Bristol Airport Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) Stage 2 Engagement Presentations

9th and 10th November 2021

Bristol Airport hosted two online presentations over TEAMs, on Tuesday 9th and Wednesday 10th November 2021. These presentations formed part of the engagement activities for the CAP1616 Stage 2 Define work. Change sponsors (here being Bristol Airport) are required to re-engage with all stakeholders who they previously contacted as part of Stage 1.

In October 2021, Bristol Airport invited all their aviation and local stakeholders to attend one of the two presentations which would last for two hours. A final prompt email was sent out on the week before the presentations as a reminder. A few days before the presentations, TEAMs links were emailed to all stakeholders who had responded.

The presentations were hosted by Bristol Airport (Airfield Technical and Compliance Manager) and supported by NATS (Airspace Change Specialist and Design Lead). Attendees were provided with an update of work completed thus far, including the previous Design Principles engagement which some had attended, and the recent design work.

Presenters asked attendees to drop any comments into the chat function which would either be responded to in the session or covered in upcoming correspondence which would summarise the two presentations. Specifically attendees were asked to provide comments on the design options presented or any general questions they have in relation to Bristol Airport's Airspace Change Proposal. Questions and responses can be found below.

The format of the presentations was as follows:

- Welcome and introduction
- Background into the wider programme of UK airspace modernisation and Bristol Airport's role within
- Summary of the CAA's CAP1616 process, underpinning this ACP
- Bristol Airport's ACP inputs and drivers
- Bristol Airport ACP timeline and work completed so far (Statement of Need, Design Principles)
- Current traffic flows and distribution at Bristol Airport
- ACP design objectives
- Development of Bristol's long-list of design options and explanation behind them
- Final closing comments and thanks

Questions and comments received alongside responses from Bristol Airport:

Q: How close to the airport does the Hold have to be?

There is no mandatory specific distance that a Hold must be from an airport. A Hold should be close enough to the origin airport to avoid unnecessary track distance and associated fuel burn/ CO_2. There also needs to be sufficient controlled airspace to allow the transitions which route aircraft from the Hold onto final approach.

Bristol's current holding procedure is in the overhead, above the airport, which creates operational complexities such as radar cluttering. Therefore, it is highly likely that a future holding procedure will be further from the airport than it is today.

Q: How are the noise impacts of the routes assessed and who by?

A more detailed noise analysis will be completed as part of the upcoming Stage 3 work and associated options appraisal. We will present how communities will be affected as a result of the different design options, compared to each other and against todays' noise impacts. Noise impacts will be shown as visual contours and measured in decibels (dB).

The Environmental Research and Consultancy Department (ERDC), within the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), will be commissioned to complete this work for Bristol Airport.

Comment: I don't agree that 'no new people should be over flown' as this doesn't seem fair to all. Comment please.

The different "noise mitigation" Design Principles have been included to reflect the differing feedback received. Some of these Design Principles are in conflict with one another which echoes the range of opinions received from stakeholders. During the upcoming consultation, we will outline which of the design options best meet the different Design Principles.

As demonstrated in the supporting slides, there are a variety of different route placements for the design options; some above populated areas and others not.

Q: Why should a city have less overflown flights as a populated area, as this is a noisy place already and air traffic noise would be less noticeable.

Design Principle 15 ("minimise the total population overflown") has been included following feedback from some stakeholders that it would be preferable to overfly as few people as possible. This could be achieved by avoiding urban conurbations and/or prioritising the overflight of rural areas or bodies of water i.e. there are several ways in which this principle could be met.

As covered above, in the upcoming consultation we will clearly outline which of the design options (such as different departure routes) best meet the different Design Principles. Stakeholders can provide feedback on the different design options which can cover anticipated noise impacts.

Q: Where will the hold to the North and south be held and at what height

Different Hold options are covered in the upcoming slides, showing a number of potential locations around the Airport. It is highly likely that the current Hold will be moved from its position in the overhead (above Bristol Airport).

The upcoming Stage 2 submission to the CAA (Jan 2022) will include a Design Principle Evaluation. This will qualitatively assess each of the design options (including the Holds) against each Design Principle which will highlight the differing pros/ cons of each option e.g. noise and environmental impacts.

