Bournemouth FASI(S) ACP

Response on Design Principles

28 October 2021

CPJ-5663-RPT-16 V1.0

www.cyrrus.co.uk

info@cyrrus.co.uk

Executive Summary

The CAA wrote to 18 airports in the South-East of England (including Bournemouth) to advise them that it is essential that they participate in a programme of Airspace Modernisation. This programme consists of a coordinated attempt to improve upon the efficiency of airspace usage across the region whilst implementing the latest technology with the aim of reducing the environmental impacts associated with aviation.

We conducted a targeted consultation on 25 August 2021 with a background understanding of what Bournemouth Airport needs to address in this Airspace Change Proposal (ACP). This included a comprehensive document setting out the purpose and a series of draft Design principles titled "Introduction to Design Principles". This document included a short survey on the establishment of 'Design Principles' that will ultimately shape the development and assessment of 'Options' for change. The survey was active for a period of 37 days ending on 30 September 2021 which included several reminders prior to closing.

This document acts as a record of the responses received on the Draft Design Principles and describe how they shaped the final Design Principles. The responses that were received were largely supportive or offered no alternatives, the Draft Design Principles have become the Final Design Principles that will be submitted to the CAA 'Define' Gateway assessment.

We would like to thank the stakeholders for their time, consideration, and valuable input. We look forward to continuing to work with them to improve our system of flight procedures and our airspace configuration.

Contents

List of figures

1. Introduction

1.1. Engagement

1.1.1. A document titled '*Bournemouth FASI(S) ACP: An Introduction to Design Principles*' was issued to the stakeholders (detailed at Annex A) on 25 August 2021. Contained within this document was an explanation of what was being asked along with a link to an online survey.

1.1.2. Stakeholders were asked to provide feedback by 30 September 2021.

1.1.3. To ensure we provided everyone ample opportunity to respond, we allowed for a response period of greater than 30 days and sent follow-up reminders on 16th, 24th and 29th September with the engagement period closed on 30th September.

1.1.4. The Bournemouth Airport Consultative Committee (ACC) was briefed both prior to, and during, the engagement period by the Airport management team. The briefing consisted of an overview of the reasoning for the project and included a presentation and the document mentioned above.

1.2. Responses

1.2.1. A total of ten responses were received through the online survey and an additional response via email. They are divided into the following categories:

- 3 aircraft operators;
- 3 community representative bodies;
- 3 NATMAC addressees;
- 1 Environmental body; and
- 1 ATM technical stakeholder.

1.2.2. The survey results are contained with Section 2 and non-survey feedback in Section 3. The Final Design Principles, as determined through this targeted stakeholder engagement, is contained within Section 4.

1.2.3. A summary of the survey results, redacted to remove personal details and with associated graphs, is included in this submission and titled; "*Bournemouth Airport ACP DP Survey Results-Redacted*".

1.2.4. The survey results are in a summary format that cannot be manipulated, therefore specific responses are not viewable. This report has extracted those comments under the respective DP review.

2. Survey Responses and Impact

2.1. Question 1

2.1.1. It is possible that, during the options development phase, flightpaths may be identified that have a lower potential environmental impact and greater efficiency. These flightpaths may of course impact new people currently not overflown routinely. **Would you prefer that any future Bournemouth flight procedures be designed to deliver the best possible routes in terms of noise, emissions and operational efficiency, or is the avoidance of impacting new communities of greater importance?** Available answers:

- Avoid affecting new people; or
- Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency; or
- Don't know; and
- Optional open text field to provide amplification on your answer.

2.1.2. 60% of respondents answered that we should 'Seek options to reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency'. 30% either had no comment on priority or did not know. One community representative body responded that they wanted no night flights.

2.1.3. **Comment** – The avoidance of new people appears not to be an emotive issue. The 'Environmental' DPs (DP2-5) capture the desire to *'Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency'*.

2.2. Question 2

2.2.1. It may be possible to concentrate or merge flightpaths in such a way that the environmental impact is always concentrated in certain areas (perhaps because the route is more efficient or affects less people). Conversely, it may be possible to design a system that disperses the environmental impact. Dispersion would affect more people but less often. **Would you prefer to see a system of flight paths that concentrates the impact or disperses it?** Available answers:

- Concentrate; or
- Disperse; or
- Don't know; and
- Optional open text field to provide amplification on your answer.

