

Future Airspace Strategy Implementation (FASI)

London Terminal Manoeuvring Area (LTMA)

Airspace Change Proposal (ACP)

ACP-2020-043

ACP-2020-044

ACP-2020-045

Stage 2 Develop and Assess

Southend Airport Arrivals Connectivity Module

To be read in conjunction with Master Document

The NATS logo is positioned in the lower right quadrant of the page. It consists of the word "NATS" in a bold, italicized, blue sans-serif font. A large, light blue decorative graphic, resembling a stylized swoosh or a flight path, starts from the left edge of the page and curves downwards and to the right, ending near the bottom right corner. The logo is placed over the right side of this swoosh.

NATS

1. Introduction

1.1 About this document

- 1.1.1 This document describes the arrival connectivity options for Southend airport, which have been developed using the methodology described in Section 2 of the Master document.
- 1.1.2 Southend is a single runway airport approximately 36 miles east of London. The airport handles mainly charter, cargo and business flights, and private aircraft flying. easyJet and Ryanair were prominent operators but ceased operations at Southend in 2021 due to negative impacts of Covid. easyJet has since resumed operations.

2. Baseline

- 2.1.1 This description of the current airspace around Southend should be considered the ‘Do Nothing’ option if no airspace change was to take place.
- 2.1.2 Table 1 shows actual¹ airport traffic counts from the 2019 baseline traffic year to 2022. The NERL forecast for network traffic levels is shown in the Master document Section 3.9. Airport forecasts are independent of the network and will be included within airport ACPs.

| Year | Arrivals | Departures ² | Total Movements |
|------|----------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 2019 | 11,588 | 11,235 | 22,823 |
| 2020 | 4,874 | 4,581 | 9,455 |
| 2021 | 2,112 | 1,778 | 3,890 |
| 2022 | 1,912 | 1,480 | 3,392 |

Table 1 Actual air traffic movements: Southend Airport 2019-2022

- 2.1.3 Southend has a number of arrival procedures (STARs), shown in Figure 1 and Table 2. Two holds, SPEAR & GEGMU, provide for delay absorption, although these are both below network levels.

| Airport | Hold | STARs | Associated ATS Routes |
|----------|-------|--|---|
| Southend | GEGMU | SUMUM 1S, XAMAN 1S, KATHY 1S, SAM 1S, NEVIL 1S, SOVAT 1S | L980, L620, M189, L613, L608, Q63 |
| | SPEAR | LISTO 1S, FINMA 1S, SILVA 1S | L15, M605, L612, P18, Q4, (U)Y124, Z197 |

Table 2 Current arrival connectivity for Southend

- 2.1.4 Southend does not have SIDs but has initial departure routes which join with the ATS route network at designated waypoints³ (Table 3). These routes may be varied at the discretion of ATC.


| Departure to | Via | Route |
|-------------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| Northeast | L608/L620 | CLN |
| Southeast | L9/L10/Q70 | DET – DVR |
| South & Southwest | M189 | DET – LYD |
| West | Q63 | EVNAS – LAM – BPK – HEN – CPT |
| North | L10/N601 | EVNAS – LAM – BPK |

Table 3 Current departure connectivity for Southend

¹ This is based on CFMU actual data for 2019; this may vary from airport data.

² Discrepancies between arrival and departure data is due to some departure flights not utilising the ATS network and therefore not captured in the dataset.

³ Departure routes are all below 7,000ft and will be subject to Airport ACP. NERL will ensure network connectivity.



Key:
 STARs including en-route holds
 Terminal holds (below 7,000ft)

Figure 1 Current arrival procedures for Southend

2.1.5 Figure 2 shows a radar density plot of Southend arrival traffic for a typical busy summer week and indicates traffic distribution. The majority of traffic in 2019 arrived from the south and east.




