

## AIRSPACE CHANGE

### Further developments

In my earlier document, summarising where we were as at November 2018, I let Menston residents know that LBA's Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) document was in preparation and, although it was late, the airport hoped to present it to the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) before too much longer. As at the date of the next Airport Consultative Committee meeting on 13 December, there was no mention of this, only that discussions were taking place with representatives of the CAA.

In the event, LBA submitted their ACP to the CAA on 17 December, only 4 days later, but did not announce it, nor have they published it on the LBA website. Therefore, not many people are aware that it has gone to the CAA and is now being considered. It is available on the CAA website, and can be downloaded (all 78 pages) from the URL:

[https://www.caa.co.uk/uploadedFiles/CAA/Content/Accordion/Standard\\_Content/Commercial/Airspace/Airspace\\_Change/70818%20040%20LBA%20ACP%20Proposal%20Document%20Issue%201%20\(For%20Release\)%20REDACTED.pdf](https://www.caa.co.uk/uploadedFiles/CAA/Content/Accordion/Standard_Content/Commercial/Airspace/Airspace_Change/70818%20040%20LBA%20ACP%20Proposal%20Document%20Issue%201%20(For%20Release)%20REDACTED.pdf).

If you copy the above URL and paste it into your web browser, you should be able to view and/or download the document. Not that you'll be much the wiser!

Sadly, it is written in technical jargon and lacks the one thing we (Menston residents) need, and that's a clear track of the new flight-path overlaid on a map.

I can offer residents no assurance that the new flight-path (to be called the Standard Instrument Departure or SID) will pass across the green space between Menston and Burley. I have received verbal assurance that the SID will "replicate the original NPR as closely as possible" but that's rather loose language and the ACP itself makes no such claim. In fact the ACP states that:

".. the new SIDs have been designed to broadly replicate the existing profiles (as far as practicable) and all the new SIDs comply with the existing Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs). Whilst there will be some slight change to the tracks overflown, the truncated element of the SID means that aircraft can expect to receive clearances to climb higher than the existing SID clearance limit sooner than at present, therefore promoting a continuous climb profile which is seen to be beneficial in terms of noise exposure."

So, I remain confused by the statements that the SIDs will comply with the NPRs, but there will be "some slight changes to the tracks overflown": that seems contradictory. Furthermore, LBA (in an earlier document and chart) stated that "aircraft can depart anywhere within the blue hatched area", but this was the whole of the swathe, not the centre-line. Therefore, it is not possible to take any reassurance if LBA hold to the view that it is the entire swathe and not the centre-line which represents the NPR. In addition, if aircraft will be permitted to climb higher and faster, won't that involve keeping the aircraft on full throttle and generate MORE noise exposure, not less?

In the circumstances, I can offer little confidence that the ACP contains what we have repeatedly said is essential for Menston (and Burley, as their circumstances are similar).



I have obtained a promise from Jim Wylie, Head of Air Traffic Services at LBA, that he will make a presentation in Menston, and make all these matters clear, but that cannot take place until late February. We have provisionally agreed that a meeting/presentation will be held at Kirklands on 27 February. There will be notices issued to confirm it.

Unfortunately, the ACP submission as it stands is already with the CAA, and the period of scrutiny (16 weeks) has started on 21 January. We can still make representations to the CAA, but that's not very helpful until and unless we understand the document and what it really means. The presentation on 27 February can only explain what is already in that ACP, but that's another month away, assuming we have clarity at that time. It's a bit like being told: "This is what we're going to do, but we'll explain it for you."

In light of all this, I met with members of the Parish Council and put forward the draft of a letter, to be sent on behalf of the Parish Council. After discussion and as much of an explanation of the ACP as I can currently give, this was approved and despatched to the CAA on 24 January by Registered Post (and receipt has been confirmed). In short, the letter says we remain unhappy about the level of "consultation" provided for the residents of Menston before the document was produced, we have no evidence that our comments have been received or considered, and we can't understand the ACP.

This could, and should, all have been very simple. LBA knows exactly what the flight path has always been between Menston and Burley, that it avoids overflying residential addresses, and that it's the best and only route which could be drawn to do so. There have been consistent and repeated claims of noise and nuisance when aircraft have strayed from that route, and it only takes 1 minute for a jet aircraft to fly all the way along that flight-path, after which it can set the route to its destination. Why should we have to put up with noise and overflying when this has been set down and established for 40 years? If only LBA would enforce it and make operators comply, there would be no reason for complaints from either Menston or Burley. We have had confirmation that this flight-path CAN be flown by modern jet aircraft – it's obvious that a majority DO fly it – so why can't they just confirm the route, program it into the aircrafts' sat-nav systems and then FLY IT?

Any resident who wishes to make further representations is entitled to do so, and if anyone wants to discuss it with me first, I can be contacted by telephone (873497) or by email at [alanelsegood@gmail.com](mailto:alanelsegood@gmail.com).

*Alan Elsegood*, Menston's Rep. on the Airport Consultative Committee