-2023
Flight path changes	Flight paths to be sensitive to the surrounding population and not on how quickly we can get a plane up in the air. This can be achieved by keeping the flight paths over the River Forth for as long as possible. No take off or landings between 11.00pm and 06.30am.	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Quieter planes	Encourage airlines to use quieter aircraft such as the new engine options used by easy Jet	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Night / morning restrictions	A ban on night flights between 22:00 and 06:00	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Favourable comments	I don't think there is much more they can do. I use the airport as often as I can, I love flying and I love the convenience Edinburgh	Comment noted. No action added in relation to this comment

	Airport gives me being close to my house. Flyover noise is a small price to pay.	
Listen / respond / communicate	Listen to the concerns of the communities it is going to effect	Comment noted. No action added in relation to this comment
No new routes	Flight paths should remain limited to reduce noise impacts.	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Noise monitors / studies / maps	Measure the noise at various locations.	Action added to Table 9 1c. We will carry out community-based noise surveys during the summer months to further our understanding of the noise climates under our flight paths.
Grants for sound proofing	Triple glazing for those affected. Considering anti-social hours are not the same seven days a week. Flying up river and avoiding housing as much as possible. Particularly landing and taking off.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will commission LAeq summertime contour maps and subsequent database of eligible properties every two years. We will continue to benchmark our noise mitigation and compensation measures with other comparable airports. We propose to compare noise contours and the number of people exposed with other airports to understand if other noise mitigation schemes have been more successful.
Fewer flights	Fewer flights at low altitude over populated areas!!!	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Complaint system	The complaints procedure used by the airport are farcical; one merely receives an apology and if one asks specific questions then the person who replies isn't competent to address them and seems unable or unwilling to find answers	Action added to Table 9, point 2. We will launch a noise and track keeping system on our website that allows the public to investigate and monitor flights themselves, and make enquiries about our flight operations
Hostile (general)	As much as I support the airport to grow business and the surrounding economy unfortunately my experience it there is very little interest in reducing the aircraft noise caused by growing operations to the closest communities	Comment noted. No action added in relation to this comment
Execs need more awareness	Ask the directors / senior management to live in Calderwood for one week. You will soon understand my points regarding the noise pollution	Comment noted. No action added in relation to this comment
Frequently swap runway direction / routes	More frequent alternation of runway take-off and landing paths. Majority of flights seem to take off/ land from east end of runway which affects our property much more than when from the west end.	An explanation of runway usage is detailed within Appendix 1 of the NAP document.
Work with other airports	Joking aside, stop push for profit expansion and view Scottish Air Passenger needs from a Scottish perspective. Route sharing with Glasgow and Aberdeen would better serve the communities, instead of trying to be the biggest/most profitable. Put people and communities ahead of profit and cash.	Comments noted. No action added in relation to this comment

Independent oversight	The airport needs to be truthful in their dealings with the public. I have had to complain a number of times about aircraft flying overhead due to the change in flight paths usage in 2015. The response from the airport has been that there has been no change to flight paths. This is incorrect. There needs to be independent assessment of the impact all the changes are having on the surrounding community.	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Trials	Any airspace change must be preceded by a full trial and then consultation, not the other way around on any new flight paths.	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Plan based on up to date population info	Use up to date maps to find out where communities are based geographically and don't fly planes over their villages and towns	The population data within our NAP is provided by the Scottish Governments consultants. The noise contouring produced for Noise Action Plans is determined by UK and EU regulations and legislation as detailed within Section 05 of the NAP.
Use rail	Stop increasing air traffic and sent short distance passengers by carbon and noise friendly rail.	Comments noted. No action added in relation to this comment
Fines / tariffs	The airport could actually take measures, rather than relying on others to adopt noise mitigation actions. Where are the fines for aircraft not using CDAs and CCDs, balanced by cost reductions for aircraft which do follow them?	This issue is mitigated and managed with in Section 04 existing noise management – CDAs/ CCDs and 1b of the action table.
Compensation	Surely, we are entitled to compensation due to the inconvenience and the reduction on our property price	Our Insulation Scheme is on par with that of other UK airports and follows current UK government legislation and guidelines
RNAV	EDI should be looking closely at the potential for utilising the new RNAV technology to mitigate the effects of aircraft noise.	Comments noted. No action added in relation to this comment
Weekend restrictions	No flights on Sundays	Comments noted. No action added in relation to this comment
Night / morning restrictions	We believe the airport should introduce a voluntary limit on night time flights and total noise permitted at night. Such a system is already required by statutory regulation at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted but also voluntarily adopted at Manchester and Luton. We believe Edinburgh Airport traffic has reached such a level as to justify a night time limit as well.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Noise monitors / studies / maps	EA should provide accurate noise contour maps. EA should provide more noise monitors in areas not directly under flight paths so that lateral noise impact can be measured more accurately	The noise contouring produced for Noise Action Plans is determined by UK and EU regulations and legislation as detailed within Section 05 of the NAP. Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will carry out community-based noise surveys during the summer months to further our understanding of the noise climates under our flight paths.
Fines / tariffs	Charge higher rates for noisy planes. Fine for departures from prescribed paths & noise levels	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be

