

CAA Environmental Assessment and Statement

Title of airspace change proposal	Removal of London Stansted LYD6R/5S SIDs	
Change sponsor	NATS En-Route Ltd (NERL)	
Project no.	ACP-2020-066	
SARG project leader	[REDACTED]	
<i>Case study commencement date</i>	22 Feb 21	
<i>Case study report as at</i>	12 Apr 21	
Instructions		
<p>In providing a response for each question, please ensure that the ‘status’ column is completed using one of the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • yes • no • partially • n/a <p>To aid the SARG project leader’s efficient project management, please highlight the “status” cell for each question using one of the three colours to illustrate if it is:</p> <p>resolved Green not resolved Amber not compliant Red</p>		
1. Introduction		
	<p>This CAA environmental assessment and statement describes the considerations relevant to NATS En-Route Ltd’s (NERL) airspace change proposal (ACP) for the removal of London Stansted’s Standard Instrument Departure (SID) dependencies from the Lydd (LYD) Doppler Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range (DVOR) navigation beacon. This ACP is for the removal of London Stansted’s LYD 6R/5S SIDs as illustrated within the UK Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) AD 2.EGSS-6-4.</p> <p>NERL is currently in the process of ‘rationalising’ its DVOR navigation beacons. Whilst maintaining or improving safety this programme aims to reduce costs and dependency on ground-based navigation aids (NavAids) by decommissioning and removing redundant, ageing DVORs. The programme plans to remove any existing dependency on these NavAids from any current procedures e.g. Standard Terminal Arrival Routes (STARS).</p>	

	<p>The LYD DVOR in the south of England was selected to be removed from NERL's network of ground-based NavAids, approved under a separate ACP, and is scheduled to be decommissioned by the end of 2023. The LYD DVOR has the following Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) dependencies which were not captured in the original NERL ACP; 2 SIDs at London City Airport, and London Stansted LYD 6R/5S SIDs. This ACP (ACP-2020-066) is for the removal of London Stansted 6R/5S SIDs.</p> <p>This environmental assessment and statement is based upon information presented in '<i>Removal of London Stansted's LYD 6R/5S SIDS Airspace Change Proposal V1.2</i>', including all associated consultation and assessment material. The change sponsor has followed the CAA's process as listed within CAP1616: Airspace Change document.</p>	
2. Nature of the Proposed Change		Status
2.1	Is it clear how the proposed change will operate, and therefore what the likely environmental impacts will be?	Yes
<p>This proposal seeks to remove the LYD 6R/5S SIDs from the UK AIP, removing the remaining dependency of London Stansted IFPs on the LYD DVOR. This ACP affects airspace design below 7,000 ft, however the sponsor states that this proposal '<i>will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown</i>'. This ACP has therefore been scaled as Level 2C as the proposal does not expect to alter traffic patterns or flight behaviour below 7,000 ft and subsequently there will be '<i>no expected impact on noise</i>'. As stated in CAP1616, a sponsor is required to assess fuel and CO₂ impacts as part of a Level 2 proposal.</p> <p>Three options on how best to achieve the removal of the remaining dependencies of London Stansted's IFPs on the LYD DVOR were developed by NERL. These are known as Option 0; '<i>do nothing (baseline)</i>', Option 1; '<i>RNAV replication of the Stansted LYD 6R/5S SIDs</i>' and Option 2 (NERL's preferred option); '<i>Remove the Stansted LYD 6R/5S SIDs and use existing DET SIDs / extend [Air Traffic Service] ATS Route M604 to replace the removed SIDs</i>'. Options 0 and 1 were rejected and not taken forward to consultation due to either not meeting or only partially meeting the four Design Principles (DPs). Option 2 was NERL's preferred option, met all four DPs and was the single option taken forward to the consultation stage.</p> <p>Option 2 proposes that aircraft currently departing London Stansted using LYD 6R/5S SIDs fly the coincident DET 1R/1S SIDs which terminate at DET. The remaining portion of the LYD SIDs will be replicated by extending UK ATS Route M604 from DET to LYD to replace the removed portion of LYD SIDs. This new segment of ATS Route M604 will be Route Availability Document (RAD) restricted so that it is only available to those flights which would have flown the defunct LYD 6R/5S SIDs. Unlike the LYD 6R/5S SIDs, currently DET 1R/1S SIDs are</p>		

