

## Cotswold Airport - Airspace Change Proposal for a Defined Approach for Selected Operators - Final Design Principles

| Ser | Design Principle  | Priority Rank (Avg) | Group Agreement | Comments  | Final Principle   | Rationale   |
|-----|---|---------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|
| 1   | The design must be ICAO Doc 8168 PANS OPS compliant, validated and flyable by all* aircraft intending to make an approach. Therefore, it should meet international norms for safety levels.                           | 1                   | Partial         | Safety compliance was of paramount importance to all groups engaged, particularly the local communities. Equally, many operators and commercial flying schools suggested removal of the PAN OPS compliance statement, as this may limit options and was the only reason we did not have a unanimous agreement. Thus, this will be modified for the final principle, yet does not change the priority or meaning, therefore does not need re-engagement.   | The design must be technically flyable and enhance existing operational performance and levels of safety  | Designs must maintain the required levels of flight safety and improve the safety case for larger jet and commercial helicopter approaches at Kemble  |
| 9   | The design must integrate with NATS airspace network and RAF Brize Norton Standard Arrivals Routes (STARS)  | 2                   | Unanimous       | Strong agreement from commercial/corporate operators and Bristol/ NATS and RAF Brize Norton   | The design must integrate with NATS airspace network and RAF Brize Norton Standard Arrivals Routes (STARS)  | Cognisant of the Brize Norton ACP potential impact of increased controlled airspace in the local area and the changes planned under LAMP.   |
| 5   | The design should regularise approach paths onto predetermined, published routes to bring certainty to local residents and airspace users.  | 3                   | Partial         | Partial agreement, which although was unanimously supported as a design principle, agreement across the groups is that this should not be limited to a few approved operators or driven by capability. Many based flying training organisations (7 on site) would also wish to utilise the approach for IR training. Local residents were slightly disappointed that this wasn't the case (CAP 122 safety case will determine trade off between operational requirement and safety) and that for the majority of the traffic this would not change the current GA arrivals and departures routes and circuit. The gliding communities also requested that consideration is given to the increasing density of both GA and gliding traffic in class G airspace to the west of Kemble, particularly considering ACP changes to other airfields, such as RAF Brize Norton. | The design should regularise approach paths onto predetermined, published routes to bring certainty to local residents and airspace users.  | As per stakeholder comments, the detailed views should be considered in the next Stage during assessment of options.  |
| 6   | The design should help ensure aircrew can plan their arrival using defined routes laterally and vertically, so permitting low-power continuous descents, thus reducing noise and emissions.                           | 4                   | Unanimous       | Unanimous agreement, and strongly supported by the local communities to reduce noise/environmental impacts (from current operations) and from corporate jet/helicopter operators.   | The design should help ensure aircrew can plan their arrival using defined routes laterally and vertically, so permitting low-power continuous descents, thus reducing noise and emissions.                           | This principle is aligned with government policy and guidance, thus any defined approach should seek to improve the noise abatement controls.   |
| 8   | The design should respect existing noise abatement/sensitive areas, as detailed within KAOP 38 (our noise abatement, as listed on our website).   | 5                   | Unanimous       | It was noted that our current noise abatement processes work, but approaches utilising a long final approach used by corporate jets and Cat D aircraft is outside this and villages are overflowed by pilots adopting their own (undefined) VFR approach. A defined approach should enable noise abatement to be better managed.  | The design should improve existing noise abatement/sensitive areas, as detailed within KAOP 38 (our noise abatement, as listed on our website).   | This principle is aligned with government policy and guidance   |
| 4   | The design should reduce the amount of people overflowed.   | 6                   | Unanimous       | Both operators and one local community raised the point that, dependent upon traffic volume, we might consider multiple approaches to both minimise disruption to those affected by the defined approach and that to have an offset or pins approach for helicopters to reduce their noise, would be beneficial.  | The design should reduce the amount of people overflowed.   | Design must consider multiple approach options and must include analysis of having a separate approach offset for helicopters. However, the airspace change process is already lengthy and a balance of risk argument will need to be considered in the next stage to balance the conflict between safety and operational requirement and better understand if this is a worthwhile control mechanism, based on predicted traffic numbers utilising the approach. Much of this will also be linked to the CAP 1122 bow tie safety case. This is aligned with Government policy and guidance |
| 2   | The Design must reduce the scattering effect of aircraft arrival tracks resulting from pilot managed visual navigation, including overhead joining of the circuit.  | 7                   | Unanimous       | Unanimous agreement, and strongly supported by the local communities for a safety perspective   | The Design must reduce the scattering effect of aircraft arrival tracks resulting from pilot managed visual navigation, including overhead joining of the circuit.  | Aligned with Government policy and guidance and for aircraft departing airways above 7000ft allows efficient use of airspace and using the most expeditious route on the approach.  |
| 7   | The design should take account of local planning policy with regards to future urbanisation in the vicinity of the airfield, so that no future communities are overflowed (and that our safeguarding remains extant). | 8                   | Partial         | Part linked to Ser 4. Partial agreement from the group as communities that are currently subject to noise feel any disturbance should be equally distributed and that any new development (within our safeguarding area), by virtue of building next to an active airport should expect to be subject to operational noise.   | The design should take account of local planning policy with regards to future urbanisation in the vicinity of the airfield, so that no future communities are overflowed (and that our safeguarding remains extant). | This principle is aligned with government policy and guidance   |
| 3   | The design should achieve a reduction in visual intrusion.  | 9                   | Partial         | Partial agreement and limited support for this design principle, since the planned design principles and conflict between safety and operational requirement will mean many of the GA activity will remain within the current circuit and noise abatement measures, thus any new approach will not significantly change the current levels of intrusion for most traffic  | The design should achieve a reduction in visual intrusion.  | This principle is aligned with government policy and guidance.  |

\* For approved operators only and limited to jet aircraft, ranging from A320 sized to smaller executive jets.