2.2.2. 30% of respondents would like to see impact dispersed whilst 20% would like to see it concentrated. The other 50% did not wish to comment or did not know which should be favoured. An aircraft operator felt that *'our primary concern is that of safety in the air and on the ground. For aircraft, simplicity is key'*.

2.2.3. **Comment** – The aircraft operator makes a valid point with regards to simplicity as this supports our first DP relating to the importance of safety. There is no clear preference on the dispersal or concentration of noise from the responses received.

2.3. Question 3

2.3.1. It may be possible to avoid certain areas. In order of preference ((1) being of most importance and (3) being of least importance), please advise which of the following you would like us to protect from the impact of aviation noise and emissions. Available answers:

- Built-up areas (i.e. densely populated);
- Rural Areas (i.e. sparsely populated);
- Areas of Tranquillity (e.g. National Parks, AONBs, recreational parks etc.)
- Optional open text field to provide amplification on your answer.

2.3.2. 30% of respondents did not answer this question. If responses were scored 3 points for 'Most Important', 2 points for 'Important' and 1 point for 'Least Important', the following scores would apply based upon the responses:

- Tranquillity (17);
- Built Up Areas (16); and
- Rural Areas (15).

2.3.3. **Comment** - There is very little between these responses/scores, however, it can perhaps be deduced that rural sparsely populated areas are of least importance to those that responded overall and that the tranquillity afforded by the National Park and AONBs are of the greatest importance to those who responded.

2.4. Question 4

2.4.1. Are there any specific areas or noise sensitive buildings you would like us to be made aware of where overflight should be avoided if possible? Available answers:

- Yes (Please expand on answer); or
- No; and
- Optional open text field to provide amplification on your answer.

2.4.2. **Response:** 90% of respondents had no areas specifically to mention however, an environmental body asked that the following areas be avoided:

- Kingston Lacy;
- Brownsea Island;
- Corfe Castle; and
- Studland beaches.

2.4.3. **Comment** - These areas will be highlighted to the designers during the options development phase as areas to try and avoid where possible.

2.5. Question 5

2.5.1. Some airports have sought opportunities to build into the system known periods of relief from the adverse effects of aviation noise. These known or scheduled periods are known as 'Respite' periods during which times aircraft are channelled onto 'Respite' routes relieving

the burden on certain communities. It must be stressed that airspace constraints sometimes limit the art of the possible, however it is something that could be investigated. **Given the option, would you like to see a system developed that had periods of known respite built-in?** Available answers:

- Yes; or
- No; or
- Don't mind; or
- Don't know; and
- Optional open text field to provide amplification on your answer.

2.5.2. **Response:** 50% of respondents would be keen to see a system developed that had periods of known respite built-in. 20% did not know and 30% declined to comment. An aircraft operator stated that *'operationally, we would need to understand more the planned times and the restrictions before comment'.*

2.5.3. **Comment –** Options should be developed that consider periods of respite if required and where possible.

2.6. Question 6 – DP 1

2.6.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP1 – Importance of Safety – The airspace design and its operation must be as safe or safer than today.

2.6.2. **Response:** 90% strongly agreed with this DP, 10% declined to comment.

2.6.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.7. Question 7 – DP 2

2.7.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP2 – Overflight – The new procedures should not increase the number of people overflown by aircraft using the Airport.

2.7.2. **Response:** 50% of respondents were 'Neutral', 20% disagreed, 10% agreed, 10% strongly agreed and 10% declined to comment.

2.7.3. **Impact:** On balance this DP should remain unchanged.

2.8. Question 8 – DP 3

2.8.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

Q8) **DP3 – Noise Footprint** – The new procedures should not increase the noise footprint of the existing airport operation, i.e. it should not increase the number of people affected within the 51dBA $L_{Aeq\ 16\ hour}$ contour.

2.8.2. **Response:** 40% agreed, 20% strongly agreed (i.e. 60% in favour) whilst 20% disagreed and 20% were 'Neutral'.

2.8.3. **Impact:** On balance this DP should remain unchanged.

2.9. Question 9 – DP 4

2.9.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP4 – Tranquillity – Implementation should minimise disturbance to the Moors River System SSSI and, where possible, minimise the impact upon the New Forest National Park and the nearby Areas of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB).