	<p>not available H24 (unavailable between 0500-2200 UTC summer and 0600-2300 UTC winter). DET 1R/1S SIDs will be updated to H24 availability only for aircraft departing M604-LYD, which will be reflected in the RAD so that only aircraft routing along the new portion of ATS Route M604 will be able to depart via DET H24.</p> <p>From an environmental perspective, NERL anticipate that the ACP will provide a 'negligible impact' to fuel efficiency and CO₂ emissions, although the overall effect is stated to be '<i>positive</i>'. This is due to some aircraft operators calculating fuel required based on the flight plan, therefore aircraft which previously flew the LYD 6R/5S SIDs will fly and flight plan a reduced distance of 21 NM at 5,000 ft on the DET SIDs / extended ATS Route M604. The sponsor anticipates that this ACP will allow aircraft to carry '<i>less excess fuel</i>' providing a '<i>fuel saving</i>' and subsequent '<i>positive impact on CO₂ emissions</i>', however the sponsor states this '<i>cannot be calculated</i>'. This is a logical conclusion to reach.</p>	
3. Secretary of State Call-in Noise Criterion		Status
3.1	<p>Is the proposal likely to meet the Secretary of State's criterion for call-in on noise impacts? If yes, has the additional assessment on that criterion been undertaken and what are the results? If no, what is the rationale for that conclusion?</p> <p>The criterion, as set out in the DfT's Air Navigation Guidance (2017)¹ is that the proposed airspace change could lead to a change in noise distribution resulting in a 10,000 net increase in the number of people subjected to a noise level of at least 54 dB² <u>as well as</u> having an identified adverse impact on health and quality of life.³</p>	No
	<p>This proposal aims to remove London Stansted LYD 6R/5S SIDs from the UK AIP. The sponsor explains that traffic routing via LYD will use DET 1R/1S SIDs, which are coincident with the LYD SIDs as far as DET, and ATS Route M604 which will be extended from DET to LYD. Aircraft will fly and flight plan a reduced distance of 21 NM at 5,000 ft on the DET SIDs / extended ATS Route M604.</p> <p>Although this ACP affects airspace design below 7,000 ft, the sponsor states that this proposal '<i>will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown</i>'. This ACP has therefore been scaled as Level 2C as the</p>	

¹ The DfT's call-in criteria are set out in The Civil Aviation Authority (Air Navigation) Directions 2017, Section 6, paragraph (5). These Directions are replicated in Annex D of the DfT's Air Navigation Guidance 2017.

² L_{Aeq,16h} noise exposure.

³ The assessment of the numbers of people affected and the associated adverse impacts on health and quality of life of the airspace change proposal should be carried out by the sponsor in accordance with the requirements set out in the DfT's Guidance.

	proposal does not expect to alter traffic patterns or flight behaviour below 7,000 ft and subsequently 'there is no expected impact on noise'. As a result of this, the proposal will not affect noise exposure above 51 dB L _{Aeq,16h} and therefore does not meet the noise criterion for call-in by the Secretary of State.	
4. Statement of Need		Status
4.1	Does the Statement of Need include any environmental factors?	No
	The Statement of Need does not include any environmental factors.	
5. Design Principles		Status
5.1	Does the final set of Design Principles include any environmental objectives?	Yes
	<p>The ACP has two design principles that include environmental objectives:</p> <p>Design Principle 4: <i>'The proposed airspace change should minimise the impact on stakeholders, including ground-based stakeholders and other airspace users'</i> includes environmental objectives to minimise impact on ground-based stakeholders.</p> <p>Design Principle 3: <i>'the proposed changes should minimise any changes to actual flight behaviours – laterally, vertically or in dispersal'</i> includes no specific environmental reference, although if achieved ensures negligible environmental impacts as aircraft behaviour will not be changed.</p>	
5.2	Does the proposal explain how and to what extent the final airspace design achieves any environmental Design Principles?	Yes
	<p>The document <i>'Multi-Gateway Documentation V1.2'</i> explains that Design Option 2; <i>'Remove the Stansted LYD 6R/5S SIDs and use existing DET SIDs / extend ATS Route M604 to replace the removed SIDs'</i>, will result in <i>'no change to flight behaviours'</i> and have <i>'no impact on other stakeholders'</i> which meets the two Design Principles (DPs) with environmental relevance, DP 4; <i>'The proposed airspace change should minimise the impact on stakeholders, including ground-based stakeholders and other airspace users'</i> and DP 3; <i>'The proposed changes should minimise any changes to actual flight behaviours – laterally, vertically or in dispersal'</i>.</p>	

