

Meeting Minutes

Project Title Gatwick Route 4
Client ANS/GAL
Purpose of Meeting Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement
Date of Meeting 1 February 2022
Held at TEAMS
Present

[REDACTED]

Stakeholders

[REDACTED]

Mole Valley District Council

[REDACTED]



For Information

Copies to	CAA
Classification	Public
Osprey Reference	71248/069
Issue	Final

This document is of UK origin and has been prepared by Osprey Consulting Services Limited (Osprey) and, subject to any existing rights of third parties, Osprey is the owner of the copyright therein. The document is furnished in confidence under existing laws, regulations and agreements covering the release of data. This document contains proprietary information of Osprey and the contents, or any part thereof shall not be copied or disclosed to any third party without Osprey's prior written consent.

© Osprey Consulting Services Limited 2019



Meeting Summary

Item	Action
<p>Opening introductions</p> <p>█ welcomed everyone to the meeting, introduced the representatives from █ and Osprey and explained the housekeeping rules for this meeting. He confirmed that the presentation would be shared after the meeting and that the record of the meeting and feedback received would be published in accordance with CAP 1616 requirements.</p>	<p>█</p>
<p>Presentation</p> <p>The attached presentation was used for the briefing.</p>	
<p>Current Situation</p> <p>█ began the presentation and delivered the content up to and including slide 11, the first question point. No questions were asked.</p>	
<p>Stage 2 Gateway January 2020</p> <p>█ continued the presentation starting at slide 12 and continued up to and including slide 14, the next question point. No questions were asked.</p>	
<p>Establishing a New Baseline</p> <p>█ continued the presentation up to and including slide 23. He majored on the effect that COVID has had on the destinations, climb profiles and positioning of departures on Route 4 and how changes are still likely to continue to occur as progression to full recovery from COVID takes place.</p> <p>Questions and feedback were raised as follows:</p> <p>█ <i>Representing █ - At any stage in the future will the coding houses be asked to standardise?</i></p> <p>█ <i>responded that he will answer this fully in later slides but that the airport is currently responsible for publishing the conventional tracks and for the monitoring of them with respect to track keeping. Airports in the UK are not responsible for how the coding houses take the conventional designs and then make RNAV overlays for the airlines.</i></p> <p>█ <i>- Representing █ - Asked for clarification on slide 18, specifically the use of 400m versus previously used figure of 1000m</i></p> <p>█ <i>responded that the figures used refer to average tracks due to the nature of the way they are flown.</i></p>	

Item	Action
<p>██████████ – Representing ██████████ Stated that the Belfast flights are going straight up above the Heathrow flights, and this is producing winners and losers regarding new people overflowed. She asked if this was being monitored. She continued by stating that routes are not being flown as they were so she wanted to know how a baseline could be achieved</p> <p>██████████ explained that Gatwick are capturing the actual data as a measurable and representative traffic sample, as explained in slide 23 bullet one, as a requirement to show what happens if no ACP takes place. However, due to COVID the problem is that this data set does not reflect normal usage, so an arrangement has to be agreed with the CAA. ██████████ stated that Gatwick does not believe the changes due to COVID will remain BUT that the traffic pattern, including aircraft types, destinations, and numbers, will return to 2019 patterns. The low traffic levels and vectoring changes mean that plain recorded data cannot be used as it will not give the right answer as to what it would be like if this ACP did not take place.</p> <p>██████████ – Representing ██████████ – Asked, with reference to slide 20 whether monitoring of track keeping only occurred up to 4000’ and why track keeping fallen below 90% for June.</p> <p>██████████ responded that yes, Gatwick monitor to 4000’ and Swanwick controllers can vector above that as necessary and only below that when it is for safety reasons. These below 4000’ isolated events are captured and investigated by the airport.</p> <p>██████████ explained that the proportion of positioning flights is currently much higher than pre COVID, especially to Heathrow, and these really stand out when percentages are compared due to the much smaller overall traffic levels on Route 4; it is these changing volumes of traffic that have reduced the proportional track keeping figure.</p> <p>██████████ – Representing ██████████ – Requested that pictures showing only tracks up to 4000’ would be useful</p> <p>██████████ agreed to take this action to the Track Keeping team.</p> <p>██████████ continued to present slide 23 and up to slide 29 - no further questions were raised. ██████████ aided the explanation of slide 29 by explaining how the CAA have stated that a temporary situation cannot be used as a baseline and that CAP 1781 substitution is also only ever temporary.</p>	<p>GJ</p>
<p>Design Options Review and New Option 7</p> <p>██████████ continued the presentation to slide 33, explaining how Do Nothing will be used to show the difference against the Do Minimum and that all the other options will then be assessed against the Do Minimum, as that is the expected scenario at the date of implementation. Data modelling will be extrapolated to provide information at the expected date of implementation and at 10 years after implementation. This must take account of known changes to provide clarity to stakeholders.</p> <p>Questions and feedback were raised as follows:</p>	