2.9.2. **Response:** 30% strongly agreed and 30% agreed (i.e. 60% in favour), 30% were 'Neutral' whilst a community representative body strongly disagreed.

2.9.3. **Impact:** On balance this DP should remain unchanged.

2.10. Question 10 – DP 5

2.10.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP5 – Emissions and Air Quality – The new design should seek to minimise the growth in aircraft emissions, the further degradation in local air quality and adverse ecological impacts to address growing concerns about the impact of aviation on climate change.

2.10.2. **Response:** 60% agreed and 10% strongly agreed (i.e. 70% in favour) whilst 30% were 'Neutral'.

2.10.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.11. Question 11 – DP 6

2.11.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP6 – Operational Requirements – The new procedures should address the needs of most operators at Bournemouth Airport.

2.11.2. **Response:** 50% agreed and 30% strongly agreed (i.e. 80% in favour) whilst 10% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment.

2.11.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.12. Question 12 – DP 7

2.12.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP7 – Airspace Dimensions – The airspace design should afford the appropriate volume of controlled airspace to contain and support commercial air transport for both runways, enable safe, efficient access for other types of operation and release controlled airspace that is not required.

2.12.2. **Response:** 50% agreed and 30% strongly agreed (i.e. 80% in favour) whilst 10% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment.

2.12.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.13. Question 13 – DP 8

2.13.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP8 – Airspace Availability – Sufficient controlled airspace should be available to support Bournemouth Airport operations independently.

2.13.2. **Response:** 40% agreed and 20% strongly agreed (i.e. 60% in favour) whilst 30% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment.

2.13.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.14. Question 14 – DP 9

2.14.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP9 – Airspace Complexity – The airspace design should seek to reduce complexity and bottlenecks in controlled and uncontrolled airspace and contribute to a reduction in airspace infringements.

2.14.2. **Response:** 50% strongly agreed and 30% agreed (i.e. 80% in favour) whilst 10% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment.

2.14.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.15. Question 15 – DP 10

2.15.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP10 – Compliance – The design shall be fully compliant with the design criteria stated in ICAO Doc 8168 (PANS OPS), acceptable to the CAA and, the implementation shall follow all applicable legislation and regulations.

2.15.2. **Response:** 50% agreed and 30% strongly agreed (i.e. 80% in favour) whilst 10% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment.

2.15.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.16. Question 16 – DP 11

2.16.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP11 – Aircraft Category – The new procedures shall be technically flyable by all aircraft types in approach Speed Categories A through D.

2.16.2. **Response:** 30% strongly agreed and 20% agreed (i.e. 50% in favour) whilst 40% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment.

2.16.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.17. Question 17 – DP 12

2.17.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP12 – Equipage and Approval – The new procedures shall be flyable by the majority of Bournemouth commercial aircraft operators.

2.17.2. **Response:** 40% strongly agreed and 20% agreed (i.e. 60% in favour) whilst 20% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment. A national aviation body disagreed.

2.17.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.18. Question 18 – DP 13

2.18.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP13 – Arrival Transitions – The arrival transition designs shall seamlessly integrate with the new RNP instrument approach procedures at Bournemouth Airport and if possible, the existing ILS approach procedures.

2.18.2. **Response:** 40% strongly agreed and 20% agreed (i.e. 60% in favour) whilst 20% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment. A community representative body disagreed.

2.18.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.19. Question 19 – DP 14

2.19.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP14 – Departure Procedures – The Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs) shall terminate at the agreed 'Gateways' into the route network and are deconflicted from the arrival transitions.

2.19.2. **Response:** 40% agreed and 30% strongly agreed (i.e. 70% in favour) whilst 20% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment.

2.19.3. **Impact:** DP remains unchanged.

2.20. Question 20 – DP 15

2.20.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP15 – Coordination – The new procedures result in a reduction in the amount of tactical coordination required by ATCOs.

2.20.2. **Response:** 30% strongly agreed and 20% agreed (i.e. 50% in favour) whilst 30% were 'Neutral' and 20% declined to comment.

2.20.3. **Impact:** As there were no objections, this DP remains unchanged.

2.21. Question 21 – DP 16

2.21.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP16 – Independence – The new procedures and airspace configuration should enable Bournemouth Airport to operate independently of Southampton Radar.

