

**MINUTES OF GATWICK ROUTE 4 AIRSPACE CHANGE PROJECT ASSESSMENT MEETING
HELD AT HILTON HOTEL GATWICK ON 24 JANUARY 2019**

28 January 2019

CAA – Attention [REDACTED] (Account Manager)

Present	Appointment	Representing
[REDACTED]	<i>Principal Airspace Regulator</i>	CAA
[REDACTED]	<i>Communities & Coordination</i>	CAA
[REDACTED]	<i>PBN¹ Implementation Lead</i>	CAA
[REDACTED]	<i>Instrument Flight Procedures</i>	CAA
[REDACTED]	<i>Environment & Analysis</i>	CAA
[REDACTED]	<i>Principal Airspace Regulator</i>	CAA
[REDACTED]	<i>Account Manager (by teleconference)</i>	CAA
[REDACTED]	<i>Head of Airspace Strategy and Engagement</i>	GAL ²
[REDACTED]	<i>Airspace and Environmental Performance Manager</i>	GAL
[REDACTED]	<i>Chief Operating Officer</i>	Osprey
[REDACTED]	<i>IFP³ Team Leader</i>	Osprey
[REDACTED]	<i>Operational Projects Lead</i>	ANS

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA confirmed receipt of the Gatwick Route 4 Statement of Need (SoN) and that the relevant documents would be published together with minutes of the meeting on the CAA airspace change website. CAA explained the purpose of the meeting and confirmed that the meeting was an Assessment Meeting and not a Gateway. The CAA reinforced that the Sponsor was required to provide a broad description of their proposed approach to meeting the CAA's CAP 1616 requirements, but the CAA was not deciding whether the proposed approach met the detailed requirements of the CAA's process at this stage. The purpose of the Assessment Meeting (set out in detail in CAP 1616) was broadly:

- for the Sponsor to present and discuss their SoN,
- to enable the CAA to consider whether the proposal concerned falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process,
- to enable the CAA to consider the appropriate provisional Level to assign to the change proposal.

Additionally, the Sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to proceed to fulfil the requirements of the airspace change process and to provide information on timescales. Lastly, the Sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to meet the engagement requirements of the various stages of the airspace change process.

¹ Performance Based Navigation

² Gatwick Airports Limited

³ Instrument Flight Procedures

	ACTION
<p>Item 1 – Introduction</p> <p>The [REDACTED] welcomed all attendees. [REDACTED] read the introductory statement above. [REDACTED] thanked the CAA for accommodating the meeting and stated that, while there was clearly history associated with Route 4, GAL considered this project to be a fresh start based on a new set of objectives which will focus solely on RNAV⁴ SIDs to Runway 26 Left Route 4 and will not consider conventional procedures.</p> <p>[REDACTED] stated that he was temporarily managing the Route 4 Project from an Osprey perspective on behalf of the Project Manager ([REDACTED]). He expected [REDACTED] to return to the Project the following week.</p> <p>[REDACTED] invited [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to present the background slide pack in support of the Gatwick Route 4 Statement of Need dated 19 December 2018.</p>	
<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</p> <p>[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] presented (slides attached) the broad content of the Statement of Need. The presentation highlighted that the aim of the project was to design and implement permanent changes to the Runway 26 Left Route 4 SIDs⁵. While it would be examined as part of the Design Principles, it was anticipated that the new route would be either to, or in the close proximity of, but not beyond reporting point SUNAV.</p> <p>[REDACTED] stated that this clarification was important as it would provide a clear distinction between the Route 4 responsibilities and those of other projects such as FASI-S; the Route 4 project would not consider the wider impact of FASI-S but it would be anticipated that the FASI-S project would consider the impact of Route 4.</p> <p>However, while consultation should be based purely around the issue of Route 4, [REDACTED] stated that it should be made clear what consultees are being asked to comment on as it could influence their response.</p> <p>[REDACTED] stated that the project would also seek to limit and reduce where possible, the environmental impacts on local communities in the vicinity of Route 4.</p>	
<p>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change</p> <p>The slides attached indicate the opportunities and issues identified by the Sponsor. Further to the objectives identified in Item 2 above, the Sponsor will take the opportunity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider changes to the existing (temporary) RNAV SID to further reduce the impact experienced by local communities of aircraft departing Gatwick Airport; • Investigate the potential to increase the climb angle/altitude aircraft must achieve during their initial climb; • Consider, and be compatible with, the objectives outlined in the CAA's 	