Figure 2 Southend traffic density arrivals FL245-FL70 5-11 August 2019

2.1.6 Medium jets are the most prevalent aircraft type at Southend, as shown in Table 4. easyJet was the most prevalent operator in 2019, with approximately 32% of the traffic.

| Southend – Aircraft Type | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Aircraft Group | Movements | % traffic |
| Small Jet | 2,743 | 12% |
| Medium Jet | 14,718 | 65% |
| Heavy Jet | 4 | <1% |
| Turboprop/Piston/Prop | 5,351 | 24% |

| Southend – Top 4 Aircraft Operator Usage | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Operator | Movements | % traffic |
| easyJet | 7,284 | 32% |
| Ryanair | 4,468 | 20% |
| Stobart Air | 4,169 | 19% |
| Loganair | 2,230 | 10% |

Table 4 Aircraft type and top carriers - Southend

3. Design Development

3.1.1 Working with the airport, NERL developed 15 high-level concept options for Southend⁴. NERL has assessed that based on required traffic loading, Southend would require at least one hold, either attached to an RMA or attached to a systemised arrival structure. Initial viability assessments were produced for location and structure type (Figure 3) and presented to stakeholders in formal engagement (Ref 7). Feedback was requested through the engagement response questionnaire.




Figure 3 Engagement Initial Viability Matrix

3.1.2 'Do Nothing' is an option for Southend, as the current hold(s) are below 7,000ft. Southend's ACP would progress in accordance with their requirements below 7,000ft, and NERL would provide network connectivity for arrivals and departures. As the structure would be in Southend's ACP, NERL's geographic constraints do not apply.

3.2 Stakeholder engagement

3.2.1 We received 5 responses from 5 different stakeholders related to the Southend design concepts. Table 5 presents a summary of the feedback and how this has influenced the design.

3.2.2 Feedback recognises that Southend is a smaller airport with low traffic demand compared to others in the LTMA. This feedback has been used to inform the Design Principle Evaluation.

3.2.3 No new options were developed as a result of the stakeholder engagement, but engaged-upon options were removed due to SME development (see paragraph 3.3.3).

⁴ See Master document Section 2.2 for a detailed description of this work.

| Stakeholder | Feedback ('You said') | Response ('We did') |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Airspace4All | Supports holds at minor airports, with direct routings, to keep track miles minimal. | Feedback was used to inform the evaluation of DP1, DP2, DP3 & DP8 for each airport. |
| Biggin Hill | Full engagement is required. | NERL has worked collaboratively with all FASI sponsors throughout the process, including Biggin Hill, and will continue to do so going forward. No new options and no amendment to the design envelope as a result of this feedback. |
| British Airways | Considering the number of movements at Southend, this must be deprioritized to facilitate Heathrow and Gatwick efficiencies. | At this stage, no airport will be prioritised over another, as we strive for a balanced network-wide design. Stage 3 development will identify prioritisation needs. |
| BGA | Traffic demand at Southend is low. Any network supporting structure should be proportionate to this level of traffic. Solutions appear to sensibly suggest the use of airspace over the sea. | Feedback was used to inform the evaluation of DP5 & DP6. Structures will be refined at stage 3 in proportion to the traffic demand from a specific airport. No new options and no amendment to the design envelope as a result of this feedback. |
| Southend Airport | With the aspirations of the airport to reach 10 million passengers, holding options above FL70 would need to be planned for. Current Southend holding options below FL70 are limited to 3 levels without coordination with TC. Therefore, an option of do nothing would not be desirable. | NERL have included a number of arrival structures, above 7,000ft, in their long list of options, as well as 'Do Nothing'. Feedback was used to inform the evaluation of DP1 and DP8. No new options and no amendment to the design envelope as a result of this feedback. |

Table 5 Engagement feedback and NERL response

3.3 Southend Design Concepts

- 3.3.1 Table 6 summarises the high-level qualitative considerations for potential locations for Southend arrival structures, and Table 7 summarises the viability assessment for the arrival structures suitable for Southend. These have been developed from SME input and stakeholder engagement.
- 3.3.2 Not every arrival structure concept may be viable in every location; the Viability Matrix (Figure 5) illustrates the possible combinations.
- 3.3.3 As described in the Master document paras 2.4.2 & 2.4.3, the concepts Holds Further Out and Trombones were removed as viable concepts at this stage. A detailed description of each structure can be found in Section 5 Appendix 1.

