

Dear Sirs,

I write in response to the 'Aviation Noise discussion paper'.

My reply takes the form of commenting on designated paragraphs of that paper.

- 1.1 Yes, the increase in the number (and therefore the sustained noise) of aircraft has effected an increase in nuisance and annoyance;
- 1.11 Money neither reduces the nuisance and nor can it compensate for it;
- 2.15 This is absolutely true. It is quite impractical for people to keep note of every disturbance and to make a complaint each time. Most of us just suffer in silence;
- 2.4 Yes, when landing into the wind the noise of the receding aircraft, with the jets pointing in one's direction, is greater than on its approach. That is not to underestimate the noise on its approach, too. The noise increases further with the changing the pitch of the engines, as mentioned in 2.10;
- 2.6 The figure of 700,000, I suggest, is a considerable understatement when taking those affected in all the UK airports and this appears to be reflected in tables 2.1 and 2.2, the latter showing LHR's figure alone at 725,000 – more than all the other airports put together at (697,000);
- 2.19 The connection between outdoor aircraft noise and sleep deprivation is substantiated by the fact that I am very frequently woken by it between 4.30 am and 5.30 am. The comparison between the affect and level of aircraft noise with that of a baby crying is a bad one, since parents, especially mothers, are by nature programmed to hearing their baby crying;
- 2.20 Yes, older people tend to sleep less deeply than the young;
- 2.32 The main flight path over Barnes passes directly over Barnes Primary School, also (2.36) over Barnes Common;
- 3.27 Whatever measurement is used it is the peak individual aircraft noise that wakes people up. The rest of the noise remains a nuisance. Never mind the average, it is the noise of each and almost every aircraft that constitutes a nuisance, interrupts conversation (especially outdoors or with windows or doors open) and sleep. The average noise level over a given period may be relevant to its affect on health, but is less so from the nuisance point of view compared to that of each and every individual aircraft. In this respect, the statement at 3.27 is absolutely right;
- 3.37-3.39 As far as I am concerned, the so-called noise efficiency of an airport is totally irrelevant since, whatever this may be, people are still suffering the same amount of nuisance. This *productivity* measurement ignores the impact of aircraft noise on people living within the noise footprint. I do not think that those concerned would appreciate this kind of somewhat twisted philosophy;
- 3.43 This sounds like a good idea;
- 3.46/7 Quite correct;
- 3.48 Why opt for a decibel level that marks the *onset* of significant community annoyance? Why not adopt a lower level that avoids this onset. I think the Government should research the

current absolute levels of aircraft noise in each postcode area and base the noise level required to avoid significant community annoyance on the results.

3.53 I would recommend the measurement of an absolute noise level. To take the *extra* noise level above that already experienced would assume that the existing noise level is acceptable which it is not, particularly during the early morning and late evening.

It would be hard to imagine a greater number of people who would be affected by aircraft noise than that caused by the expansion of LHR. Any new airport should be sited -

- a) where it would cause the least harm and certainly not within a densely populated area;
- b) where approach and take-off can be effected over the sea;
- c) without causing pollution over a large number of people (which occurs now);
- d) without endangering lives by flying over densely populated areas (as at present – a crash over London would be a disaster on a massive scale);

4.1 As far as I am concerned nuisance noise is nuisance noise and should be reduced, preferably, by removing LHR to a less populated area. No amount of money, otherwise, is going to alter this basic fact;

4.6 This can hardly come as a surprise since common sense would indicate that those living beneath, or very close to, a flight path would be likely to provide the highest volume of complaints. They would not, therefore, represent the general population;

4.8 That may be so, but the *average* noise level has no bearing as regards the aircraft noise produced in the early morning, in particular, and the fact that people are awakened thereby at a ridiculously early hour;

4.11 I should have thought that, given these figures, the target would be 50_{L_{DNL}} and not 55_{DNL}. In the event of this target being unachievable at LHR, such a situation would provide a good indicator of the need to move the airport elsewhere;

4.17 - last paragraph. It is for this reason that a move to a non-urban environment is strongly indicated;

4.20 Absolutely right. Night-time noise is bad enough with windows closed but it becomes infinitely worse with them open. This point is relevant to the introduction of double glazing since, with windows open, it would provide no benefit whatsoever. Also, the space between panes required to make double glazing effective against noise is far greater than that needed against heat loss. Many window frames would be unable to provide sufficient depth to take such a measure;

4.22 These comparative figures do not apply in the case of early morning and night flights when traffic noise is substantially lower than at other times;

4.24 My views have already been expressed at 4.1;

4.26 This paragraph attempts to show the residents as being at fault for living under an aircraft noise footprint! When I moved to Barnes twenty-five years ago LHR operated a fraction of the

number of flights that it does now, with consequently far less noise. If the fault lies anywhere, it is with the decision by successive governments, airline and airport operators for allowing/insisting on the continual expansion of an airport, mistakenly taken over as London's main hub, instead of building, like France, a properly sited and designed one at a much earlier stage. To have thousands of aircraft regularly overflying densely populated areas of London is madness from the safety angle alone, but especially so as, additionally, all these flights contribute in a major way to air and noise pollution. I have no intention of moving from my home and no amount of money is going to reduce the noise of these flights. This being so, the right thing to do is to move this airport to a far more suitable site;

4.37 But all these considerations are important and, perhaps, should become subject to study;

5.2 They would say this wouldn't they. Of course the doubling of the number of flights will increase the amount of noise produced, not necessarily in intensity but certainly in duration (apart from doubling the air pollution they cause);

5.13 Yes, the second sentence says it all – airports should not be located in noise-sensitive areas;

5.22 Yes, fine. But to be told in advance that you are going to be bitten by a shark in no way lessens the pain!

5.28 & 5.31 I think it is fair to say that towards dawn sleep becomes lighter. So it is at this very time that the greatest number of night flights are concentrated – 04.30 – 06.00 with the inevitable likelihood of people being prematurely awakened.

5.39 Noise envelopes would permit airports to operate at any time and at any level during the night. This would be totally unacceptable to those living beneath a flight path. Also, whatever body was made responsible for monitoring such activity would have to be completely independent. Their task would be like trying to check on the movements of a jelly.

Yours faithfully,