

# Access to Public Information Response

April 23<sup>rd</sup> 2014

## REQUEST UNDER THE CODE OF PRACTICE FOR ACCESS TO PUBLIC INFORMATION

Request sent on April 23<sup>rd</sup> 2014

The Public Services Department has recently sought public consultation with respect to complaints of aircraft noise and/or low flying to the south west of the airport. There have been 60 such complaints since August and response has been sought from the aviation community and others.

On 9 April I notified PSD that its refusal to answer my request for further information concerning the nature of the complaints should be treated as a request under the terms of the Code of Practice for access to public information. This email is in furtherance of that request.

The information which I wish to have disclosed to me is as follows:

1. With respect to the 60 complaints please identify the number of complainants and the number of complaints made made by each of them.
2. Please identify the nature of the complaints with respect to each complainant.

Thus, with respect to point 1. I may be told that Complainant A has made 24 complaints, Complainant B 16 and Complainants C and D 10 each.

With respect to point 2. Complainant A's complaints all related to light aircraft, whilst those of Complainant B. were related to 12 public transport aircraft and 4 light aircraft whilst Complainant C. had only complained about Trislander aircraft.

My belief is that the information the subject of this request is readily available. I stress that I do not request that complainants be identified. I believe that I need the information to make a fully reasoned submission and have concluded that the refusal to provide it to me could indicate that the consultation is intended to be cursory in nature.

States of Guernsey response April 30<sup>th</sup> 2014:

A log of correspondence/calls received between June and the end of November 2013 was compiled for review by the Director of Civil Aviation.

This detailed 51 separate complaints, general concerns, or requests for information, from 18 individuals.

- 19 complaints identified specific aircraft movements. Of these, 10 listed multiple movements, while nine referred to a single aircraft movement.

- Another 23 complaints referred to a general trend of increased noise and/or variation in flight path, or reported multiple aircraft movements without identifying specific flights.
- A further nine requests for information or suggestions, arising from above complaints/concerns, were also included.

Reports that were received which fell into more than one of the above general categories, e.g. they referred to a specific aircraft movement and a general trend, were recorded under both.

In addition, the log also included:-

- Two public meetings. Each one is listed as a single entry, although multiple specific complaints and/or reports of a trend were highlighted by a number of attendees.

Of the 18 correspondents detailed above:-

- 14 contacted the Department only once or twice, usually to report either a trend or, in some instances, multiple aircraft movements.
- 1 contacted the Department four times
- 1 contacted the Department seven times
- 1 contacted the Department eight times
- 1 contacted the Department 14 times

An overview of the most common complaints is included in section 5 of the subsequent DCA report. Aurigny Trislander aircraft were most frequently mentioned in complaints relating to specific aircraft movements. However individual complaints have not been categorised by aircraft type, therefore such a breakdown is not available.

It should be noted that further complaints and other correspondence have been received since the log was compiled. This correspondence is being kept on file for consideration as part of the consultation, however it has not yet been summarised or analysed in the same manner.