ID	Start time	Completion time	Name	Company/Organisation (where applicable)	Date of response	Must maintain (and ideally enhance) current safety standards	Must be in compliance with all laws and regulations	Must enhance navigation standards by utilising modern navigation technology	Must provide sufficient capacity to support future demand	Are there other design principles that must be achieved?	Points - In what order would you prioritise the following design principles?	Points - Should minimise the amount of fuel used and the CO2 subsequently emitted
Form Response 1	6/25/19 15:37:29	6/25/19 15:41:08	anonymous	British Helicopter Association	6/25/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	There should be minimal impact to users of surrounding airspace - not affect their safety	4	2
Form Response 2	6/29/19 10:06:14	6/29/19 11:00:03	anonymous		6/29/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		2	1
Form Response 3	7/1/19 19:52:56	7/1/19 20:34:05	anonymous	The Honourable Company of Air Pilots	7/1/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Airspace change must also support operational resilience during abnormal conditions, providing increased capacity without system resilience may precipitate increased passenger delays/disruption during poor weather periods. Therefore, Resilience should be removed from question 6 and introduced here. As part of addressing safety in the first item above, it is important that changes do not result in increased flight deck workload or introduce additional complexity.	1	3
Form Response 4	7/4/19 10:00:32	7/4/19 10:03:07	anonymous	SWISS International Air Lines ltd.	7/4/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		1	3
Form Response 5	7/8/19 10:27:52	7/8/19 10:30:55	anonymous		7/8/2019						1	1
Form Response 6	7/16/19 9:15:22	7/16/19 9:27:16	anonymous	London Biggin Hill Airport	7/16/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Liaison with adjacent airports to ensure a coordinated and agreed approach to the reorganisation of the adjacent airspace, ensuring equal opportunities for all airspace users.	1	1
Form Response 7	7/19/19 14:50:08	7/19/19 14:52:32	anonymous	London Borough of Redbridge	7/17/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	That the stacking of planes not have a negative impact on the residents of the London Borough of Redbridge. Where planes must be stacked, we would ask that this be done a reasonable hours. The borough already must endure stacking from the Lombard Stack.	1	1
Form Response 8	7/29/19 10:48:44	7/29/19 10:53:10	anonymous	Gatwick Airport	7/26/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Form Response 9	7/29/19 10:53:17	7/29/19 10:56:50	anonymous	Local Resident	7/29/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Must reduce the impact of LCY on local residents	3	1
Form Response 10	8/1/19 14:16:21	8/1/19 14:19:03	anonymous	N/A	7/29/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	1) Important to stop think of hub spoke routes that concentrate convergence and start thinking of a spider-web, designed to minimise it. 2) Meeting demand should not be a design principle. The existence of demand does not predicate it's being fully met when their are high social or environmental costs. Rather it predicates controlling how and to what degree the meeting of demand should be permitted. Hence a major proportion of our legislation and fiscal policy is concerned to regulate demand fulfilment be it for tobacco, gambling, sex industry, fossil fuels etc.	3	1
Form Response 11	8/4/19 21:13:08	8/4/19 21:16:00	anonymous	Dulwich & Herne Hill Quiet Skies Campaign	8/4/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		2	1
Form Response 12	8/7/19 13:12:10	8/7/19 13:16:39	anonymous	SWISS Route Support	8/7/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		2	4
Form Response 13	8/8/19 10:11:22	8/8/19 10:28:39	anonymous	KLM Cityhopper	8/8/2019	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Must enable current users to still operate without new/different navigation standards. Introduce CDO at LCY.	1	3
Form Response 14	8/11/19 7:43:38	8/11/19 7:50:40	anonymous		8/11/2019	No	Yes	No	No	Ensure collective contribution to sharing of burden of aircraft noise, not severe penalisation of select communities	5	2
Form Response 15	8/13/19 13:52:14	8/13/19 13:59:56	anonymous	DAATM - MOD	8/13/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The MOD would wish London City to consider the inclusion of a DP that acknowledges the requirement to consider other airspace users, including adjacent airports. Specific to current operations at RAF Northolt, a design that allows airports to operate independently would be preferable however given the complexity of the airspace, a design that minimises any dependency on another airport's operation and minimises over flight of the same communities on one another's departure/arrival routes, would be acceptable. In addition, airspace modernisation and future airspace design must consider and allow for MOD access to airspace in order to meet future defence requirements.		1