| Location | Viability Considerations |
|-----------|--|
| North | An arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the north of the airfield would likely conflict with Biggin Hill, London City and Stansted traffic. |
| Northeast | There is sufficient airspace to enable an arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the northeast of the airfield, subject to deconfliction with London City and Stansted traffic and the Shoeburyness DA Complex. |
| East | There is sufficient airspace to enable an arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the east of the airfield, subject to deconfliction with Biggin Hill and London City traffic and the Shoeburyness DA Complex. |
| Southeast | There is sufficient airspace to enable an arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the southeast of the airfield, subject to deconfliction with Biggin Hill, Heathrow and London City traffic and the Shoeburyness DA Complex. |
| South | An arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the south of the airfield would likely conflict with Biggin Hill, Gatwick and London City traffic. |
| Southwest | An arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the southwest of the airfield would likely conflict with Biggin Hill, Gatwick, Heathrow, London City and Northolt traffic. |
| West | An arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the west of the airfield would likely conflict with Biggin Hill, Heathrow, London City, Northolt and Stansted traffic. |
| Northwest | An arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the northwest of the airfield would likely conflict with Biggin Hill, Heathrow, London City, Luton, Northolt and Stansted traffic. |
| Overhead | There is sufficient airspace to enable an arrival structure, and associated connectivity, overhead the airfield, subject to deconfliction Biggin Hill, Heathrow, London City and Northolt traffic and the Shoeburyness DA Complex. |

Table 6 Southend Arrivals: Location viability considerations – post engagement

| Structure | Viability Considerations |
|-------------------------|--|
| Optimised (inner) holds | Optimisation of the current day structures. There is sufficient airspace for optimised hold(s), and this would likely meet the runway throughput demands. |
| Point merge | There is sufficient airspace to suitably place a point merge. Based on traffic throughput, this may need to be a shared facility. |
| Switch merge | There is insufficient airspace to suitably place a switch merge. |

Table 7 Southend Arrival structures: Viability considerations – post engagement

- 3.3.4 Figure 4 shows the Southend design envelope, developed by SMEs through collaborative workshops and formal engagement with Southend and other stakeholders. This design envelope is based on the viability considerations presented above in Table 6 & Table 7, developed through two-way engagement as shown in Table 5.
- 3.3.5 Airspace design constraints, as described in the Master document Section 3.5, are highlighted in orange. A consideration for Southend is Shoeburyness Danger Area as shown.




Figure 4 Southend Design Envelope and design constraints – post engagement

3.3.6 The Southend Design Concepts which were considered viable at this stage, within the Design Envelope presented, are shown in the Southend Arrival Structure Viability Assessment (Figure 5).




Figure 5 Southend Design Options Comprehensive Viability Matrix

3.3.7 The viable 'Do Nothing' and 7 design options were taken forward as the comprehensive list to Design Principle Evaluation.

3.4 Design Principle Evaluation

3.4.1 Table 8 shows the DPE assessment criteria. SMEs, in this case air traffic control experts and airspace change experts, list topics associated with each DP and qualitatively test how each option would react to those topics, describing how a red/amber/green outcome is reached.