Comment: 2-minute departure separation seems a safety point and should not be changed

The 2-minute separation is not in place for safety reasons but is a legacy procedure which has an adverse impact on environmental performance from increased ground delay.

If Bristol Airport do wish to change the departure separation procedures, a comprehensive safety case will have to be completed and submitted to the CAA.

Q: Has loss of EGNOS required an update of the future RNAV plans for the Airspace?

There will be no adverse change on the operation or future plans to do so.

Q: Will the departures fly to a height of at least 3,000 ft before turning to these new flights paths

At this point in the process these designs are purely indicative and do not as yet have specific climb profiles associated with them.

This level of detail will form part of the Stage 3 work which we will formally consult upon.

Comment: It is important to realise that departing five miles and having to reach 3,000 ft reduces noise for residents close to the airport

The ongoing design work will take aircraft performance and associated climb profiles into consideration.

Point on noise impact noted and hence the inclusion of the noise mitigation design principles.

Comment: At 2030 there will still be many older aircraft in use. These aircraft with a full load will not be able to make these climbs.

As the design options are developed, the fleet mix at Bristol Airport will be taken into consideration. If an aircraft type is not able to make a particular climb or turn, the procedure will either be changed

to make it possible, or an alternative procedure will be made available for "lower performance" aircraft.

Airlines will be engaged throughout the design work, as completed so far, to ensure that design options are appropriate from their perspective i.e. flyable.

Q: Can you confirm the dates please?

Submission of Stage 2 work to the CAA: end of January 2022.

CAA decision: end of February 2022

Presuming approval, commencement of Stage 3 work: start of March 2022

Q: Will you disseminate the slides?

The slide pack will be uploaded to the portal in early 2022 as part of the Stage 2 submission and publicly available.

Bristol Airport and NATS attendees across both presentations:

[redacted] - *NATS, LAMP ATM Development Lead*
[redacted] - *Bristol Airport, Public Affairs Executive*
[redacted] - *NATS, Airspace Change Specialist*
[redacted] - *NATS, Airspace Design Lead*
[redacted] - *Bristol Airport, Public Relations and Community Manager*
[redacted] - *Bristol Airport, Airfield Technical and Compliance Manager*
[redacted] - *NATS, Bristol Airport General Manager*
[redacted] - *NATS, Project Manager*

Stakeholder attendees for the presentation on 09/11/2021, 13:00 – 15:00:

[redacted] - *Binegar Parish Council*
[redacted] - *North Somerset Council*
[redacted] - *Nailsea Town Council*
[redacted] - *Keynsham East Council*
[redacted] - *Bath and North East Somerset Council*
[redacted] - *Weston-Super-Mare Town Council*
[redacted] - *Sedgemoor District Council*
[redacted] – *NATS*
[redacted] - *Churchill and Langford Residents' Action Group (CALRAG) Co-Chair*
[redacted] - *North Somerset Council*
[redacted] - *Exeter Airport*
[redacted] - *Executive Jet Charter Ltd*
[redacted] - *Portishead Town Council*

Stakeholder attendees for the presentation on 10/11/2021, 10:00 – 12:00:

[redacted] - *Kingston Seymour Parish Council*
[redacted] - *Saltford Parish Council*
[redacted] - *Exeter Airport*
[redacted] - *Parish Councils Airport Association (PCAA)*
[redacted] - *South West Trade Unions Congress (TUC)*
[redacted] - *easyJet*
[redacted] – *Duries*
[redacted] - *Cardiff Airport*
[redacted] – *Bristol Airport Consultative Committee (BACC) Chair*
[redacted] - *St Cuthbert Out Parish Council*
[redacted] – *Ryanair*
[redacted] – *NATS*
[redacted] - *Chew Magna Parish Council*
[redacted] - *Department of Health and Social Care*
[redacted] (unaffiliated)
[redacted] - *Devon Air Ambulance*
[redacted] - *Badgworth Parish Council*
[redacted] - *Light Aircraft Association*