Form Response 16	8/14/19 11:54:07	8/14/19 11:58:28	anonymous		8/14/2019						3	1
Form Response 17	8/16/19 14:40:45	8/16/19 14:51:57	anonymous	NATS En-Route Limited	8/16/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		2	2
Form Response 18	8/18/19 16:33:50	8/18/19 16:56:44	anonymous		8/18/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Looking at other options / sites to minimise environmental impact. Compliance with the zero carbon policy levels for London by 2050. Consideration of local residents / areas for noise and air pollution. Maintain the 24 hour quite period.	2	1
Form Response 19	8/19/19 11:56:52	8/19/19 12:10:10	anonymous	Flybe	8/19/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Must not penalise current day-to-day operations just to allow for future demand.	2	2
Form Response 20	8/19/19 21:42:06	8/19/19 21:47:04	anonymous		8/19/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		3	1
Form Response 21	8/20/19 8:10:52	8/20/19 8:31:31	anonymous		8/20/2019	Yes	Yes	No	No	The most important design principle is that the airport operations should be acceptable to society. This means conducting the airport's activities in such a way as to minimise the harm to society. This should be the over-arching principle - "do no harm".	3	1
Form Response 22	8/20/19 16:22:56	8/20/19 16:25:59	anonymous		8/20/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Minimise noise pollution. Minimise flights over London, a densely populated city.	1	1
Form Response 23	8/22/19 16:09:06	8/22/19 16:14:19	anonymous	London Borough of Waltham Forest	8/22/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The change in airspace modernisation must be seen as an opportunity to reduce the impact of air travel on the health and wellbeing of people living underneath flight paths, and the contribution of the aviation industry to meeting the IPCC's objective for zero net emissions by 2050. As a result, the following design principles should be added to Tier 1 objectives: 1.Must reduce the amount of fuel used and the CO2 subsequently emitted; 2.Must reduce aircraft noise, and the impact of aircraft noise on people living underneath flight paths; 3.Must reduce the impact of air pollution on people living in the local area from aircraft. The design principle 'Must provide sufficient capacity to support future demand' should be removed from the Tier 1 design principles, and placed in Tier 2. Enabling future demand should not take priority over the health and wellbeing of people living underneath flightpaths or reducing the aviation industries contribution to climate change. This is supported by the UK Committee on Climate Change (CCC), which states achieving the UK's disappointing target of net-zero by 2050 target, and current targets for aviation emissions set out in Aviation 2050, will require steps to reduce demand in air travel, limiting growth to 25% increase on today's levels.	1	2
Form Response 24	8/22/19 19:05:23	8/22/19 19:11:56	anonymous		8/22/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		1	2
Form Response 25	8/22/19 21:54:04	8/22/19 22:05:36	anonymous		8/22/2019	Yes	Yes	No	No	Reduce the number of flights. Don't fly between 11pm and 7am. Add tax to the fuel as with cars.	1	1
Form Response 26	8/23/19 9:56:04	8/23/19 10:07:52	anonymous	Hacan East	8/3/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Our view is that the only Tier 1 principles should be those which are non-negotiable. That applies to the first three but not the fourth one.	1	1
Form Response 27	8/23/19 10:08:01	8/23/19 10:58:31	anonymous	Heathrow Airport	8/14/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Heathrow accepts that the airspace design should aim to be compliant with relevant laws and regulations. However there may be cases whereby a final design may not be fully compliant with a particular regulation and has a specific safety case to mitigate this issue. Given the importance of noise to local communities, and as reflected in the air navigation guidance 2017, Heathrow believes that the list of mandatory design principles should contain a principle relating to meeting the Govt's commitments on sustainable growth with respect to noise. (relating to number 4) Heathrow included a design principle reflecting its need to provide sufficient capacity following expansion to meet requirements of the Airports National Policy Statement. Perhaps London City could rephrase design principle D to reflect the need to provide sufficient capacity to instead meet the requirements of the CAA's Airspace Modernisation Strategy.		