| DP | Priority | Description | SME subjective assessment topics, include but not limited to | Red | Amber | Green |
|----|----------|--|--|---|--|---|
| 0 | A AMS | Safety Safety is always the highest priority (Note: Red could not be solved by mitigation, amber may be able to be solved by mitigation). | Human performance (ATCO control-ability) Human performance (pilot fly-ability) IFP (fly-ability) Surrounding airspace users (inside/outside of CAS) Impact if ATM tools fail | Unacceptable level of safety risk | Diminished - Issue(s) identified could result in an elevated level of safety risk when compared to today's operation | Enhanced - improvement over today's level of safety. Maintained - safety risk could be maintained within acceptable levels of today's operation |
| 1 | B AMS | Operational The airspace will enable increased operational resilience | <u>Network</u> Weather avoidance Disruption in neighbouring ANSPs | Reduced resilience and capacity during disruption | Similar resilience and capacity during disruption | Increased resilience and capacity during disruption |
| | | | <u>Airport</u> Holding levels Delay absorption between hold and 7,000ft | Reduction in delay absorption | Delay absorption similar to today | Improve delay absorption |
| | | | <u>Airport</u> Time to restart after runway closure Number of aircraft off the hold | Reduction in disruption recovery | Disruption recovery similar to today | Improve disruption recovery |
| 2 | B | Economic Optimise network fuel performance | Track mileage Economic performance Aircraft height Method of delay absorption | Fuel performance worsened | Fuel performance similar to today | Fuel performance improved |
| 3 | B AMS | Environmental Optimise CO ₂ emissions per flight | Track mileage GHG performance Aircraft height Method of delay absorption | CO ₂ emissions worsened | CO ₂ emissions similar to today | CO ₂ emissions improved |
| 4 | C | Environmental Minimising of noise impacts due to LAMP influence will take place in accordance with local needs | Overall environmental impact Environmental impact below 7,000ft Impact on tranquillity (or visual intrusion) | LAMP influence not aligned with local ACP sponsors' needs | Extent of alignment not yet known | LAMP influence fully aligned with local ACP sponsors' needs |

| DP | Priority | Description | SME subjective assessment topics, include but not limited to | Red | Amber | Green |
|----|----------|--|--|--|---|--|
| 5 | C | Technical The volume of controlled airspace required for LAMP should be the minimum necessary to deliver an efficient airspace design, taking into account the needs of the UK airspace users | Lateral footprint of CAS Vertical footprint of CAS Proportional to airport traffic levels | Airspace required not the minimum necessary to deliver an efficient design | Extent of airspace required not yet known Or Similar CAS to today | Airspace required the minimum necessary to deliver an efficient design |
| 6 | C AMS | Technical The impacts on GA and other civilian airspace users due to LAMP will be minimised | Change to boundaries of CAS Changes to CAS classification Safety based impacts | Excessive negative impacts | Negative impacts minimised but requires changes to other airspace users' activities Or Similar impacts to today | Positive impacts to other airspace users' current activities |
| 7 | C AMS | Technical The impacts on MoD users due to LAMP will be minimised | Overall amount of danger area available Amount of time for danger area available Flexible use airspace provision Change to access between danger areas Safety based impacts Radar corridor access | Negative impacts not minimised or would require excessive changes to current MoD operations | Negative impacts minimised but requires changes to current MoD operations Or Extent of impact not yet known | Negative impacts minimised or no negative impact on current MoD operations |
| 8 | B AMS | Operational Systemisation will deliver the optimal capacity and efficiency benefits (Note: This is about airspace capacity, not ground infrastructure capacity which could be the limiting factor to overall airport capacity). | Traffic throughput Sectorisation Effect on overall network capacity Effect on airports' arrival flow | Design option unable to support the forecast traffic loading for the airport and the network | Design option supports the forecast traffic loading for the airport or the network | Design option supports the forecast traffic loading beyond the reference period for both the airport and the network |
| | | | Overall ATCO workload Levels of tactical intervention (radio transmissions per flight) No increase to operations requirements Balancing out of hot spots | Design option increases ATCO workload | ATCO workload similar to today | Design option decreases ATCO workload |