	NERL continue to state in document <i>'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2'</i> that Option 2 meets DP 3 and DP 4, providing assurance that there will be <i>'negligible impact on the local community'</i> as a result of the proposal. The proposal is <i>'supported by Stansted Airport's Consultative Committee which includes members of the local community'</i> .	
5.3	Were there any proposed environmental Design Principles that were rejected from the final set? If so, is the rationale for rejecting those Principles reasonable?	No
	No environmental Design Principles (DPs) were rejected from the final set. DPs were developed in isolation by NERL given the <i>'simplicity'</i> of the proposal and, therefore, it was <i>'not deemed proportional to engage'</i> on the four DPs. However, NERL discussed the DPs with Stansted Airport on a call prior to submission of the document <i>'Multi-Gateway Documentation V1.2'</i> to the CAA. The sponsor states that <i>'no issues were raised'</i> .	
5.4	Were there any design options during the airspace change process that might have better met the environmental Design Principles than the final proposal as submitted to the CAA? If so, is the rationale for rejecting those options set out?	No
	<p>Design Option 0 and Design Option 2 both met the two Design Principles (DPs) with environmental relevance, DP 3; <i>'The proposed changes should minimise any changes to actual flight behaviours – laterally, vertically or in dispersal'</i> and DP 4; <i>'The proposed airspace change should minimise the impact on stakeholders, including ground-based stakeholders and other airspace users'</i>.</p> <p>Design Option 2; <i>'Remove the Stansted LYD 6R/5S SIDs and use existing DET SIDs / extend ATS Route M604 to replace the removed SIDs'</i> met all four DPs and was therefore the only Design Option to be accepted and progressed by the sponsor. This option is anticipated to provide a <i>'fuel saving'</i> as departures will fly and flight plan a reduced distance of 21 NM at 5,000 ft on the DET SIDs / extended ATS Route M604. This will allow aircraft to fly carrying <i>'less excess fuel'</i> providing a <i>'fuel saving'</i> and overall <i>'positive impact on CO₂ emissions'</i>. It should be noted that the sponsor states these impacts to be <i>'negligible'</i> although the <i>'overall effect will be positive.'</i></p> <p>Design Option 0; <i>'Do nothing (baseline)'</i> did meet DP 3 and DP 4, however, it was rejected as it did not meet DP 2; <i>'Remove Stansted Airport procedure dependencies on the LYD DVOR through appropriate and proportional design changes'</i>, which NERL state is a key objective behind the ACP. Unlike Design Option 2, Design Option 0 would not remove the 21 NM segment at 5, 000 ft from the IFP, therefore from an environmental perspective aircraft would not benefit from a <i>'fuel saving'</i> and subsequent <i>'positive impact on CO₂ emissions'</i>.</p>	