2.21.2. **Response:** 30% strongly agreed and 30% agreed (i.e. 60% in favour) whilst 20% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment. One NATMAC representative body disagreed with no supporting comments.

2.21.3. **Impact:** On balance this DP will be consolidated under DP8 as both address the issue of independent operations.

2.22. Question 22 – DP 17

2.22.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP17 – Cost of Change – The new procedures shall be implemented in a cost-effective manner.

2.22.2. **Response:** 40% strongly agreed and 20% agreed (i.e. 60% in favour) whilst 20% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment. One NATMAC representative body disagreed.

2.22.3. **Impact:** Due to the obvious intent and recent funding grants made available this DP is deemed unnecessary as a result of agreed funding criteria and robust oversight. Recommendation is to remove this DP.

2.23. Question 23 – DP 18

2.23.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP18 – Operational Cost – Provided it does not have an adverse impact of community disturbance, procedures should be designed to optimise fuel efficiency.

2.23.2. **Response:** 40% strongly agreed and 20% agreed (i.e. 60% in favour) whilst 30% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment.

2.23.3. **Impact:** As there were no objections, this DP remains unchanged.

2.24. Question 24 – DP 19

2.24.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP19 – AMS Realisation – This ACP must serve to further, and not conflict with, the realisation of the AMS.

2.24.2. **Response:** 40% strongly agreed and 20% agreed (i.e. 60% in favour) whilst 30% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment.

2.24.3. **Impact:** As there were no objections, this DP remains unchanged.

2.25. Question 25 – DP 20

2.25.1. To what extent do you agree with the following? Please provide comment as to how you would prefer the Design Principle in question reworded or why you would like to see it removed altogether.

DP20 – PBN – The new procedures should capitalise on as many of the potential benefits of PBN implementation as are practicable.

2.25.2. **Response:** 40% agreed and 30% strongly agreed (i.e. 70% in favour) whilst 20% were 'Neutral' and 10% declined to comment.

2.25.3. **Impact:** As there were no objections, this DP remains unchanged.

2.26. Question 26

2.26.1. Have we missed anything that should be incorporated as a Design Principle? Available answers:

- Yes (please provide amplification); or
- No, I'm content you've captured everything; or
- Not sure; and
- Optional open text field to provide amplification on your answer.

2.26.2. 80% of respondents had nothing to add. The remaining paragraphs address the two comments that were submitted.

2.26.3. **Community representative body** - '*It goes without saying that noise is far less intrusive in a very densely built-up area with high levels of traffic, and I feel more thought should be given to those people who are subjected to intrusive noise from aircraft, especially at night. Its seems that animals in the New Forest are given a higher priority than is justified*'.

2.26.4. **Comment** – Other than the importance of safety, the DPs have not been prioritised. The impact of aviation noise on a variety of environments has been considered in the development of these DPs. DPs 2 and 3 specifically address the impacts of noise on people (not animals) whereas DP 4 considers the impact of noise on areas of tranquillity, i.e. the

New Forest National Park and the AONBs within which the importance of calm for both humans and animals is paramount.

2.26.5. **Environmental representative body** - *'As well as tranquillity, affects on places important for the tourism and visitor economy (although the places we've mentioned in our responses are all in AONBs)'*.

2.26.6. **Comment** – CAP1616 states that:

'There is no universally accepted definition of tranquillity and therefore there is no accepted metric by which it can be measured. In general terms it can be defined as a state of calm. The consideration of impacts upon tranquillity for airspace changes is with specific reference to National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), plus any locally identified 'tranquil' areas that are identified through community engagement and are subsequently reflected within an airspace change proposal's design principles'.

The areas and places identified during this engagement, plus any more that are raised as important 'tranquil areas' through ongoing engagement, will be considered in the development of options and through the consultation phase of the ACP.

3. Non-Survey Feedback

3.1.1. Feedback was received from the British Gliding Association (BGA) by email. The email did not respond to the draft DPs and a request was made to the representative to submit a survey response only, this was not received.

3.1.2. Notwithstanding, the feedback from the BGA is included Figure 1 without amendment.

3.1.3. The responses are generic and have been identified as identical in other airport ACP responses. As such, the BGA response is not seen as helpful in the context of establishing DPs as they are not specific to the context of the Bournemouth ACP but to the wider Airspace Modernisation Strategy (AMS) and captured under DP19.