Form Response 28	8/23/19 10:58:34	8/23/19 11:00:04	anonymous	MP for Poplar and Limehouse	8/16/2019	Yes	Yes					1
Form Response 29	8/23/19 11:00:07	8/23/19 11:01:55	anonymous		8/16/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	A recognition that air transport will diminish over the next few years as it become increasingly recognised that the pollution effects are too damaging to the environment.	1	1
Form Response 30	8/23/19 11:02:08	8/23/19 11:03:42	anonymous		8/18/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Maintain the 24 hour quite period. Looking at other options / sites to minimise environmental impact. Compliance with the zero carbon policy levels for London by 2050. Consideration of local residents / areas for noise and air pollution.	2	1
Form Response 31	8/23/19 11:27:41	8/23/19 11:29:19	anonymous		8/23/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Reduce pollution and noise in London area.	1	2
Form Response 32	8/23/19 15:34:23	8/23/19 15:40:19	anonymous	London First	8/23/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, we agree with those principles.	2	2
Form Response 33	8/23/19 19:38:12	8/23/19 19:48:37	anonymous		8/23/2019	Yes	No	Yes	No	Residents under the flight path MUST NOT be impacted by any increase in flights and the times of existing flights must be altered.	1	1
Form Response 34	8/24/19 8:10:50	8/24/19 8:21:50	anonymous		8/24/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		1	2
Form Response 35	8/24/19 14:27:41	8/24/19 14:32:46	anonymous		8/24/2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Impact on residents who are overflown by Heathrow flights must be considered	1	1
Form Response 36	8/25/19 12:39:11	8/25/19 12:47:32	anonymous	Netjets Transportes Aereos	8/25/2019	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	None	1	3

ID	Points - Should limit and where possible reduce aircraft noise	Feedback - Should limit and where possible reduce aircraft noise	Should minimise air pollution in the local area from aircraft	Points - Should minimise air pollution in the local area from aircraft	Feedback - Should minimise air pollution in the local area from aircraft	Should improve resilience during abnormal operating conditions	Points - Should improve resilience during abnormal operating conditions	Feedback - Should improve resilience during abnormal operating conditions	Are there other design principles that should be achieved?	Points - Are there other design principles that should be achieved?	Feedback - Are there other design principles that should be achieved?	Are there any design principles that should be removed from the list in Q6?	Points - Are there any design principles that should be removed from the list in Q6?	Feedback - Are there any design principles that should be removed from the list in Q6?	Points - In what order would you prioritise these noise mitigation options?	Feedback - In what order would you prioritise these noise mitigation options?	Use noise efficient operational practices	Points - Use noise efficient operational practices	Feedback - Use noise efficient operational practices	Minimise the number of people newly overflown	Points - Minimise the number of people newly overflown	Feedback - Minimise the number of people newly overflown	Maximise sharing through predictable respite routes	Points - Maximise sharing through predictable respite routes	Feedback - Maximise sharing through predictable respite routes	Avoid overflying communities with multiple routes, including from other airports	Points - Avoid overflying communities with multiple routes, including from other airports	Feedback - Avoid overflying communities with multiple routes, including from other airports	Maximise sharing through managed dispersal	Points - Maximise sharing through managed dispersal	Feedback - Maximise sharing through managed dispersal
Form Response 1			3			1											1			7			4			5			2		
Form Response 2			2			4											1			7			1			1			1		
Form Response 3			2						Please see answer to Q11.			Resilience should be removed from question 6 and placed in the list of 'Must do' design principles.					1			7			6			4			5		
Form Response 4			2			4											1			7			2			5			6		
Form Response 5			1			1											2			1			2			1			6		
Form Response 6			2			4			Harmonised Routes - Consider the effect of any changes in flight routes on the behaviour of other airspace users.			No					1			2			2			2			3		
Form Response 7			1			1			All of the above are key priorities. We consider noise and pollution as going hand and hand. Please ensure no additonal noise or pollution is created.																						
Form Response 8									No																						
Form Response 9			2			4											3			5			2			4			1		
Form Response 10			1			2											3			5			2			1			1		
Form Response 11			1			2											1			7			1			1			1		
Form Response 12			4			1											2			6			3			5			7		
Form Response 13			4			2			NO			NO					1			2			4			5			7		
Form Response 14			2			4											4			1			6			2			5		
Form Response 15									MOD has no comment.			MOD has no comment.																			
Form Response 16			2			4											4			7			3			1			2		
Form Response 17			2			2			We would also like to suggest that one specific Design Principle is given consideration, particularly with reference to the integrated nature of the wider programme of airspace modernisation. Therefore we would suggest adding sufficient wording to cover the following; •Any design work undertaken will ultimately take into account the change in vertical reference caused by the transition altitude, particularly with interactions with other airports. With the rationale: •NATS will be responsible for the network design for arrivals and departures above 7000ft/FL70 with Exeter Airport responsible for the routes to/from the ground, including interactions with adjacent airports and appropriate community engagement. However network route positions will be influenced to a large degree by the airports' requirements (geographically distilled into the Letterbox positions for each proposed route). These letterboxes/route positions will also be influenced by the Transition Altitude and any interactions between the routes of other airports.																						
