

London Gatwick Route 4
Design Principles

Epsom Room, Hilton, Gatwick Airport

[REDACTED] (GAL) - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (GAL) - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (GAL) - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (ANS) - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] - [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] (Plane Justice) - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (Plane Justice) - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] - (CAGNE)
[REDACTED] (Cathay Pacific Airways) - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (London Heathrow Airport) - [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] - Due regard should be given to the existing conventional routes and the historic routes when implementing new RNAV routes.

[REDACTED] - Heathrow are introducing new procedures queried whether these should be included as constraints by LGW when considering the design of the new R4.

[REDACTED] - NPRs are anachronistic and more weight should be given to the historical routes flown by aircraft.

(Presentation) All agreed that the proposed Level 1 appeared to be the appropriate level for the ACP.

[REDACTED] - Multiple tracks (defined within a swathe) would be preferable as these would offer a degree of controlled dispersion.

[REDACTED] - Agreed that dispersion was preferable and noted that even a small degree of dispersion would be notable on the ground.

[REDACTED] - Reinforced that historical tracks should be paramount and whilst this principle is not addressed in the formal presentation it should be the prime principle.

[REDACTED] - Recommended that whilst we should be mindful of FASI-S that project should not be a constraint on the development of design principles for R4.

[REDACTED] - Any interaction with the LHR DETLING SID should preserve the capacity for the DETLING procedure and throughput capacity.

[REDACTED] - Queried whether the proposed LHR arrival envelopes would be a restriction for R4. [REDACTED] responded by explaining R4 will precede FASI-S and that separate project will follow on. [REDACTED] highlighted that at this point in time no routes have been designed for the future FASI-S project.

[REDACTED] - Dispersion is preferable to concentration.

[REDACTED] - Avoiding Horley should not be the de-facto position. Rural areas should not be specifically targeted. The R4 ACP should take into account other proposed changes to airspace and assess the combined impact.

█ - If urban areas were overflowed historically that should be taken into account. Expressed disagreement that an even spread over the Route should be an aim and that the historical tracks as flown in 2012 should be the aim. The NPR should not be a consideration when considering design principles for R4.

█ - Stated that the overflight of Horley was a result of changes to the route noticeable September 2016. AS responded that the overflight of Horley has been largely addressed.

█ - The pre 2012 route should be the priority and the historical flight paths should be designed to. This ACP should replicate the conventional procedures (Pre 2012) which was the principle behind the initial CAA designs.

█ - A straight departure to 7000ft would be a good solution and address most concerns.

█ - Consideration could be given to different routes for day and night flying. Flights at night are likely to have a bigger impact over urban areas than those in the day. The number of people overflowed should be minimised. Overflight of new population should be avoided.

█ - The Ethical Principles for Airspace Design document contains the principles that should be adhered to. The document has been referenced in the questionnaire return from Plane Justice.

█ - Frequency of movements should be considered when attempting to balance out CO2 emission calculations.

█ - Respite routes should not be used as new people will be overflowed.

█ - Respite is not an option.

█ - Those people historically overflowed (Pre 2012) should provide the baseline for considering the new route. Consideration could be given to additional new traffic (circa 20%) that have utilised this route post 2012 and for this traffic alternative routes could be an option.

█ - Respite routes that are alternated by days of the week would deepen division in communities and it would be difficult to 'umpire' the decision of when such respite options should be implemented.

█ - Other departures routes already offer a 'de-facto' form of respite. Specific respite routes for R4 should not be introduced.

█ - Radar vectoring should not be expected below 7000ft.

█ - The R4 ACP should be seen as 'righting a wrong' in the short term whereas the FASI-S project provides a longer term opportunity to consider changes.