| DP | Priority | Description | SME subjective assessment topics, include but not limited to | Red | Amber | Green |
|----|----------|---|--|---|--|--|
| 9 | B AMS | <p>Technical The main route network linking airport procedures with the En Route phase of flight will be spaced to yield maximum safety and efficiency benefits by using an appropriate standard of PBN</p> <p>(Note: The main route network is considered as FL70 - FL245. Approach structures are not considered as 'the main route network').</p> | Airspace requirement vs. RNAV rating Required aircraft equipage standards | PBN standard applied to route spacing would maintain or decrease efficiency and maintain safety | PBN standard applied to route spacing would limit efficiency and safety benefits | PBN standard applied to route spacing is likely to maximise efficiency and safety benefits |
| 10 | A | <p>Policy Must accord with the CAA's published Airspace Modernisation Strategy (CAP1711) and any current or future plans associated with it.</p> | <p><u>AMS "Ends" Strategic Objectives</u> Safety (DP0) Integration of diverse users (DP6 and DP7) Simplification (DP1, DP8 and DP9) Environmental sustainability (DP3)</p> | No or limited alignment with the AMS | Partial alignment with the AMS | Aligned with the AMS |

Table 8 Design Principle Evaluation Assessment Criteria

3.4.2 Table 9 shows the AMS assessment criteria which are used to determine the overall RAG status for DP10.

| DP10 outcome | Criteria for DP0, DP1, DP3, DP6, DP7, DP8 and DP9 |
|--------------|---|
| Red | DP0 (Safety) is red OR 2 other DPs are red |
| Amber | All other colour combinations not covered by Red or Green |
| Green | 2 DPs are green and 0 are red OR 3 DPs are green and 1 is red |

Table 9 - AMS Assessment Criteria

3.4.3 The criteria in Table 10 describe how each option's overall combination of reds/ambers/greens lead to the option progressing to the next step or to rejection and discounting from further development.

| DP Priority | Criteria for Rejection Status |
|-------------|-------------------------------|
| A | 1 red OR 1 amber |
| B | 2 reds |
| C | 2 reds |

Table 10 - Accept / Reject Criteria

3.4.4 Each design option has been assessed against the Design Principles. The following code is used for each design option. Airport (e.g. MC) - Structure Type (e.g. Inner Hold: IH/Point Merge: PM) - Location (e.g. Northeast: NE). DN = Do Nothing. DM = Do Minimum.

| DP | Priority | MC - DN | MC - IH - NE | MC - IH - E |
|---|----------|--|--|--|
| RESULT | | ACCEPT | ACCEPT | ACCEPT |
| DP0 Safety | A AMS | Maintained: Similar operation to today | Maintained: Holds are used elsewhere in current day operations and are known to be safe | Maintained: Holds are used elsewhere in current day operations and are known to be safe |
| DP1 Operational (Delay Absorption) | B AMS | Arrival structure will remain below 7,000ft. There will be no change to delay absorption above 7,000ft | Would provide increased levels of delay absorption | Would provide increased levels of delay absorption |
| DP1 Operational (Disruption Recovery) | B AMS | Arrival structure will remain below 7,000ft. There will be no change to disruption recovery above 7,000ft | Holds will be slightly further from runway, but overall disruption recovery similar to today | Holds will be slightly further from runway. Extended track miles required to avoid DA. Overall disruption recovery worsened than today |
| DP2 Economic (Fuel) | B | Arrival structure will remain below 7,000ft. There will be no change to fuel performance above 7,000ft | Optimised concept aligned with airport traffic flows, therefore improved fuel performance | Optimised concept aligned with airport traffic flows. Extended track miles to avoid DA. Therefore, fuel performance neutral |
| DP3 Environmental (CO ₂) | B AMS | Arrival structure will remain below 7,000ft. There will be no change to CO ₂ emissions per flight above 7,000ft | Optimised concept of current day operation aligned with airport traffic flows, therefore CO ₂ emissions per flight improved | Optimised concept aligned with airport traffic flows. Extended track miles to avoid DA. Therefore, fuel performance neutral |
| DP4 Environmental (Noise) | C | Impact on routes (and noise distribution) below 7,000ft not known at this point | Impact on routes (and noise distribution) below 7,000ft not known at this point | Impact on routes (and noise distribution) below 7,000ft not known at this point |
| DP5 Technical (CAS) | C | Today's operation, no change from baseline above 7,000ft | Design likely to be within current day CAS; ability to return CAS will be assessed in Stage 3 | Design likely to be within current day CAS; ability to return CAS will be assessed in Stage 3 |
| DP6 Technical (Other Users) | C AMS | Today's operation, no change from baseline above 7,000ft | Likely to be in current day CAS, no anticipated change in impacts | Likely to be in current day CAS, no anticipated change in impacts |
| DP7 Technical (MoD) | C AMS | Operation is known not to impact MoD currently, therefore no change in impact | Assumes design would not impact Shoeburyness DA Complex. Therefore, no negative impact on current MoD operations | Assumes design would not impact Shoeburyness DA Complex. Therefore, no negative impact on current MoD operations |
| DP8 Operational (Capacity) | B AMS | Aligns with network traffic flows and concept can support the airport required arrival loading | Aligns with network traffic flows and concept can support the airport required arrival loading | Aligns with network traffic flows and concept can support the airport required arrival loading |
| DP8 Operational (Efficiency) | B AMS | Similar concept to today's operation, therefore no change in ATCO workload anticipated | Addition of holds above 7,000ft. This would likely be managed with no anticipated change to ATCO workload | Addition of holds above 7,000ft. This would likely be managed with no anticipated change to ATCO workload |
| DP9 Technical (Route Spacing) | B AMS | Does not fully utilise the performance capabilities of modern aircraft | Structure will be designed, in collaboration with the airport, to the highest appropriate PBN standard enabling efficient spacing between routes | Structure will be designed, in collaboration with the airport, to the highest appropriate PBN standard enabling efficient spacing between routes |
| DP10 Policy (AMS) | A | Green: DP0, DP7, DP8 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP3, DP6, DP8 Red: DP9 | Green: DP0, DP1, DP3, DP7, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP6, DP8 Red: None | Green: DP0, DP1, DP7, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP3, DP6, DP8 Red: DP1 |