6. Options Appraisal		Status
6.1	<p>Have environmental impacts been adequately reflected and assessed in the Options Appraisal?</p>	Yes
	<p>This ACP affects airspace design below 7,000 ft, however the sponsor states that this proposal <i>'will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i>. This ACP has therefore been scaled as Level 2C as the proposal does not expect to alter traffic patterns or flight behaviour below 7,000 ft. As detailed in CAP1616, a sponsor is required to assess fuel and CO₂ impacts as part of a Level 2 proposal.</p> <p>Within the Options Appraisal the sponsor states that removal of the LYD 6R/5S SIDs and use of the DET SIDs / extension of ATS Route M604 will <i>'provide a fuel saving'</i> as departures will fly and flight plan a reduced distance of 21 NM at 5,000 ft on the DET SIDs / extended ATS Route M604. This will allow aircraft to fly carrying <i>'less excess fuel'</i>. NERL also state within the Options Appraisal that <i>'the proposed changes would introduce no changes to lateral or vertical tracks therefore no change to environmental impact'</i> with respect to greenhouse gas emissions. In addition to this, NERL mention that there will be <i>'no change in noise or air quality impacts'</i> as a result of the proposal. It should be noted however, within the document <i>'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2'</i>, NERL state the impacts regarding fuel and CO₂ emissions to be <i>'negligible'</i> although the <i>'overall effect will be positive'</i>.</p> <p>The use of a high-level qualitative assessment by the sponsor is appropriate as this ACP's anticipated environmental impact is expected to be positive overall. This is in-line with the requirements for a Level 2C ACP, where a qualitative assessment and explanation is adequate if the anticipated impact is positive.</p>	
6.2	<p>Is the final proposal as submitted to the CAA the airspace design option that also produced the best environmental impacts as assessed by the Options Appraisal? If not, does the rationale for selecting the preferred option adequately explain this choice?</p>	Yes
	<p>Option 2; <i>'Remove the Stansted LYD 6R/5S SIDs and use existing DET SIDs / extend ATS Route M604 to replace the removed SIDs'</i> was the only option progressed to the consultation phase as it met all four Design Principles (DPs).</p> <p>All Design Options sought to minimise any changes to actual flight behaviours, laterally, vertically or in dispersion (DP 3) and minimise the impact on stakeholders, including ground-based stakeholders and other airspace users (DP 4). Design Option 1; <i>'RNAV replication of the</i></p>	

	<p><i>Stansted LYD 6R/5S SIDs</i> was rejected based on partially meeting DP 3 and DP 4. Design Option 0; <i>'Do nothing (baseline)'</i> was rejected as it did not meet DP 2; <i>'Remove Stansted Airport procedure dependencies on the LYD DVOR through appropriate and proportional design changes'</i>, which is a key objective behind the ACP.</p>	
<p>7. Noise [for Level 1 and Level M1 airspace change proposals]</p>		<p>Status</p>
<p>7.1</p>	<p>Has the noise impact been adequately assessed and presented in both the consultation material and the final submission to the CAA, taking account of scalability and proportionality?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>Included within the documents <i>'Consultation Document V1.4'</i> and <i>'Airspace Change Proposal V1.0'</i> the sponsor stated that <i>'this proposal will not lead to a <u>significant change</u> in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i>. As this statement could lead to confusion regarding the environmental impacts of the proposal, the CAA requested clarification. The sponsor updated this statement, now included within the final submission document <i>'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2'</i>, stating that <i>'this proposal <u>will not lead</u> to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i>. This ACP has therefore been scaled as Level 2C as the proposal does not expect to alter traffic patterns or flight behaviour below 7,000 ft and subsequently <i>'there is no expected impact on noise'</i>.</p> <p>It should be noted however, that the sponsor acknowledges within the document <i>'Consultation Document V1.4'</i> that this ACP introduces the possibility that aircraft currently flying a LYD 6R/5S departure could now be instructed to fly a DET 1D departure, a noise preferential route to avoid Great Dunmow. This is an RNP1 route which has potential to concentrate tracks over the ground. However, the sponsor states that this change will affect <i>'<2 flights a day on average, comfortably less than the Planned and Permanent Redistribution of air traffic (PPR) threshold of 13 flights per day and as such can be considered negligible'</i>. The sponsor further states that this ACP <i>'will not alter the profile of any flights which will subsequently fly a DET 1R/1S or introduce new controlled airspace'</i>. Figure 3 within the document <i>'Consultation Document V1.4'</i> illustrates that <i>'the centrelines of the DET 1S and DET 1D are coincident'</i> where the sponsor states <i>'that the majority of aircraft departing London Stansted via DET or LYD departure fly close to the centreline until being tactically vectored by ATC'</i>. It should be noted however that the sponsor highlights the fact that <i>'in the unlikely event that there are unexpected issues caused by this proposal, reversion to the pre-implementation state would not be possible due to the scheduled decommissioning and subsequent removal of the LYD DVOR.'</i></p> <p>Based on the information provided by the sponsor, it is understood there will be no change in the number of flights, flightpaths or flight behaviour as a result of this ACP, therefore the rationale for not conducting a noise assessment is acceptable. As stated in CAP1616, a sponsor is required to assess fuel and CO₂ impacts as part of a Level 2 proposal.</p>	

