

Future Airspace Programme - Step 1B Submission Change Control summary

Page 7	Removal of the mandatory status on Design Principle S,P,C
Page 8 & 9	Link included to 'Beyond the Horizon: the future of UK aviation' report
Page 18	Additional text added 'EMA had identified the right requirements that must be
	met in any future airspace design, such as safety and regulatory standards'
Page 28	Removal of a duplicated paragraph.
Page 33	Additional text added "East Midlands Airport"
Page 36	Corrected the number of longlisted principles to 59
Page 36	Corrected the number of written responses to read "two letters and email
Figure 13	responses".
Page 45	Additional text added 'to remove the reference to 'increasing risk'. In addition,
Table 7 – DP S	definitions for safety and airspace users were added to the reference table in
	response to calls for clarity from stakeholders about both of these terms. Some
	stakeholders also asked about the safety standards used in aviation. Design
	Principle P (contained within table 8) sets out a requirement to comply with regulations and standards. Some aviation stakeholders queried whether the word
	'all' should be inserted into the design principle to make it clear safety applied to
	everyone using the airspace. This was not added as the definition for airspace
	users in the reference table makes this clear.'
Page 45	Additional text added 'In addition, a question was asked about how EMA would
Table 7 – DP P	take account of future airspace change proposals. In response, the principle was
	amended to provide clarity on this point, and to remove acronyms.'
Dogo 46	Additional text added 'In addition, stakeholders asked for more clarity to be
Page 46 <i>Table 7 – DP A2</i>	provided on how EMA was defining emergency aircraft and airspace users. A
Tuble 7 - DP AZ	definition for airspace users and emergency aircraft has been included in the
	reference table to address this.
	Some aviation stakeholders asked for clarity on what changes there would be to
	EMA's controlled airspace boundary. This will become apparent during the
	evaluation of detailed designs against the final design principles during Stage 2,
Page 47	and the consultation undertaken during Stage 3, of the CAP1616 process.' Additional text added 'Some stakeholders asked whether this Design Principle
Table 7 – DP E	should be strengthened to include the word 'must' rather than should. In order to
Tuble 7 - DP E	maintain the ability to balance principles in the Stage 2 assessment, this change
	was not made. This decision is also supported by stakeholders who highlighted
	that, whilst reducing emissions is key, if the reduction is not significant then the
	priority should be reducing noise impacts. At stage 2, the impacts on noise and
	emissions will be assessed and, in line with paragraph B.29 in Appendix B of
	CAP1616, the Government's altitude-based priorities will be consulted.'
	Some stakeholders also asked why there were multiple Design Principles
	suggested for noise but only one for emissions. The emissions Design Principle
	seeks to reduce emissions where possible and can be applied to all flight paths.
	Multiple noise principles have been suggested for noise as there are multiple
	options for reducing noise, such as dispersing aircraft, avoiding certain areas etc.'
	'a definition for emissions has also been added to the reference table.'
Page 47	Additional text added 'Some wanted to see more information about where flight
Table 7 – DP N1	paths would be plotted, the time of day, frequency, and the level of noise
. WOIC / DI NI	1 , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,



	early stage, these details will become clear following the technical assessments in Stage 2 and will be highlighted as part of the consultation in Stage 3.'
D 40	
Page 48	Additional text added 'Some stakeholders commented that the wording of this
Table 7 – DP N2	principle was too vague and non-committal. In response to this, EMA removed the
	phrase 'where practical' to provide a more firm statement. A question was also
	asked whether the noise principles could be combined. EMA reviewed all of the
	noise principles and felt that combining them into one principle would be less
	effective as each principle addresses a different element of aircraft noise.'
Page 49	Additional text added 'and how this will be measured'
Table 7 – DP N3	
	'A question was asked about whether this Design Principle wording could be
	strengthened to include 'must' and 'not increase'. As with the emissions principle,
	this change was not made as EMA felt it was important to maintain the ability to
	balance principles in the Stage 2 assessment.'
Page 49	Additional text added: 'In addition, a definition for 'areas especially sensitive to
Table 7 – DP N4	noise' was added to the reference table to respond to stakeholders' request for
Tuble 7 Bi N4	more clarity on this phrase.'
Page 50	Removal of the mandatory status on Design Principle S,P,C
Table 8	
Page 51	Additional text added 'Beyond the Horizon: the future of UK aviation'. (Hyperlink
Table 9	to the document also added).
Page 54	Capitalisation of the 'e' in EMA
Page 56	Additional text added
	'Regulations - East Midlands Airport (EMA) falls within the scope of the European
	Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) and therefore is subject to a number of
	regulations, which include:
	Aerodrome regulations in the form of Implementing Rules (IR), Acceptable
	Means of Compliance (AMC) and Certification Specifications (CS).
	The European Commission published Commission Regulation (EU) No
	139/2014. The regulation contains the Implementing Rules that cover all EASA
	aerodromes.
	EASA Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) and Guidance Material
	(GM) to Authority, Organisation and Operations Requirements for Aerodromes.
	EASA Certification Specifications (CS) and Guidance Material for
	Aerodrome Design CS-ADR-DSN.'
	nerodrome pesign es non por.