| DP | Priority | MC - IH - SE | MC - IH - OH | MC - PM - NE (Maybe shared) |
|---|----------|--|--|--|
| RESULT | | ACCEPT | REJECT | REJECT |
| DP0 Safety | A AMS | Maintained: Holds are used elsewhere in current day operations and are known to be safe | Maintained: Holds are used elsewhere in current day operations and are known to be safe | Maintains: PM are used in current day operations and are known to be safe. In this location, increased ATCO workload |
| DP1 Operational (Delay Absorption) | B AMS | Would provide increased levels of delay absorption | Would provide increased levels of delay absorption | Would provide increased levels of delay absorption |
| DP1 Operational (Disruption Recovery) | B AMS | Holds will be slightly further from runway, but overall disruption recovery similar to today | Holds will be slightly further from runway, but overall disruption recovery similar to today | Additional distance from hold to runway could delay recovery following disruption |
| DP2 Economic (Fuel) | B | Optimised concept aligned with airport traffic flows, therefore improved fuel performance | Fuel performance worsened as aircraft route overhead then track away to lose height on descent, increasing track miles | Fuel performance worsened due to extended track miles to complete the PM structure |
| DP3 Environmental (CO ₂) | B AMS | Optimised concept of current day operation aligned with airport traffic flows, therefore CO ₂ emissions per flight improved | CO ₂ emissions worsened as aircraft route overhead then track away to lose height on descent, increasing track miles | CO ₂ emissions worsened due to extended track miles to complete the PM structure |
| DP4 Environmental (Noise) | C | Impact on routes (and noise distribution) below 7,000ft not known at this point | Impact on routes (and noise distribution) below 7,000ft not known at this point | Impact on routes (and noise distribution) below 7,000ft not known at this point |
| DP5 Technical (CAS) | C | Design likely to be within current day CAS; ability to return CAS will be assessed in Stage 3 | Design likely to be within current day CAS; ability to return CAS will be assessed in Stage 3 | Design likely to be within current day CAS; ability to return CAS will be assessed in Stage 3 |
| DP6 Technical (Other Users) | C AMS | Likely to be in current day CAS, no anticipated change in impacts | Likely to be in current day CAS, no anticipated change in impacts | Likely to be in current day CAS, no anticipated change in impacts |
| DP7 Technical (MoD) | C AMS | Assumes design would not impact Shoeburyness DA Complex. Therefore, no negative impact on current MoD operations | Assumes design would not impact Shoeburyness DA Complex. Therefore, no negative impact on current MoD operations | Assumes design would not impact Shoeburyness DA Complex. Therefore, no negative impact on current MoD operations |
| DP8 Operational (Capacity) | B AMS | Aligns with network traffic flows and concept can support the airport required arrival loading | Aligns with network traffic flows and concept can support the airport required arrival loading | Supports the required airport arrival loading, however, negatively impacts capacity of eastbound network traffic flows |
| DP8 Operational (Efficiency) | B AMS | Addition of holds above 7,000ft. Increase complexity southeast of Southend. Overall, increase in ATCO workload | Addition of holds above 7,000ft. This would likely be managed with no anticipated change to ATCO workload | All traffic could be required to be worked by NERL, therefore may increase ATCO workload |
| DP9 Technical (Route Spacing) | B AMS | Structure will be designed, in collaboration with the airport, to the highest appropriate PBN standard enabling efficient spacing between routes | Structure will be designed, in collaboration with the airport, to the highest appropriate PBN standard enabling efficient spacing between routes | Structure will be designed, in collaboration with the airport, to the highest appropriate PBN standard enabling efficient spacing between routes |
| DP10 Policy (AMS) | A | Green: DP0, DP1, DP3, DP7, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP6 Red: DP8 | Green: DP0, DP1, DP7, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP6, DP8 Red: DP3 | Green: DP0, DP1, DP7, DP9 Amber: DP6, DP8 Red: DP1, DP3, DP8 |