7.2	If a noise assessment has not been undertaken by the sponsor, has this decision been adequately explained and evidenced in both the consultation material and the final submission to the CAA, and is the rationale reasonable?	Yes
	<p>Included within the documents 'Consultation Document V1.4' and 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.0' the sponsor stated that 'this proposal will not lead to a <u>significant change</u> in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'. As this statement could lead to confusion regarding the environmental impacts of the proposal, the CAA requested clarification. The sponsor updated this statement, now included within the final submission document 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2', stating that 'this proposal <u>will not lead</u> to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'. This ACP has therefore been scaled as Level 2C as the proposal does not expect to alter traffic patterns or flight behaviour below 7,000 ft and subsequently 'there is no expected impact on noise'.</p> <p>Based on the information provided by the sponsor, and as stated in the final submission document 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2' it is understood that there will be no change in the number of flights, flightpaths or flight behaviour, therefore the rationale for not conducting a noise assessment is reasonable. As detailed in CAP1616, a sponsor is required to assess fuel and CO₂ impacts as part of a Level 2 proposal.</p>	
7.3	Summary of anticipated noise impacts from the final proposed airspace change.	
	<p>This ACP affects airspace design below 7,000 ft, however as detailed within the final submission document 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2' the sponsor states that this proposal 'will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'. This ACP has therefore been scaled as a Level 2C as the proposal does not expect to alter traffic patterns or flight behaviour below 7,000 ft and subsequently 'there is no expected impact on noise'. However, it must be noted that on approval of this change proposal, as is acknowledged by the sponsor, a negligible number of movements (<2 aircraft a day) will use the DET 1D SID.</p> <p>Based on the information provided by the sponsor no adverse noise impacts are expected to occur. As detailed in CAP1616, a sponsor is required to assess fuel and CO₂ impacts as part of a Level 2 proposal.</p>	

8. CO ₂ Emissions	Status
8.1	Yes
<p>Included within the documents 'Consultation Document V1.4' and 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.0' the sponsor stated that 'this proposal will not lead to a <u>significant change</u> in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'. As this statement could lead to confusion regarding the environmental impacts of the proposal, the CAA requested clarification. The sponsor updated this statement, now included within the final submission document 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2', stating that 'this proposal <u>will not lead</u> to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'. This ACP has therefore been scaled as a Level 2C as the proposal does not expect to alter traffic patterns or flight behaviour below 7,000 ft.</p> <p>Within the final submission document 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2' NERL state that removal of the LYD 6R/5S SIDs and use of the DET SIDs / extension of ATS Route M604 is anticipated to provide a 'fuel saving' as departures will fly and flight plan a reduced distance of 21 NM at 5,000 ft. This will allow aircraft to fly carrying 'less excess fuel' providing a 'fuel saving' and subsequent 'positive impact on CO₂ emissions', however the sponsor states this 'cannot be calculated'. These impacts are quoted as being 'negligible' although the 'overall effect will be positive'. It should be highlighted however that within both the 'Consultation Document V1.4' and 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2' NERL also state that this ACP '<u>could</u> lead to a reduction in fuel/CO₂/greenhouse gas emissions' which is inconsistent with other statements made within the submission. Based on the information provided by NERL an overall 'positive impact on CO₂ emissions' and fuel efficiency as a result of this ACP is a sensible conclusion to reach.</p> <p>The use of a high-level qualitative assessment for fuel and CO₂ impacts is reasonable as this ACP's anticipated environmental impact is expected to be 'negligible' although the 'overall effect will be positive'. This is in-line with the requirements for a Level 2C ACP where a detailed fuel and CO₂ assessment is not necessary (or proportionate) beyond a qualitative assessment and explanation where a positive impact is identified.</p>	