Form Response 18			3			4			Impact to local areas for noise / air pollution. Compliance with the impending government zero carbon policy. Maintain the 24 hour quite period			Should remove current low level flight paths. ie 3000ft					5			6			2			1			3		
Form Response 19			4			3						No					1			2			3			5			4		
Form Response 20			2			4			No			No					2			7			5			1			4		
Form Response 21			2			4						Yes - the last on the list.					4			5			2			1			3		
Form Response 22			1						Reduce flights over London, due to noise and air pollution.											7						1					
Form Response 23			3			4			A design principle to minimise the cumulative impact of flight paths on communities from airports across London and the South East should be added to the objectives of the modernisation process. Specifically, LCY should work with Heathrow airport to prioritise reduction of flights below 5,000ft across Waltham Forest, and wider LCY flightpath. Flights from LCY rise to 3,000ft within 9km of take-off, but then remain at this altitude for the next 15km as they fly across East London and the flight-path of aircraft approaching Heathrow. Flights from LCY are particularly impactful due to their low height, and designing operations to allow flights from LCY to fly above 5,000ft should be a priority for both Heathrow and LCY. This should be treated as priority 4, above 'should improve resilience during abnormal operating conditions'.			The following design principle 'should improve resilience during abnormal operating conditions' should be removed from the Q2a list. Reducing the impact of aviation on people living underneath flight paths should be the priority of any changes to airspace operation, and should not be compromised due to industry fuelled increase in demand for air travel. This design principle should be replaced with a priority to minimise the cumulative impact of airport flights across London and the South East, as detailed in Q2b.					4			7			2			1			3		
Form Response 24			3			4			The people living near the airport should be main consideration			yes the one about increasing resilience during abnormal conditions.					5			2			6			1			7		
Form Response 25			1			4			Shouldn't fly during abnormal flying conditions. Should set up a board including local people living in the flightpaths who are elected and are active community members. Make sure that you offset any carbon emissions you produce and that you are carbon neutral.			It's not clear what improving resilience is in abnormal conditions. Sounds like continue to fly in situations such as adverse weather conditions. This sounds dangerous and should be removed.								1						1					
Form Response 26			1			1			We are happy with these Tier 2 principles. As indicated in our summary, since these changes are dealing with changes below 7,000ft, in line with Government policy, reducing noise rather than cutting CO2 should be the priority.								2			4			1			7			3		
Form Response 27									Heathrow believes that local communities should be the key stakeholder involved in ranking the design principles. From a network perspective, the principle to improve resilience is a high priority. Given the close proximity of Heathrow and LCY and in recognition of community feedback relating to overflights from both airports, Heathrow would welcome the inclusion of a design principle which reflects the desire to promote optimal network performance. London City may also wish to include a principle which seeks to minimse the impact on other airspace users.																	1					
Form Response 28																															
Form Response 29			1			4			Yes, fewer flights								1			1			1			1			1		
Form Response 30			3			4			Reducing noise / air pollution to local areas Compliance with the impending government zero carbon policy. Maintain the 24 hour quite period.								6			5			2			1			3		
Form Response 31			1			4			Reduce pollution and noise in London area.			NO					1			1			3			1			3		
Form Response 32			2			1			No, we agree with those principles.			No, we agree with those principles.					1			4			4			4			4		
Form Response 33			1			1						Should improve resilience during abnormal operating conditions					1			1			1			1			1		
Form Response 34			3			4											3			4			5			2			6		
Form Response 35			1			1			see response to Q.5								1			1			1			1			1		
Form Response 36			4			2			None			None					6			3			5			4			7		

ID	Minimise the total population overflown	Points - Minimise the total population overflown	Feedback - Minimise the total population overflown	Avoid overflying noise sensitive areas e.g. schools, hospitals, care homes	Points - Avoid overflying schools, hospitals, care homes	Feedback - Avoid overflying noise sensitive areas e.g. schools, hospitals, care homes	Are there other noise mitigation options we should consider and how would you prioritise them relative to your response in Q5?	Points - Are there other noise mitigation options we should consider and how would you prioritise them relative to your response in Q5?	Feedback - Are there other noise mitigation options we should consider and how would you prioritise them relative to your response in Q5?	Do you have any further comments?	Points - Do you have any further comments?	Feedback - Do you have any further comments?
