

Department for Transport

**Survey of Noise Attitudes (SoNA) 2014:
Annoyance**

Further Analysis

Peer Review

Prepared by

Dr Hannah Devine-Wright

Placewise Ltd

&

Stephen Turner, MA, MSc, HonFIOA

Stephen Turner Acoustics Limited

Report Number: PW/STA/06

Date: September 2022

CONTENTS

Section		Page
1	Introduction	3
2	Review	4
3	Overall Conclusion	5

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Placewise Limited (PW) and Stephen Turner Acoustics Limited (STA) have been commissioned by the Department for Transport (DfT) to carry out a peer review of CAP 2250 – Survey of Noise Attitudes 2014 (SoNA2014): Annoyance – Further Analysis.

- 1.2 The comments set out below provide the outcome of this peer review. They should be read in conjunction with the following reports:
 - PW/STA/03 published as CAP 1506c which describes the peer review of the first edition of CAP 1506, published in 2017;
 - PW/STA/04 published as CAP 1506c which describes the peer review of the second edition of CAP 1506, published in 2021

- 1.3 The further analysis of the results of the SoNA2014 study explored several specific issues as described in Paragraph 1.4 of CAP 2250.

2.0 Review

- 2.1 The peer review process followed broadly the same approach as that which occurred for CAP 1506. The reviewers were presented with a draft of the report and this was examined to determine
- if the analytical process was robust;
 - if the analysis properly addressed the aims;
 - if the outcome accurately reflected the analysis; and
 - if the presentation was clear.
- 2.2 The peer reviewers raised a number of issues with the authors, but these were mainly related to the clarity of presentation and typographical issues. With the work carried out in connection with reviewing the second edition of CAP 1506, the reviewers were satisfied with the accuracy of the analytical work undertaken. Having said that, as previously noted by the reviewers, it has to be remembered that respondents were asked to recall their experience of aircraft noise during the previous summer. Although the use of retrospective recall was adequate for this study, ideally, subjective responses would have been obtained during the same time period as that covered by the noise exposure data.
- 2.3 The reviewers also made suggestions regarding documents to be referenced (particularly in connection with the analysis associated with the effectiveness of respite) again to assist with the robustness of the conclusions.
- 2.4 Of all the issues considered, the reviewers felt that the element concerning quantifying the benefits of respite (defined as predictable periods of relief from aircraft noise) to be of greatest interest. For many years, there has been the impression that those affected by the runway alternation system operated at London Heathrow perceived a benefit of respite. Building on the research work undertaken by Heathrow Airport Limited, the results of this further analysis of SoNA2014 provides evidence that this is the case. Furthermore,

the analysis has helped to quantify the degree of respite needed for it to be perceived as such. (See Tables 16 and 17 in CAP 2250).

3 Overall Conclusion

- 3.1 PW and STA have reviewed the report entitled “Survey of Noise Attitudes 2014: Aircraft Noise and Annoyance, Further Analysis”, CAP 2250.
- 3.2 A range of issues have been explored as part of this further analysis and the reviewers are satisfied that the work is robust.
- 3.3 It is, therefore, the view of the peer reviewers that the results and conclusions of the further analysis of the data from SoNA2014 as set out in CAP 2250 can be used as a basis for the further development of Government policy in this area.