8.2	<p>If an assessment of the impact on CO₂ emissions has not been undertaken by the sponsor, has this decision been adequately explained and evidenced in both the consultation material and the final submission to the CAA, and is the rationale reasonable?</p>	Yes
	<p>Included within the documents 'Consultation Document V1.4' and 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.0' the sponsor stated that 'this proposal will not lead to a <u>significant change</u> in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'. As this statement could lead to confusion regarding the environmental impacts of the proposal, the CAA requested clarification. The sponsor updated this statement, now included within the final submission document 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2', stating that 'this proposal <u>will not lead</u> to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'. This ACP has therefore been scaled as a Level 2C as the proposal does not expect to alter traffic patterns or flight behaviour below 7,000 ft.</p> <p>As stated within the final submission document 'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2' the removal of LYD 6R/5S SIDs and use of the DET SIDs / extension of ATS Route M604 'will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'. However, the ACP is anticipated to 'provide a fuel saving' as aircraft will fly and flight plan a reduced distance of 21 NM at 5,000 ft compared to the defunct LYD SIDs. The sponsor states that this ACP will have an 'overall positive impact on CO₂ emissions although this cannot be calculated'.</p> <p>In-line with a Level 2C ACP, a detailed fuel and CO₂ assessment is not necessary (or proportionate) beyond a qualitative assessment and explanation where a positive impact is identified. The sponsor's rationale for a qualitative assessment is reasonable.</p>	
8.3	<p>Summary of anticipated impact on CO₂ emissions from the final proposed airspace change.</p>	
	<p>The removal of LYD 6R/5S SIDs and use of the DET SIDs / extension of ATS Route M604 'will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown', however the ACP is anticipated to 'provide a fuel saving' as aircraft will fly and flight plan a reduced distance of 21 NM at 5,000 ft compared to the defunct LYD SIDs. The sponsor anticipates that this ACP will have a 'positive impact on CO₂ emissions although this cannot be calculated'. It should be noted that the sponsor states these impacts to be 'negligible' although the 'overall effect will be positive'.</p>	

9. Local Air Quality [for Level 1 and Level M1 airspace change proposals]		Status
9.1	Has the impact on Local Air Quality been adequately assessed and presented in both the consultation material and the final submission to the CAA, taking account of scalability and proportionality?	N/A
	<p>This ACP is concerned with airspace design below 7,000 ft, however it has been scaled as a Level 2C ACP as this proposal <i>'will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i>. In-line with the requirements of a Level 2C ACP the sponsor states within the final submission document, <i>'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2'</i>, that the assessment of local air quality is not applicable due to this ACP being a Level 2C change.</p> <p>The Air Navigation Guidance 2017 states, <i>'due to the effects of mixing and dispersion, emissions from aircraft above 1,000 feet are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality'</i>, therefore as flight behaviours are not anticipated to change as a result of this ACP no impact upon local air quality is anticipated.</p>	
9.2	If an assessment of the impact on Local Air Quality has not been undertaken by the sponsor, has this decision been adequately explained and evidenced in both the consultation material and the final submission to the CAA, and is the rationale reasonable?	N/A
	<p>This ACP is concerned with airspace design below 7,000 ft, however it has been scaled as a Level 2C ACP as this proposal <i>'will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i>. In-line with the requirements of a Level 2C ACP, the sponsor states within the final submission document, <i>'Airspace Change Proposal V1.2'</i>, that the assessment of local air quality is not applicable due to this ACP being a Level 2C change.</p> <p>The Air Navigation Guidance 2017 states, <i>'due to the effects of mixing and dispersion, emissions from aircraft above 1,000 feet are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality'</i>, therefore as flight behaviours are not anticipated to change as a result of this ACP no impact upon local air quality is anticipated. The sponsor's rationale for not conducting an assessment of the impact on Local Air Quality is reasonable.</p>	