Form Response 1	3				6							
Form Response 2	7				2		A complete ban should be imposed on all but the quietest classes of aircraft. There should be a zero tolerance policy completely restricting any noisier craft from taking off or landing at the airport due to the built up nature of the surroundings. Noisier aircraft should be confined to using 'out of town' airports (e.g. Stansted). A maximum cap on noise should be introduced (duration of noise, and level of noise) for all neighbouring communities (North and South of the Thames). Compensation should be paid for all breaches of this cap (similar broadband outage or train delay in approach). This would incentivise the airport to play a more active role in noise reduction and ensure incentives are properly aligned with the community. It would also ensure the community's expectations are better managed as they will know the maximum level of noise they can reasonably expect to encounter and that the airport is properly incentivised to address any deviations from this.			With respect to noise, the priorities must be maximising sharing and respite. Even though this means a greater number of people will be affected by noise, each person would be affected to a lower, more reasonable level. This would be a more equitable way of sharing the cost to the community from the airport (noise). Given the community shares in its benefits (e.g. jobs and economic profits) it is right that the costs (noise) are shared more evenly and not concentrated on a few unfortunate homes under highly concentrated flight paths. The 'Our Future Skies' (London City Airport, 2019) proposed principle that City Airport should increase capacity to meet demand should be removed from the design principles for London City Airport. In the UK, airport capacity should be evaluated at a regional and national level not at an airport specific level. Capacity increases should focus on airports that can both meet demand and minimise the environmental impacts of increasing capacity (including noise, CO2, air pollution). This is best achieved through airports in lower population density areas (e.g. Stansted) where the impacts are lower.		
Form Response 3	2				3					Noise will be a major concern for those living close to airports but it is likely that those people will increasingly want other aspects of aviation's environmental footprint to be minimised too. There may be emission benefits in using higher power settings and climbing more steeply in the early stages after take off, rather than the current practice of reducing power for noise abatement. There may also be scope to apply different procedures at (e.g.) different times of day, providing that did not introduce complexity that could exacerbate flight deck workload.		
Form Response 4	3				4							
Form Response 5	1				1					As requested I have further responded to Q6 and Q9. Please marry the above upwith the email responses provided previously.		
Form Response 6	4				2		Use of continuous climb and continuous descent profiles to/from 7000ft.			No		
Form Response 7												
Form Response 8							We don't believe it appropriate to offer a relative priority to the noise mitigation methods but would offer that we consider that all three of the practices below to be at the core of effective noise management in a PBN environment. A Use noise efficient operational practices □ Avoid overflying communities with multiple routes, including from other airports □ Maximise sharing through managed dispersal			We are supportive of the design principles that London City are proposing and look forward to working with them to develop a safe, efficient and resilient airspace design that delivers benefits for all airspace users, and recognises the potential impacts that a future design might create.		
Form Response 9	7				6							
Form Response 10	5				3		Individual flight approach routes should be set to ensure: a) Flights converge only when necessary for safety reasons: b) Ditto for descent below 3,000 and 2,000 ft. c) Minimum lateral separation standards be set, for distances of e.g. 8,6, 4 and 2 from airstrip, to ensure that a) is achieved and that e.g. at 6 miles out no flights approach at below 4,000 ft and consecutive flights are separated by at least 800 lateral metres.			1)Each flight should be automatically monitored for adherence to the rules and landing fees increased in proportion to their divergence. 2) Organisations controlling flights below 7,000 ft should have a financial incentive to adhere to the rules and achieve the required noise and environmental standards by paying penalties based on the cumulative performance of all flights as recorded in 1) above.		
Form Response 11	7				4							
Form Response 12	4				1							
Form Response 13	3				6		NO			Introduce CDO procedures. Current altitude constraints result in early descent during arrival procedures and continuous climb during departures would be much appreciated as an outcome of airspace restructuring.		
Form Response 14	7				3					I will be writing to my mp. The noise is unbearable		
Form Response 15							MOD has no comment.			The MOD recognises the importance of Airspace Modernisation and remains committed to ensuring airspace is used safely, efficiently and flexibly. Airspace modernisation and future airspace design must consider and allow for MOD access to airspace in order to meet future defence requirements. The MOD welcomes continued engagement throughout your ACP process.		