3.1.4. Bournemouth Airport will continue to diligently follow the CAP1616 process and engage local and associative stakeholders in this ACP to ensure that the relevant Initiatives contained within the AMS are applied.

Recognition that GA including sporting and recreational aviation has legitimate rights of access to airspace.
Sponsors must show how they are integrating their proposal within the overall UK airspace modernisation context (for example, proposals which do not connect efficiently between upper and lower airspace (potentially under different airspace "management") would only inhibit overall airspace efficiency and therefore not receive our support.
Reiteration that the UK airspace's default classification is G.
Reiteration that ICAO Class E airspace default is without the addition of a TMZ or RMZ
Expectation that data used, particularly forecasts, includes details of any and all assumptions and available supporting evidence re; - reasonably justified forecast traffic levels - analysis of overall airspace safety changes, ie based on modelling and evidence rather than subjective opinion
Minimum size of existing and any proposed controlled airspace.
Steeper and continuous climbs and descents for cost and environmental benefits as well as minimisation of controlled airspace footprint.
Use of Class E airspace as an alternative to class C and D airspace.
Optimisation of the development work above and below the 7,000ft NATS en-route split.
Flexible use of airspace.
Examine options for interoperability with existing e-conspicuity, eg ADS-B, FLARM and PilotAware.
Efficient consultation.
Plan GNSS approaches outside controlled airspace to minimise impact on GA including sporting and recreational aviation and to ensure their continued right of access to the airspace

Figure 1: BGA Response

4. Final Design Principles

4.1. Overview

4.1.1. We drafted DPs for consideration and review, some of which carry over from the previous ACP. These were only draft DPs and are not listed in priority order. The survey gave stakeholders the opportunity to comment on them and to offer up further suggestions.

4.1.2. None of the responses received to the survey have resulted in any changes to the DPs as drafted. However, following feedback it was decided to consolidate the DP where possible and detailed within the Section. Accordingly, the following paragraphs detail the DPs that go forward to the CAA's 'Define' Gateway intended for use in Stage 2 of the process.

4.1.3. To simplify the understanding and future measurement against these principles, Bournemouth Airport recommends consolidating some DPs to ensure a managed approach. The essence of the consolidated DPs has been captured to ensure all elements are reflected. A brief notification is provided where DPs have been consolidated.

4.2. Safety

4.2.1. **DP1 – Importance of Safety** – The airspace design and its operation must be as safe or safer than today.

4.3. Environmental

4.3.1. **DP2 – Overflight** – The new procedures should not increase the number of people overflown by aircraft using the Airport.

4.3.2. **DP3 – Noise Footprint** – The new procedures should not increase the noise footprint of the existing airport operation, i.e. it should not increase the number of people affected within the 51dBA $L_{Aeq\ 16\ hour}$ contour.

4.3.3. **DP4 – Tranquillity** – Implementation should minimise disturbance to the Moors River System SSSI and, where possible, minimise the impact upon the New Forest National Park and the nearby Areas of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB).

4.3.4. **DP5 – Emissions and Air Quality** – The new design should seek to minimise the growth in aircraft emissions, the further degradation in local air quality and adverse ecological impacts to address growing concerns about the impact of aviation on climate change.

4.4. Operational

4.4.1. **DP6 – Operational Requirements** – The new procedures should address the needs of most operators at Bournemouth Airport.

4.4.2. **DP7 – Airspace Dimensions** – The airspace design should afford the appropriate volume of controlled airspace to contain and support commercial air transport for both runways, enable safe, efficient access for other types of operation and release controlled airspace that is not required.

4.4.3. **DP8 – Airspace Availability** – Sufficient controlled airspace should be available to support Bournemouth Airport operations independently. This DP incorporates DP16 in Section 2.21.

4.4.4. **DP9 – Airspace Complexity –** The airspace design should seek to reduce complexity and bottlenecks in controlled and uncontrolled airspace and contribute to a reduction in airspace infringements.

4.5. Technical

4.5.1. Some of the DPs under this heading have been consolidated into a single DP, the consolidated DPs are as follows:

- DP10, DP11 and DP12 are consolidated into DP10.
- DP13, DP14 and DP15 are consolidated into DP11.