		based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Fewer flights	Night flight numbers have increased by 2-3 per night compared to 2011 and by almost 5 per night since 2006. No cap on intrusive night flights is proposed. Operators are encouraged to use the CDAs. Failure to follow these creates unnecessary disturbance. No proposals are made to make use of CDAs compulsory.	Action added to Table 9, point 1c. We will investigate and implement increased landing/take-off fees for the night time period, this fee will be based on aircraft noise classification. All associated monies raised will be donated to local good causes.
Listen / respond / communicate	I would like to see a respected independent source evaluate the airports self-assessment and independent resource made available to the public to ask critical questions of the airport and suggest other noise measures which could be undertaken. It should not be up to just individuals. The airport has had 5 plus years to consider its plans whereas the public and communities have had less than 6 weeks to respond to a complex and technical situation where knowledge from around the world could be drawn.	NAP and actions are assessed by Scottish Government Ministers and then the EU prior to finalised NAP being published online.
No new routes	EA should also respect the well-established routes for departure which avoid built up areas and fly over areas largely comprising farmland; industrial estates and waterways/sea and avoid built up/residential areas EA should respect and implement all statutory requirements to properly minimise the number of residents overflown by aircraft - especially those not previously overflown at lower levels	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.
Flight path changes	Use the Airspace Change Proposal to identify a different arrival pathway for runway 24 which is identical in distance to what is currently proposed but doesn't over fly the main residential areas of Midlothian.	This comment relates to the Airspace Change Programme (ACP) and is out with the scope of the NAP.

Conclusions

Response rate

The response rate was comparatively good. The overall sample size of 213 provides a dataset with a margin of error of between $\pm 1.34\%$ and 6.71% , calculated at the 95% confidence level (market research industry standard). The majority of respondents lived in close proximity to the airport. There was a late submission from EANAB which has been fully summarised and included in the appendix. The bulk of responses came from North Queensferry, Cramond and Dalgety Bay/ Aberdour areas.

Effects of noise

On the whole, the consultation attracted those who are affected by noise, with over half saying they were acutely affected. Overflying was the most important issue followed by night flights and flight taking off. Night noise, daytime noise and sleep disturbance were the most mentioned three types of noise interruption. Interestingly non-flyers were more likely to mention these issues which suggests that some are more tolerant than others and that the effects of noise are not confined to the issue itself.

Importance of initiatives

All of the five initiatives discussed (detailed within Table 9 of the NAP) were rated as very important by the majority of the sample. All scored higher than four and managing noise efficiently and effectively scored a mean of 4.81 out of a maximum of 5. Having access to information such as the noise and track system, CDAs, CCDs and having schemes such as noise mitigation and a complaints procedure were all thought to be important. Each element gained a score of over 4 out of a maximum of 5.

The draft NAP document

Overall nearly two thirds of the sample had read it in full or a lot of it. the majority said it had enhanced their understanding of noise fully or somewhat. A third said it contained surprises they claimed to include inaccuracies, disregard for locals, failure to explain flight paths and lack of relevant noise monitors. It received high ratings for detailing reason, explaining policy and depth of technical detail. 40% of the sample said it fully or somewhat built on EAL's noise management strategy.

Additional actions

Respondents cited the following actions they think EAL should be taking included: flight path changes, night and morning restrictions, communicating more, noise monitors and fewer flights.

We understand that people have different levels of sensitivity to noise and we recognise that noise from aircraft operations is a concern for the communities around the airport. By carrying out this consultation we have been able to engage with local communities, helping us understand what issues are of importance to them. The final Noise Action Plan 2018-2023 is available on our website within our Noise Lab and we would encourage anyone with noise related concerns to read the document and contact us with any questions on the below details.

Flight tracking website <https://flighttracking.casper.aero/edi/>

Email: noise@edinburghairport.com

Phone: 0800 731 3397 (24/7)

Noise Lab <https://noiselab.casper.aero/edi/>

Appendix 1 Summary of EANAB response – received after the consultation closed

After the close of the consultation the Edinburgh Airport Noise Advisory Board (EANAB) submitted a document for consideration. EANAB's responses were considered within the scope of this NAP. Key points made in that document included:

- Concern over the noise monitors and the need to rely on modelling to quantify noise in places other than the direct flight path. It came with a request to install multiple permanent noise monitors beneath existing flightpaths in areas beyond 51LAeq.
- Noise contour maps fail to take in vectoring and dispersal as the model assumes that aircraft follow the SID route. It suggested analysis of EDI radar data to account for dispersal and input the noise modelling tool with data representative of EDI operations. It stated concern over the public's ability to understand contour maps and that the maps were limited in the areas they cover. It also claimed that maps are not produced frequently enough and that they are not validated locally.
- It commented on continuous climb departures and continuous descent approaches stating that the NAP document was misleading. It stated that EAL should talk of noise re-distribution and explain that, depending on the departure profiles, some areas will benefit in terms of noise while others will be negatively affected.
- It went on to talk about air quality and emissions and claimed that points relating to this were misleading. It suggested the NAP document drop suggestions that NO₂ concentrations at St Leonards are linked to EDI operations and that historical trends from 1999 be shown.
- It commented that actual incidence of noise fining is not given and suggested historical noise fining should be reviewed by EANAB.
- It claimed that many residents are concerned about night flights. It suggested that all climb profiles at night time should be optimised for noise until 10,000ft.
- Comments about compensations included the suggestions that the compensation scheme should be extended to areas out with 63dB.
- It claimed there should be a public record of what action has been taken in response to the complaint about noise with the aim of reducing noise in the future.
- The response form was criticised for giving misleading information and suggested that in future EANAB be consulted on all documents that contain references to the EANAB. It questioned the need to include questions on flying profile.
- It claimed the draft NAP document was not an easy read and that there is not enough information about the quantifiable impact of aircraft noise on health and learning.