Form Response 16	7				7							
Form Response 17							Whilst noise mitigation is the responsibility of the change sponsor we would expect that LCY would take account of the Airspace Modernisation Strategy in setting the priority.			NERL fully supports London City in this airspace change and look forward to working together on the wider programme of work.		
Form Response 18	4				7		1 - Maintain the 24 hour quite period. 2 - Reduce all / omit environmental issues to meet the 2050 climate change policy. 3 - Compliance with the impending government zero carbon policy.			We think the further development of an inner city airport totally inappropriate for this area of London. The future impact will be detrimental to our next generation and not set a good example going forward. How can we claim to be global leaders in environmental measures with this type of development.		
Form Response 19	6				7					Any noise mitigation must be balanced with minimising operational complexity.		
Form Response 20	6				3					Not fair how much noise over Tower Hamlets, since 2016. Please reduce by sharing with the more affluent over Boroughs of Redbridge etc.		
Form Response 21	6				7							
Form Response 22					1		Reduce flights over unpopulated areas.					
Form Response 23	8				5		London City Airport should implement robust policies that ensure only the quietest aircraft are permitted to land at the airport. This should be included within the principles for airspace modernisation as well as the current Masterplan proposals.			To reduce the noise impact of air travel, any future operations implemented by LCY should be designed to minimise the cumulative impact of flight paths on communities from airports across London and the South East. Specifically, LCY should work with Heathrow airport to prioritise reduction of flights below 5,000ft across Waltham Forest, and wider LCY flightpath. Flights from LCY rise to 3,000ft within 9km of take-off, but then remain at this altitude for the next 15km as they fly across East London and the flight path of aircraft approaching Heathrow. Flights from LCY are particularly impactful due to their low height, and designing operations to allow flights from LCY to fly above 5,000ft should be a priority for both Heathrow and LCY. To support this, LCY should provide a commitment to working with Heathrow to raise the height of the LCY flightpath to reduce the impact on residents living underneath both flightpaths. This should be recognised within the design principles for future airspace and the Masterplan, currently being consulted on by LCY.		
Form Response 24	3				4		Reduce the number of aircraft flying over East London. Use other airports not near highly populated areas.			If you came and spent some time with the people living underneath your flight paths you would have a better understanding of the anxiety caused by plane flights over your house.		
Form Response 25	1				1		Explain what noise reduction options are available. These may be very limited and ineffective for all. I know so cannot prioritise them. To contract the number of flights not expand them.			We need to reduce the number of flights and this is an area that needs to be contracting expanding. You need to offset all carbon produced so that the flights are carbon neutral and this need to be a top priority for people to note for. If you can't do this you shouldn't fly, because you will be creating a problem that someone else needs to solve.		
Form Response 26	5				6		Our top ranking are 'C – maximise sharing through predicable respite routes' and 'A - Use noise efficient operational practices'. We support 'B – minimise the number of people newly overflown' but C and E should take priority. We oppose 'F - minimising the total population overflown'. It is inequitable. It is also likely to increase annoyance and thus health problems because more people will be significantly annoyed – for an overview of the health evidence: http://www.aef.org.uk/uploads/Aircraft-Noise-and-Public-Health-the-evidence-is-loud-and-clear-finalreportONLINE.pdf We are not sure how realistic 'G – avoid overflying noise sensitive areas, e.g. schools, hospitals, care homes' is in a built-up area like London. It would be nice to do but may not be possible.			****THIS RESPONSE WAS FILLED IN A LETTER FROM JON STEWART. HOWEVER, HIS LETTER IS NOT LAID OUT AS CLEARLY AS THE ONLINE FORM. JACK BERENDS - LCY HAS TRANSLATED HIS COMMENTS TO FIT THE FORM. PLEASE READ ALL COMMENTS AS THEY ARE COPIED AND PASTED FROM JON'S LETTER****		
Form Response 27							As before Heathrow believes that the views of local communities should take preference when ranking design principles, especially those relating to local issues such as noise. Heathrow suggests that London City promotes the use of flexible airspace design which seeks to improve overflight heights of communities as compared to the current operations. We will continue to work with London City, both through FAS-South group and bilaterally, to provide a coordinated approach to airspace design in the south of England, while achieving the ambitions of the CAA's airspace modernisation strategy.			Heathrow welcomes the opportunity to participate in London City's engagement on its design principles for modernisation. As well as responding to this and future engagement activity, we will continue to work with London City through the FAS-South working group to ensure a coordinated approach to airspace modernisation in the south of England.		