⁴ aRea NAVigation standards

⁵ Standard Instrument Departure

	ACTION
<p>airspace modernisation strategy.</p> <p>The main issues identified were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The differential between the historic track flown by aircraft on Route 4 and the legally defined Route 4 NPR; • Interaction with existing neighbouring airport procedures, • Ensuring that the design aligns with, and does not interfere with, desired outcomes defined within Gatwick Airport’s airspace modernisation airspace change ACP 2018-60. <p>■ emphasised that the Sponsor should engage with the CAA at an early stage if there was consideration of any deviation from the IFP standards; the Sponsor accepted this.</p>	
<p>Item 4 – Options to exploit opportunities or address issues identified</p> <p>■ wished to emphasise that the project would be mindful of previous legal decisions and would seek to recognise and reconcile the issue of tracks over the ground and historical precedents.</p>	
<p>Item 5 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements</p> <p>■ confirmed that the proposed airspace change fell within the requirements of CAP 1616 and at this stage was provisionally considered to be a CAP 1616 Level 1 project.</p> <p>The category would be confirmed at the end of Stage 2, following the Develop and Assess Gateway.</p> <p>■ highlighted that the CAA portal already indicated that this was a Level 1 Airspace Change and requested that the Sponsor changes this to ‘To be Confirmed’ (<i>Sec Note – this has already been actioned</i>)</p> <p>■ stated that, in terms of scalability, the CAA would consider reductions to consultation timescales if it was felt that it could be justified in accordance with CAP 1616 and described in the Consultation Strategy.</p>	<p>CAA</p> <p>Sponsor</p>
<p>Item 6 – Provisional process timescales</p> <p>■ provided provisional timescales which were aligned to the CAP 1616 process gateways. However, it was emphasised that these were conservative timescales which made provision for potential delays between phases and to accommodate holiday periods etc; there was scope, from a purely project perspective, to potentially foreshorten some of these. ■ emphasised GAL’s desire to resolve the issue of Route 4 both for the benefit of the airport and local residents; careful management of process timelines would create a clear distinction between Route 4 and FASI-S activities.</p> <p>The indicative dates are as follows:</p>	

	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 Jan 19 - Assessment Meeting • 28 Jun 19 - Define Gateway • 27 Sep 19 - Develop and Assess Gateway • 20 Dec 19 - Consult Gateway • 21 Aug 20 - ACP Submission <p>█ stated that this would be confirmed by █ on his return but equally once any opportunities to foreshorten the above timescales had been explored.</p>	Sponsor
<p>Item 7 – Next steps</p> <p>█ described the anticipated next steps which will be conducted under Step 1B and provided the Stakeholder list that had been identified by GAL. The CAA stated that those NATMAC representatives whose organisations are most likely to have an interest should be added to the list.</p> <p>█ outlined the intended high-level approach to Step 1B, to ensure compliance with paragraph C13 of CAP1616, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The use of a structured questionnaire which would be tailored to specific stakeholder groups; - Engagement with local community groups; - Engagement through representative bodies such as GATCOM, NMB and NATMAG. <p>█ stated that this approach appeared appropriate and encouraged the Sponsor to develop an Engagement Strategy as per Appendix C of CAP 1616.</p> <p>█ emphasised the importance of maintaining records throughout the project to confirm and validate statements that would be made in the subsequent CAP 1616 submission.</p> <p>█ emphasised the need to take account of the relevant Planning Authorities when developing an Engagement Plan to ensure future planning approvals and developments are also taken into account.</p>	<p>Sponsor</p> <p>Sponsor</p> <p>Sponsor</p>
<p>Item 8 – Any other business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - █ stated that the Sponsor should consider the options outlined in CAP 1378 (Airspace Design Guidance: Noise Mitigation Considerations when Designing PBN Departure and Arrival Procedures). - █ described his role as the Account Manager for this project and explained that he would be the conduit for all engagement with the CAA. 	

█
Head of Airspace Strategy and Engagement