9.3	Summary of anticipated impact on Local Air Quality from the final proposed airspace change.	
	As stated in the Air Navigation Guidance 2017, <i>'due to the effects of mixing and dispersion, emissions from aircraft above 1,000 feet are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality'</i> . As this ACP is not expected to <i>'lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i> no impact upon local air quality is anticipated.	
10. Tranquillity [for Level 1 and Level M1 airspace change proposals]		Status
10.1	With specific reference to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks - Has the impact on tranquillity been adequately considered and presented in both the consultation material and the final submission to the CAA, taking account of scalability and proportionality?	N/A
	A high-level statement by the sponsor concludes that an assessment of impacts upon tranquillity is not applicable as this ACP is a Level 2C change. As this ACP is not expected to <i>'lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i> this is an appropriate conclusion to reach and is proportional given the nature of the changes being made.	
10.2	If consideration of the impact on tranquillity has not been undertaken by the sponsor, has this decision been adequately explained and evidenced in both the consultation material and the final submission to the CAA, and is the rationale reasonable?	N/A
	Tranquillity has been considered in a proportional manner and is consistent with the requirements listed within CAP1616. This is a Level 2C ACP concerning technical changes and is therefore not expected to <i>'lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i> .	
10.3	Summary of anticipated impact on tranquillity from the final proposed airspace change.	

	A high-level qualitative statement concludes that an assessment of impacts upon tranquillity is not applicable as this ACP is a Level 2C change. The sponsor anticipates there will be no <i>'change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i> , therefore no adverse impacts upon tranquillity are likely.	
11. Biodiversity [for Level 1 and Level M1 airspace change proposals]		Status
11.1	Has the impact on biodiversity been adequately assessed and presented in both the consultation material and the final submission to the CAA, taking account of scalability and proportionality?	N/A
	This change is not expected to impact on biodiversity, as per CAP1616 <i>'most airspace change proposals are unlikely to have an effect upon biodiversity and therefore the inclusion within the design principles is expected to be the full extent of any consideration in most instances'</i> . Biodiversity was not included as a design principle by the Sponsor and Stakeholders for this change. The proposed change is not expected to alter traffic patterns or flight behaviour; therefore, it is appropriate that no biodiversity assessment has been undertaken.	
11.2	If assessment of the impact on biodiversity has not been undertaken by the sponsor, has this decision been adequately explained and evidenced in both the consultation material and the final submission to the CAA, and is the rationale reasonable?	N/A
	The sponsor has adequately explained that the proposed change will <i>'not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i> and therefore it is not expected to have any adverse impact on biodiversity. As per CAP1616: <i>'most airspace change proposals are unlikely to have an effect upon biodiversity and therefore the inclusion within the design principles is expected to be the full extent of any consideration in most instances.'</i>	
11.3	Summary of anticipated impact on biodiversity from the final proposed airspace change.	
	No impact on biodiversity is expected as the proposal is not anticipated to have any impact on traffic patterns or flight behaviour.	

12. Traffic Forecasts		Status
12.1	Have traffic forecasts been provided, are they reasonable, and have these been used to reflect the anticipated environmental impacts of the proposal?	N/A
	The proposed change is not expected to impact on traffic patterns or flight behaviour, including the number of flights, thus, no traffic forecasts were required to be submitted or considered as part of the assessment. The change sponsor states that there will be <i>'no foreseeable change to capacity or tracks over the ground'</i> as a result of this ACP.	
Consultation		Status
13.1	Has the sponsor taken account of any environmental factors (noise, CO ₂ emissions, Local Air Quality, tranquillity or biodiversity) raised by consultees or has evidence been provided to indicate why this has not been possible?	N/A
	The sponsor states that this ACP <i>'will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i> , and thus no adverse environmental impacts are anticipated. During the 2-week consultation period Stansted Airport Environmental Issues Group shared their support for the proposal, stating <i>'it is seen as steps to modernise ATC procedures in line with technological developments'</i> and <i>'is not perceived from the information available to have an adverse environmental impact upon residents living around the airport.'</i> No responses were received from the consultation suggesting a change is needed for this proposal.	
13.2	Has the sponsor taken account of any consultation response submitted by ICCAN? If so, what are the outcomes?	N/A
	ICCAN were not included as a consultee and therefore no response was received from them.	