| DP | Priority | MC - PM - E (Maybe shared) | MC - PM - SE (Maybe shared) |
|---|----------|--|--|
| RESULT | | REJECT | REJECT |
| DP0 Safety | A AMS | Maintains: PM are used in current day operations and are known to be safe In this location, increased ATCO workload | Maintains: PM are used in current day operations and are known to be safe In this location, increased ATCO workload |
| DP1 Operational (Delay Absorption) | B AMS | Would provide increased levels of delay absorption | Would provide increased levels of delay absorption |
| DP1 Operational (Disruption Recovery) | B AMS | Additional distance from hold to runway could delay recovery following disruption | Additional distance from hold to runway could delay recovery following disruption |
| DP2 Economic (Fuel) | B | Worsened due to extended track miles to complete PM structure. Aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, worsened | Worsened due to extended track miles to complete PM structure. Aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, worsened |
| DP3 Environmental (CO ₂) | B AMS | Worsened due to extended track miles to complete PM structure. Aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, CO ₂ emissions worsened | Worsened due to extended track miles to complete PM structure. Aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, CO ₂ emissions worsened |
| DP4 Environmental (Noise) | C | Impact on routes (and noise distribution) below 7,000ft not known at this point | Impact on routes (and noise distribution) below 7,000ft not known at this point |
| DP5 Technical (CAS) | C | Design likely to be within current day CAS; ability to return CAS will be assessed in Stage 3 | Design likely to be within current day CAS; ability to return CAS will be assessed in Stage 3 |
| DP6 Technical (Other Users) | C AMS | Likely to be in current day CAS, no anticipated change in impacts | Likely to be in current day CAS, no anticipated change in impacts |
| DP7 Technical (MoD) | C AMS | Assumes design would not impact Shoeburyness DA Complex. Therefore, no negative impact on current MoD operations | Assumes design would not impact Shoeburyness DA Complex. Therefore, no negative impact on current MoD operations |
| DP8 Operational (Capacity) | B AMS | Aligns with network traffic flows and concept can support the airport required arrival loading | Supports the required airport arrival loading, however, negatively impacts capacity of southeast network traffic flows |
| DP8 Operational (Efficiency) | B AMS | All traffic would likely be required to be worked by NERL, therefore increase to ATCO workload | All traffic would likely be required to be worked by NERL, therefore increase to ATCO workload |
| DP9 Technical (Route Spacing) | B AMS | Structure will be designed, in collaboration with the airport, to the highest appropriate PBN standard enabling efficient spacing between routes | Structure will be designed, in collaboration with the airport, to the highest appropriate PBN standard enabling efficient spacing between routes |
| DP10 Policy (AMS) | A | Green: DP0, DP1, DP7, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP6 Red: DP1, DP3, DP8 | Green: DP0, DP1, DP7, DP9 Amber: DP6, DP8 Red: DP1, DP3, DP8 |

