

Meeting Minutes

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

Present

[Redacted list of attendees]

Stakeholders

[Redacted list of stakeholders]

For Information

Copies to CAA
Classification Public

Osprey Reference 71248/070

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 ANSL 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.</p> <p>Questions and feedback were raised as follows:</p> <p>█ <i>Representing █ asked for an explanation of “seek to, and where possible reduce environmental impact” as there is a fear that this will result in movement of the routes over lower density area. █ answered that overall GAL seek not to have a bigger environmental impact than currently. This ACP will enable that to actually be quantified and this information will be provided at the consultation. █ says he fears the majority response will lead to movement of flights paths over lower density areas whereas he does not want flight over new people. █ explained again that the process will be followed, and he understood the opposing views. █ stated that the process is designed to give equal weight to all opinions.</i></p> <p>█ <i>Representing █ stated that no new overflight is a DP and that he would like to understand the weighting given to the DPs; asking if they were all equal apart from Safety. █ responded saying that this is difficult, the process requires that a systematic and rational appraisal will be carried out and not all options utilise all DPs and that it is inappropriate to second guess the outcome of the process.</i></p> <p>█ <i>Representing █ stated that different entities send consultations out at the same time and resources are very stretched. █ answered that this is something GAL are aware of and noted this point.</i></p> <p>█ <i>Representing █ asked for confirmation that the aim of predictability would not result in concentration as this would be a dis-benefit. █</i></p>	

Item	Action
<p><i>explained that at the moment we are showing a Comprehensive List of options as CAP 1616 requires and some favour concentration and some dispersion.</i></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.</p> <p>Questions and feedback were raised as follows:</p> <p>■ Representing ■ asked what exactly was the starting point for Route 4? ■ utilised slide 18 to show the difference between the 2012 conventional and the 2016 RNAV, stating that due to the CAA decision, the 2012 conventional is the starting point.</p>	
<p>Establishing a New Baseline</p> <p>■ continued the presentation up to and including slide 22. 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>■ Representing ■ Stated that Slide 20 shows track keeping below the minimum acceptable so questioned how this would be suitable as the baseline? ■ explained that up to 4000' in accordance with Noise Policy aircraft are not vectored off the NPR (post meeting note – unless for safety reasons), ATC can vector once the aircraft is above 4000'. The vectoring shown on slide 20 does have an altitude key to show altitude differences. However, ■ explained that the proportion of positioning flights (especially to Heathrow) is currently much higher than pre COVID and is currently, proportionately more visible due to the smaller overall traffic levels on Route 4 and it is these that have reduced the track keeping figure.</p> <p>■ Representing ■ asked why the DVOR removal was a factor as aircraft do not now rely on these? ■ explained that this is because the conventional charts rely on the DVOR and without the DVOR there is no published route. ■ added that this is explained later in the presentation</p> <p>■ Representing ■ asked for clarification on the compliance mentioned on Slide 21 and whether the noncompliance occurs in the turn? ■ explained that noncompliance occurs below 4000' if the aircraft exit the NPR and yes this does happen for some aircraft in the turn</p> <p>■ continued to present slide 23 and up to slide 29</p>	

Item	Action
<p>Questions and feedback were raised as follows:</p> <p>██████████ Representing ██████████ asked for clarification on slide 23, ██████████ explained that GAL will use the 2012 conventional line, but it is the traffic loading from 2019 that will be applied to this route to develop a noise envelope to help understanding. ██████████ said future slides may help and explained that CAP 1781 allows airports to continue to operate on a temporary basis if a DVOR is no longer operational. This is on the understanding that an ACP is also in progress to provide a permanent solution.</p> <p>██████████ presented slide 29 and stated that metrics will be used to assess the different options against the Do Minimum baseline, which is not something that currently exists.</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> <p>██████████ Representing ██████████ said that Options 1 to 6 appear to be the same as previously shown. ██████████ agreed that this is the case, they have not changed, and that GAL has all the previous feedback. Option 7 was developed based on previous feedback and it had been stated as it was developed that it required more design work. This has now been done resulting in the New Option 7. ██████████ utilised slide 42 and 43. ██████████ reminded everyone that not all options can utilise every DP and that most have trade-offs.</p> <p>██████████ Representing ██████████ asked if it would be possible to get a copy of the slides to help the feedback, preferably with the NPR shown. ██████████ stated that the presentation will be made available and that the possibility of an improved set of graphics would be investigated. ██████████ stated that the original Option 7 was designed to provide concentration, subsequent to the previous engagement extra work on this option has been undertaken but it still is only showing the principle of the design, there are lots of sub options that could be produced. ██████████ reiterated that this stage is about broad principles, as more refined design work continues through the CAP 1616 process there is likely to be some minor adjustments to these Options.</p>	<p>MW</p>

Item	Action
<p>█ Representing █ stated that the New Option 7 might generate opposition as it exits the NPR and overflies the AONB and asked if there was a speed restriction. █ explained that there is a 190 knots restriction which is forced by the constant radius to fix design requirement.</p> <p>█ Representing █ stated that he sympathised with the previous comment. █ explained that if a tighter turn is required a different methodology would be used as shown in other options. █ explained that the original Option 7 was an example, this new version has had actual aircrew input, so the principle is the same. The original design would be so restrictive that operators would be very unlikely to be able to utilise it.</p> <p>█ Representing █ asked for an explanation of the spot heights on the options. This was provided, for example New Option 7 shows must be above 1500' followed by another must be above 3200' and then a not above 4000' which is due to route interaction. █ explained that ATC can pass instructions to climb if it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>█ continued the presentation to slide 42, highlighting the fundamentals of all the options and reminding the meeting that this is Stage 2A engagement.</p>	
<p>Next Steps</p> <p>█ continued the presentation from slide 43 to the end, he reiterated that we have all the previous feedback and requested specific feedback on the New Option 7, although other comments are welcomed.</p> <p>Questions and feedback were raised as follows:</p> <p>█ Representing █ stated that Option 0 looked exactly the same as at the previous event, but that in this meeting GAL had said it is different and the image depiction is confusing. █ explained that no, this Option has not changed. The lack of available data is the problem as previously explained. Assessment needs to be made to understand how the in place conventional is being flown. █ added that aircraft flying conventional procedures are dispersion inherent, Option 0 is trying to add dispersion within an RNAV design and will not be wind corrected as this Option requires the aircraft to fly a course. █ explained that charts only show a nominal track.</p> <p>█ Representing █ stated that he agreed with █ regarding the depiction of the line in Option 0 and stated that the swathe within the NPR is important. █ acknowledged his point.</p> <p>█ Representing █ pointed out that the CAA Airspace Portal is not providing automatic updates as it is supposed to. █ said he would pass that information to the CAA.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>█ confirmed that as the New Option 7 is new we need feedback on that, but other comments are still welcome. █ confirmed the feedback form will come out with the slides.</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	Investigate use of improved graphics to include the NPR	Open	█	28 Feb 22
4	Contact CAA re the Portal comments	Open	█	28 Feb 22