

Airspace Modernisation Workshop – Design Principles

Wednesday 29th May 2019

Attendees

London City Airport (LCY, 4 representatives)
NATS
London Borough of Newham (2 representatives)
BA City Flier
Hacan East
London Chamber of Commerce

Apologies had been received from:
Royal Docks Learning and Activity Centre
Local Resident
GLA

Meeting Minutes

Meeting started with LCY providing a short overview of airspace modernisation. LCY then proceeded with the presentation.

A representative from the London Borough of Newham enquired as to the relationship between LAMP 1a and the proposed airspace modernisation. NATS explained that LAMP is in relation to flights above 7,000 ft and that airports are responsible for flights below.

A representative from the London Borough of Newham asked whether airspace modernisation was replacing LAMP 1a or to compliment it. NATS explained that it was working in parallel and upper level routes were not complete. NATs will be providing information to the airports to help with its development. It was explained that LAMP 1a (RNAV) is in operation now and could be revised as part of this project.

LCY informed the group that LAMP 1A first phase has been approved and is in place. LCY also stressed that this is the first stage in the process and not at formal consultation stage yet.

LCY proceeded with the presentation.

A representative from HACAN East welcomed that benefits to climb and decline profiles were anticipated across the nationwide programme. It was enquired as to whether there was co-operation between the airports or is it too early in the stage. LCY advised that the changes are being done as a grouping of airports. There are already arrangements with LHR and other airports to work together once engagement has started. No one airport will take priority.

A representative from HACAN East informed the group that there was a problem with LCY planes when they fly under LHR planes because they are held at low altitude. HACAN can help raise awareness to this problem to help LCY's position with LHR in this context.

NATS suggested that keeping planes higher for longer is likely to be possible through airspace modernisation overall. LCY advised that it will explore all options. It was acknowledged that steeper continuous descent would be of benefit to local residents.

LCY explained that as it has undertaken LAMP 1a already LCY is more advanced than other airports in terms of navigation technology.

LCY played the NATs video on airspace, showing airspace through the decades.

LCY explained that every stage there is a requirement to engage or consult, and outlined the CAP1616 process.

A representative from HACAN East enquired as to whether the engagement would be general public or key stakeholders. LCY confirmed it would be key stakeholders at this stage, but that a public consultation will commence once design options had been developed later in the process. LCY reiterated the earlier point that this exercise was engagement and not consultation.

A representative from the London Borough of Newham enquired as to the significance of aircraft flying at 7000ft. NATS explained the DfT guidelines and impact above 7000ft particularly in relation to noise was not considered significant.

A representative from the London Borough of Newham enquired as to whether multiple flight routes overflying the same area would be a problem for aircraft under 7000ft.

LCY advised that where our aircraft overfly the same areas as Heathrow, that these aircraft are typically below 7,000ft.

LCY moved onto the design principle slide.

LCY explained that the discussion today was to hear views of the individuals in the room prior to wider engagement and was not formal responses on behalf of their organisation.

It was asked who the change sponsor was. LCY advised it was the airport.

It was mentioned that when engaging with stakeholders the airport should be explicit in what this process does not include e.g. operating house etc.

The list of proposed stakeholders was discussed and it was raised that the Mayor of London was not listed as a key stakeholder, along with the absence of businesses and business groups on the list. LCY confirmed that they would be included in the engagement process.

A stakeholder stated that it was right to limit initial engagement to key stakeholders who are more informed and interested at this stage. It was also mentioned that LHR went out for wider consultation but that this wasn't advised.

A representative from the London Borough of Newham enquired as to the baseline for the environmental assessment. NATS said it would be measured against current day operations and projected growth.

The design principles of other airports were reviewed.

LCY proceeded to the discussion of LCY design principles slide.

An attendee suggested that noise mitigation section should be left as options. It was suggested that during the engagement process the airport should provide context on the measures they have implemented around noise e.g. sound insulation scheme.

It suggested it would be worth spelling out which ones where there can and cannot be a choice e.g. the principle around operational practices and the choice between newly overflowed vs managed dispersal. LCY explained that they are all choices. It was advised that it needs to be spelt out as they wouldn't get it from the current wording. LCY agreed that additional explanation will be added to the wider engagement document.

A representative from the London Chamber of Commerce said that it would be good to see minimum service guarantee e.g. contingency arrangements in abnormal operating conditions. LCY explained what this principle meant.

It was enquired as to what the definition is for avoid overflying sensitive areas, and what area of the ground was considered to be impacted by aircraft overhead. NATS advised that a CAA document provides that definition.

An attendee suggested that noise in open areas should be considered. LCY enquired as to whether this should be a separate design principle. The attendee responded by saying it's something that needs looking at. It was suggested that the airport might want to treat big open parks differently to say school playing fields.

There was a discussion around whether the CO2 principle should be in Tier 1. It was understood that government guidelines suggest that noise should be prioritised over CO2 up to 7,000 ft and therefore it should be moved to Tier 2.

A representative from BA Cityfliner suggested that in Tier 1 design principle 2 and 3 go hand in hand with the EU directive. Another attendee enquired whether they overlap and one should be taken out.

A representative from the London Borough of Newham raised the point that improving air quality in the local area is not solely within the gift of the airport, so this design principle needs to specifically mention aircraft operations. LCY suggested that maybe that principle needs to be rewording.

A representative from BA Cityfliner enquired to see if the airport was looking to introduce AR point 5 approach. LCY responded by saying that it's a technology that the airport is interested in.

A representative from HACAN East suggested that the airport might want to explain to those in the engagement process the difference between managed dispersal and predictable respite routes
LCY agreed that examples may be needed. It was suggested that managed dispersal should be put in if practical.

LCY explained that Tier 1 is likely to be yes/no response; Tier 2 ranked, and noise mitigation ranked.

There was general consensus in the room that the design principles on the whole cover the right points and that the workshop was the right approach. Further workshops need to continue to have that mix of different stakeholders to encourage a balanced discussion.

A representative from the London Borough of Newham enquired as to whether we would be reaching out to complainants. JS responded by saying that it was worthwhile to reach out to regular complainants inviting them to reply, but not involving them in the workshops.