

# Gatwick Route 4 Redesign of RNAV SIDs

## Design Principles Review Response



## Document Details

---

Reference	Description
<b>Document Title</b>	Gatwick Route 4 Redesign of RNAV SIDs
	Design Principles Review Response
<b>Document Ref</b>	71248 031
<b>Issue</b>	Issue 1 Final
<b>Date</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> June 2019
<b>Classification</b>	

# 1 Responses

---

As one of our key stakeholders, London Gatwick Airport appreciates the time and effort you have invested in helping us to develop Design Principles to support the Route 4 airspace redesign project. We would now welcome any further comments you may have to help us further develop the shortlist of Design Principles. These principles will serve as the framework against which detailed design work may commence. An opportunity for further involvement will be provided during the design work, and again during the formal consultation, which will include a much wider group of aviation and non-aviation stakeholders.

Please mark your response to each of the questions below and provide any additional comments you wish us to consider.

Send your completed document to [lgwairspace.rte4@gatwickairport.com](mailto:lgwairspace.rte4@gatwickairport.com) by 1700 hours on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

Thank you for your continued support.

Question 1	
Do you agree that London Gatwick Airport has developed its Route 4 Design Principles in full accord with the process detailed in CAP 1616, Step 1B?	
Response <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Additional Comments:	

Question 2	
Do you agree that the comprehensive list of Design Principles captures the specific areas of concern you have articulated in either a questionnaire or during participation in one of the focus groups?	
Response <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Additional Comments:	

Question 3	
Do you broadly support our reasons for not including certain Design Principles in the short list? If not, please provide further comment.	
Response <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Additional Comments:	

Question 4	
Do you believe any of the items selected for the shortlist of Design Principles are inappropriate selections? If so, please explain why.	
Response <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Additional Comments:	

Question 5	
Do you agree with the prioritisation that we have applied to the shortlist of Design Principles? If not, please add any comments and use Table 1 on page 6 to provide us with your preferred prioritisation.	
Response <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Additional Comments:	

Question 6	
Are there other Design Principles not included in the long list list that you feel should be considered as candidates for the final shortlist? If so, please provide your comments.	
Response <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Additional Comments:	

Question 7	
Do you have any other comments on how the CAP 1616, Step 1B process has been conducted to date?	
Response <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Additional Comments:	

Table 1 on the next page lists the Design Principles initially prioritised according to the volume of responses (greatest volume at the top of the list) returned in questionnaires and from comment during discussions at the recent focus groups.

If you agree that the Design Principles have been prioritised correctly, then please indicate this by marking the table with a comment.

If however, you believe an item should have a higher priority, then please use the right hand column to indicate this.

Prioritised No (a)	Design Principle (b)	Your priority (c)
1	Route 4 options will be designed safely with full regulatory compliance	
2	Designs should be built to manage dispersion below 7,000 ft	
3	New Route 4 designs should give due regard to the historic routings in use before 2012	
4	Designs should seek to minimize overflight of previously unaffected locations	
5	Designs will seek to avoid overflight of notified noise sensitive areas	
6	Route 4 designs should seek to minimise the impact of adverse noise on the Surrey Hills AONB	
7	Route 4 designs should consider neighbouring airports procedures to ensure adequate deconfliction	
8	Routes should include an extended westerly climb profile before a later easterly turn	
9	Designs should not include respite options that place routes over newly overflown populations	
10	Overflight protections already contained in the UK AIP must be maintained	
11	Route 4 procedures should follow M25 and A24 corridors where background noise already high	
12	Designs should be built to concentrate dispersion below 7,000ft	
13	Procedures should include RF legs	
14	ARINC 424 coding must ensure aircraft follow the desired lateral and vertical paths	
15	Routes should be designed to limit the wrap around turn to no more than 180°	
16	Route 4 designs must consider FASI-S objectives and ensure alignment	
17	Route 4 designs should not be constrained by the lateral dimensions of the existing NPR to 4,000ft	

Table 1 - Stakeholder Prioritised Shortlist of Design Principles

Thank you for completing this table.