Form Response 28										London City Airport currently has strict operating hours and restrictions. This provides important respite from aircraft noise for local residents. I oppose the relaxation of weekend respite from London City Airport and this is a matter I will feed into the separate LCY Draft Masterplan. In this vein, for the Design Principles in Modernising London's Airspace, I support prioritising aircraft noise reduction. Thank you for inviting me to feed into this stage of the consultation and please do keep me informed as proposals are developed.		
Form Response 29	1				1		The obvious noise mitigation option would be fewer flights. Unfortunately this has been left out of your list and it might have been interesting to have asked this question			Air travel cannot continue to expand. We cannot have millions of people travelling by plane for a week or two's holiday. Enlarging city airport capacity is contrary to environmental needs and consequently is not where development should be. Reducing emissions, improving airspace organisation is fine and a good idea. Reducing noise would be excellent. But increasing the number of flights is unsustainable and should not be part of this project. The questionnaire seeks to market the apparent benefits of the project rather than look for a broader range of opinion. To that extent it joins the myriad of faux surveys used to generate supporting data.		
Form Response 30	4				7		1 - Maintain the 24 hour quite period. 2 - Impact to local areas for air pollution to meet the 2050 climate change policy. 3 - Compliance with the impending government zero carbon policy.			We think the further development of an inner city airport totally inappropriate for this area of London. How can we claim to be global leaders in reducing / omitting environmental issues with this type of development. The future impact will be detrimental to our next generation and not set a good benchmark going forward.		
Form Response 31	1				1		Reduce pollution and noise in London area.			Reduce pollution and noise in London area.		
Form Response 32	2				3		No.			Modernisation will need to take account of all London airports' needs, for both current operations and future growth. Airspace around London is still fundamentally run on principles, practices and calculations from the post-war origins of large-scale civilian aviation. Our motorways, rail routes and Tube lines are not run to such archaic assumptions and limitations, and nor should such a vital national asset as our airspace be. Airspace modernisation must enable existing technology to let aircraft fly much more precisely to pre-set routes, making a more efficient pipeline of inbound and outbound aircraft to London's airports, benefitting passengers, airlines and surrounding communities. Without action, airspace congestion will only get worse. Inefficient airspace can also means more emissions from longer journeys and prevents improvements being made that could reduce noise for communities around airports.		
Form Response 33	1				1					I have lived in Wanstead for nearly 20 years, I realise that there has been an increase in the demand on flights from City Airport, but for ALL of the flights to fly directly over our community & others ALL THE TIME is not acceptable. As a resident within the upcoming ULEZ we need to have compliant cars, in truth what is the point if there are hundreds of flights a week flying over my house & community! The noise pollution alone is enough to disturb the population never mind the carbon footprint of every flight. I strongly object to the increase in the capacity of City Airport.		
Form Response 34	7				1					"Your Response Form is too ambiguous to complete correctly." "First of all, we do not consider that sufficient publicity has been given to this matter. Advertisements in a few freebie newspapers which are not generally available across the area has NOT given the public affected sufficient notice. It also appears to us that with the ongoing Heathrow Consultations, that City Airport are endeavouring to get their Consultations through under the radar." "London City Airport is situated in a densely populated residential area and consequently their planes flyover a large residential area including South East London at altitudes of 2000 feet or less when they are some 20 miles from touch down. The noise from these planes is such as to interrupt conversation, radio and television etc. particularly in hot weather when windows etc are open. " "We do not agree that no new areas should be overflown, the noise and pollution generated by these planes must be shared out more fairly and not targeted on the same unfortunate residents. It is imperative, that as a matter of urgency that residents are NOT overflown by planes from more than one airport. This area of SE London is overflown by both City and Heathrow planes." "City Airport was built on the understanding that it would be used by turbo-prop aircraft and the BAE 146, not the jets now thundering over SE London. In addition, it would be an airport used for business people with the result that there would not be that many flights. Nowadays, planes are thundering over every few minutes. " "It is amazing how we have to respond to numerous Consultations now, but Concentrated Flight Paths were imposed upon us without any prior notice or Consultation."		
Form Response 35	1				1		large parts of South London are now insufferable to live in, we are bombarded with constant aircraft noise, it is not acceptable to make this even worse.					
Form Response 36	1				2		None			None		