Item	Action
<p>██████████ – Representing ██████████ – Will the 10-year model include the operation of the northern runway? ██████████ responded that all known changes, not just aviation activities but major planning activities must be considered. ██████████ specifically stated that there will be a 10-year scenario with and without the DCO.</p> <p>██████████ – Representing ██████████ - Stated that local housing plans are coming out in the next 2 years and must be included. ██████████ responded that housing elements will be included if sufficient information is available at the right time and are in the Route 4 catchment area. ██████████ added that knowing what to include is a problem for all ACPs and that perhaps if not enough data about a change in the environment is available a comment in the document could be considered.</p> <p>██████████ – Representing ██████████ stated that the Gatwick DCO team have this information. ██████████ responded that he was aware, and the information will align.</p> <p>██████████ continued the presentation to slide 44, highlighting the fundamentals of all the options and reminding the meeting that this is Stage 2A engagement. He advised that at public consultation he expects the current NPR to be shown alongside the consultation options in appropriate images. ██████████ explained how the new Option 7 came into existence.</p> <p>Questions and feedback were raised as follows:</p> <p>██████████ – Representing ██████████ - No Controlled Airspace boundaries are on the images; will all the options remain within the existing Controlled Airspace boundaries? ██████████ responded that yes, they will and that these images were predominantly produced for community stakeholders.</p> <p>██████████ – Representing ██████████ asked if he could re-comment on all the options, not just the new Option 7? ██████████ responded that he did not believe that the previous feedback was null and void and that these would be utilised but that any new comments would be welcome.</p> <p>██████████ – Representing ██████████ - Stated that narrow and non-dispersed flights were previously rejected, but the new Option 7 goes over Beare Green meaning more people would be overflowed. She then asked how FASI S would impact these designs, and she reiterated that she does not want a narrow specific line.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>█ responded that the options in this ACP are constrained by the current airspace and the safety criteria built into the design criteria. █ added that this ACP is planned for implementation well ahead of the much larger and wider FASIS ACP.</p> <p>█ added that this is a self-contained ACP and is not part of FASIS and that the old option 7 shows containment and that now is the opportunity to comment on the new Option 7, and general principles.</p> <p>█ – Representing █ – Requested the new option 7 in GIS. LC responded that this would be provided.</p> <p>█ – Representing █ - Requested images that show the NPR and the interaction with Route 3, together with environmental effects of the interaction.</p> <p>█ responded that Route 3 is a known quantity and is not part of this project but that previous feedback regarding interaction had been received.</p>	<p>LC</p>
<p>Next Steps</p> <p>█ continued the presentation from slide 43 to the end.</p> <p>Questions and feedback were raised as follows:</p> <p>█ – Representing █ asked for a list of attendees and the presentation. █ responded that yes, the presentation will be shared but not the list of attendees to comply with GDPR.</p> <p>█ – Representing █ asked if the consultation would be virtual or physical? She stated that the DCO vans didn't work and that use of village halls would be good.</p> <p>█ responded asking for this as written feedback as at the moment this has not yet been decided.</p> <p>█ thanked everyone for their attendance and feedback.</p>	

Summary of Actions

Action	Description	Status	Owner(s)	Due Date
1	Send out presentation and feedback form.	Complete	█	ASAP
2	Send out minutes	Open	█	28 Feb 22
3	Provide request to Track Keeping Team	Open	█	28 Feb 22



OSPREY

CONSULTING SERVICES

a *tpgroup* company

PUBLIC

Action	Description	Status	Owner(s)	Due Date
4	Provide GIS details of the new Option 7 to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] – Representing [REDACTED].	Open	[REDACTED]	28 Feb 22