inter.noise 2000

The 29th International Congress and Exhibition on Noise Control Engineering 27-30 August 2000, Nice, FRANCE

I-INCE Classification: 6.6

AIRCRAFT NOISE IN RECREATIONAL AREAS; RESULTS FROM TELEPHONE SURVEYS BEFORE AND AFTER THE 1998 TRANSITION OF NORWAY'S MAIN AIRPORT

N.H. Krog, B. Engdahl

National Institute of Public Health, Department of Environmental Medicine, Box 4404 Torshov, N-0403, Oslo, Norway

Tel.: +47 22042592 / Fax: +47 22042686 / Email: norun.krog@folkehelsa.no

Keywords:

AIRCRAFT NOISE, ANNOYANCE, OUTDOOR RECREATION, SURVEY

ABSTRACT

The 1998 transition of Norway's main airport from Fornebu to Gardermoen provided a unique opportunity to study the impact of changes in aircraft noise on the enjoyment and use of nearby recreational areas. In this study, visitors' experience of aircraft noise is also compared to their experience of other environmental factors.

One recreational area is studied at each airport; Bygdøy close to Fornebu, and Romeriksåsen near Gardermoen. Samples of visitors and potentially visitors of the recreational areas were drawn from postal addresses adjacent to the recreational areas and telephone interviewed both before and after the transition (n=1264-Bygdøy, 1418-Romeriksåsen). Visitors were interviewed about their activities in, and experiences with the area the last three months. A sample of non-visitors was interviewed about why they had not visited the area.

The change in mean score on aircraft noise annoyance is highly significant at both sites. Before the transition, 23 percent were highly annoyed by aircraft noise at Bygdøy and 4 percent at Romeriksåsen. At both sites, aircraft noise was rated as the most annoying factor before the transition. After the transition, almost no one was annoyed by aircraft noise at Bygdøy, and 17 percent were highly annoyed at Romeriksåsen. An interesting change in experience of the whole area was demonstrated at Bygdøy. Five out of seven other potentially annoying factors were rated as significantly less annoying after Fornebu was closed down. The opposite effect was not found at Romeriksåsen. Implications for use of the areas will be discussed

Advice: for more information about this work, please contact the authors.