

London Southend Airport Airspace Change Proposal

Survey on Design Principles for developing the solution to the London Southend Airport (LSA) airspace change as required under the Airspace Modernisation Strategy (AMS).

* Required

1. Please enter your name *

2. What organisation do you represent? *

3. Please provide an email for future correspondence

4. 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 LSA 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?** If 'Other' expand your answer.

Avoid affecting new people

Seek options that reduce environmental impact and have greater efficiency

Don't know

Other

5. 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 off light paths that concentrates the impact or disperses it?** If 'Other' expand your answer.

Concentrate

Disperse

Don't know

Other

6. It may be possible to avoid certain areas.

In order of preference (1) being of greatest 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.

	1 - Most Important	2. Important	3. Least Important
Built-up areas (i.e. densely populated)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rural Areas (i.e. sparsely populated)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Areas of Tranquillity (e.g. National Parks, AONBs, recreational parks etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. 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?

Yes

No

Other

8. 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?**

Yes

No

Don't know

Don't mind

Other

9. To what extent do you agree with each of the draft DPs? 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.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<p>Importance of Safety – The airspace design and its operation must be as safe or safer than today</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Overflight – The new procedures should not increase the number of people overflown by aircraft using the Airport</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>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 LAeq 16 hour contour</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Tranquillity – Implementation should minimise impact and disturbance to the Kent Downs Areas of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB)</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

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

Operational

Requirements – The new procedures should address the needs of most operators at LSA

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

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

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

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

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

Equipage and

Approval – The new procedures shall be flyable by the majority of LSA commercial aircraft operators

Arrival Transitions –

The arrival transition designs shall seamlessly integrate with the new RNP instrument approach procedures at LSA and if possible, the existing ILS approach procedures

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Departure

Procedures – Should the SIDs require amending to satisfy the broader FASI-S programme of change, these shall terminate at the agreed 'Gateways' into the route network and should be deconflicted from the arrival transitions

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

Noise Preferential

Routes – Should the SIDs need to be amended to accommodate the broader FASI-S programme of change, the amendments must honour the Section 106 NPRs

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

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

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

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

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

10. Have we missed anything that should be incorporated as a Design Principle?

Yes

No

Not sure

Other

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Microsoft. The data you submit will be sent to the form owner.

 Microsoft Forms