4.5.2. **DP10 – Technical Requirements** – The design shall be fully compliant with PANS-OPS and UK CAA criteria to meet the technical capability requirements of aircraft using the airport.

4.5.3. **DP11 – Systemisation** – The arrival transitions and departure procedures shall be deconflicted and integrate with the en-route network, as per the FASI(S) programme, and in the case of the arrival transitions shall integrate with the Instrument Approach procedures (IAPs) reducing the requirement for tactical coordination.

4.6. Economic

4.6.1. **DP13 – Operational Cost** – Provided it does not have an adverse impact of community disturbance, procedures should be designed to optimise fuel efficiency.

4.7. Strategic Policy

4.7.1. The CAA has insisted that, subject to the overriding principle of maintaining a high standard of safety, the highest priority principle of this airspace change, that cannot be discounted, is that it aligns with the CAA's published Airspace Modernisation Strategy (CAP1711) and any future plans associated with it. Bournemouth Airport is expected to participate in the development of the AMS Masterplan, in conjunction with ACOG, NERL and the other identified airports. The following DP is therefore second only to maintenance of safety.

4.7.2. **DP14 – AMS Realisation** – This ACP must serve to further, and not conflict with, the realisation of the AMS.

4.7.3. Note: It is accepted by the CAA that adherence to this DP, in what is a coordinated modernisation programme, may impact upon the development of 'Options'.

4.7.4. **DP15 – PBN** – The new procedures should capitalise on as many of the potential benefits of PBN implementation as are practicable. This includes predictability, efficiency, continuous climb and descent operations with the intention of reducing carbon emissions.

A. Stakeholder List

A.1. Community Stakeholders

Bournemouth Airport Consultative Committee (ACC)	
Christchurch Chamber of Trade & Commerce	New Forest District Council
Hurn Parish Council	Bransgore Parish Council
Christchurch Borough Council	Ferndown Town Council
Bournemouth Chamber of Trade & Commerce	Verwood Town Council
Crowhill Residents' Association	Dorset Chamber of Commerce & Industry
Burley Parish Council	Draken
Dorset County Council	Christchurch Tourism
Dorset Federation of Residents' Associations	New Forest National Park Authority
Bournemouth Christchurch & Poole Council	Broadstone Neighbourhood Forum
East Dorset District Council	Jumpers & St Catherine's Hill Residents Association
West Parley Parish Council	

A.2. Environmental Stakeholders

Environmental Bodies	
Natural England (SSSI Moors River System)	National Trust
Cranbourne Chase AONB Team (covers West Wiltshire Downs AONB also)	New Forest National Park Authority *
Dorset County Council (Dorset AONB) *	Hampshire County Council (New Forest National Park) *

* Represented on ACC

A.3. Technical Stakeholders

Air Navigation Services Providers/ATC	
NATS En-Route Ltd (NERL)	Bournemouth Airport ATC
NATS Southampton	NATS Farnborough

Aircraft Operators	
Draken	European Aviation / Maleth
EasyJet	Ryanair
Gama Aviation	TUI
Jota Aviation	Jersey Jet Centre
NetJets	FlexJet
Air Hamburg	JetFly Aviation of Luxembourg
L3Harris	CAE Oxford

A.4. Local Aviation Stakeholders

Neighbouring Airports/Airfields/Flying Clubs	
Southampton Airport	Farnborough Airport
Lee on Solent	Newton Peveril
Eyres Field	

A.5. Statutory Aviation Stakeholders

National Air Traffic Management Advisory Committee	
Airlines UK	British Parachute Association (BPA)
Airspace4All	General Aviation Alliance (GAA)
Airfield Operators Group (AOG)	Honourable Company of Air Pilots (HCAP)
Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA)	Helicopter Club of Great Britain (HCGB)
Aviation Environment Federation (AEF)	Isle of Man CAA
British Airways (BA)	Light Aircraft Association (LAA)
BAe Systems	Low Fare Airlines
British Airline Pilots Association (BALPA)	Military Aviation Authority (MAA)
British Balloon and Airship Club	Ministry of Defence - Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management (MoD DAATM)
British Gliding Association (BGA)	NATS
British Helicopter Association (BHA)	PPL/IR (Europe)
British Microlight Aircraft Association (BMAA) / General Aviation Safety Council (GASCo)	UK Airprox Board (UKAB)

This Page Is Intentionally Blank