14. Public Evidence Session (if held)		Status
14.1	If a Public Evidence Session has been held, was any <u>new</u> evidence on potential environmental impacts presented?	N/A
	Not applicable, no public evidence session has been held for this change.	
14.2	If so, was the new evidence relevant and material to the CAA's consideration of the environmental impacts of the submitted airspace change proposal?	N/A
	Not applicable, no public evidence session has been held for this change.	
15. Compliance with policy and guidance from Government, ICCAN or the CAA		Status
15.1	Has the sponsor satisfied all relevant policy and/or guidance from either the Government, ICCAN or the CAA, with regards to environmental impacts of the proposed airspace change?	Yes
	This ACP is concerned with airspace design below 7,000 ft, however it has been scaled as a Level 2C ACP as the sponsor states that this proposal ' <i>will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown</i> '. The change sponsor has complied with all relevant requirements as listed within CAP 1616 for a Level 2C ACP, taking into consideration the DfT's Altitude-Based Priorities in which CO ₂ emissions were considered as an environmental factor.	
15.2	Has the sponsor adequately considered the DfT's Altitude-Based Priorities ⁴ ?	Yes

⁴ Paragraph 3.3, DfT's Air Navigation Guidance 2017

	<p>This ACP affects airspace design below 7,000 ft, however, since the proposal alters the navigation system used and <i>'will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i>, it has been scaled as a Level 2C ACP where the environmental impacts are consistent with the Altitude-Based Priorities in which CO₂ emissions were considered as an environmental factor. The proposal is anticipated to provide a <i>'fuel saving'</i> and subsequent <i>'positive impact on CO₂ emissions'</i>. It should be noted that the sponsor states these impacts to be <i>'negligible'</i> although the overall effect will be <i>'positive'</i>.</p>	
16. Other aspects		Status
16.1	<p>Are there any other aspects of the airspace change proposal that have not already been addressed in this report but that may have a bearing on the environmental impact?</p>	No
	None.	
17. Recommendations/Conditions/PIR Data Requirements		Status
17.1	<p>Are there any Recommendations which the change sponsor <u>should try</u> to address either before or after implementation (if approved)? If yes, please list them below.</p>	No
	None.	
17.2	<p>Are there any Condition(s) which the change sponsor <u>must fulfil</u> either before or after implementation (if approved)? If yes, please list them below.</p>	No
	None.	

17.3	Are there any specific requirements in terms of the data to be collected by the change sponsor for the Post Implementation Review (if approved)? If yes, please list them below.	Yes
	Monitor flight numbers and behaviour before and after the change to ensure there are no changes to traffic volumes, traffic patterns or flight behaviours.	

18. Summary of Assessment of Environmental Impacts & Conclusions	
---	--

	<p>This ACP affects airspace design below 7,000 ft, however the sponsor states that this proposal <i>'will not lead to a change in the number of flights or flightpaths: lateral or vertical tracks of any aircraft routing currently flown'</i> and subsequently <i>'there is no expected impact on noise'</i>. This ACP has therefore been scaled as Level 2C as the proposal does not expect to alter traffic patterns or flight behaviour below 7,000 ft. In-line with Government guidance in the form of the Department for Transport's Altitude-Based Priorities, CO₂ emissions have been considered by the sponsor as an environmental factor. As this ACP is <u>not expected to lead to a change in the number of flights or flight behaviour</u> it is anticipated there will be a <i>'negligible impact'</i> to fuel efficiency and CO₂. However, the overall effect is expected to be <i>'positive'</i> as aircraft will fly and flight plan a reduced distance of 21 NM at 5,000 ft on the DET SIDs / extension of ATS Route M604. <u>It is unlikely that any adverse environmental impacts will occur</u> as a result of this ACP.</p>
--	---

Outstanding issues?		
----------------------------	--	--

Serial	Issue	Action required
1		
2		

Environmental assessment and statement sign-off and approval	Name	Signature	Date
---	------	-----------	------

Environmental assessment and statement completed by:	<i>Airspace Regulator (Environment) -</i> [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	11/03/2021
Environmental assessment and statement approved by:	<i>Chief Technical Noise Advisor</i>	[REDACTED]	12/04/2021
Chief Technical Noise Advisor comments:			