Table 11 Design Principle Evaluation

3.4.5 4 design options were assessed as not meeting the DPs and were rejected at this stage. 'Do Nothing' is a viable option and was progressed with the remaining 3 viable design options to Initial Options Appraisal.

3.5 Initial Options Appraisal

3.5.1 The following viable options have been progressed to IOA:

| Southend Option Concepts progressed to IOA |
|--|
| 'Do Nothing' |
| Inner Holds – Northeast |
| Inner Holds – East |
| Inner Holds - Southeast |

Table 12 Summary of design options progressed from DPE to IOA

Table 13 shows the assessment criteria used to complete the initial appraisal of each shortlisted option.

| Group | Impact |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Communities | Noise impact on health and quality of life |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to noise impacts compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to tranquillity impacts compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| Communities | Air Quality |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to local air quality compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| Wider Society | Greenhouse Gas Impacts |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to greenhouse gas impacts compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| Wider Society | Capacity / Resilience |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to airspace capacity and resilience compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| General Aviation (GA) | Access |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to GA access compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| GA/Commercial Airlines | Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to GA and commercial operator economic impacts from increased effective capacity compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| GA/Commercial Airlines | Fuel Burn |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to GA and commercial operator fuel burn impacts compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| Commercial Airlines | Training Costs |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to commercial operator training costs compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| Commercial Airlines | Other Costs |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to other relevant commercial operator costs compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| Airport / ANSP | Infrastructure Costs |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to airport and ANSP infrastructure costs compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| Airport / ANSP | Operational Costs |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to airport and ANSP operational costs compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| Airport / ANSP | Deployment Costs |
| | A qualitative assessment of changes to airport and ANSP deployment costs compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |
| All | Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS |
| | A qualitative assessment of how the design option performs, considering the AMS objectives of improved capacity, reduced CO ₂ , minimal impact on other users, maintaining or enhancing safety, and facilitation of defence and security objectives, compared with the 'Do Nothing' baseline. |

Table 13 Initial Options Appraisal Assessment Criteria

3.5.2 The baseline 'Do Nothing' is described in Section 2, further options are described in Section 3.3 and Sections 5 Appendix 1.

| MC – DN Qualitative Initial Impacts Assessment | | PROGRESSED |
|--|---|------------|
| Group | Impact | |
| Communities | Noise impact on health and quality of life | |
| | ANG (2017) states “at or above 7,000ft...minimising of noise is no longer a priority CAP1616 instructs sponsors to consider noise and tranquillity impacts where the proposal has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, AONBs and NPs below 7,000ft.. No change in airspace design – no changes to impacts. | |
| Communities | Air Quality | |
| | ANG (2017) states “emissions from aircraft above 1,000ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality”. No change in airspace design – no changes to impacts. | |
| Wider Society | Greenhouse Gas Impacts | |
| | Southend’s current arrival structure is below 7,000ft; with the ‘Do Nothing’ option there will be no change to GHG above 7,000ft. Any GHG impacts as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP. | |
| Wider Society | Capacity / Resilience | |
| | Southend’s current arrival structure is below 7,000ft; with the ‘Do Nothing’ option there will be no change to capacity or resilience above 7,000ft. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Southend. Any capacity or resilience impacts as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP. | |
| General Aviation (GA) | Access | |
| | Southend’s current arrival structure is below 7,000ft; with the ‘Do Nothing’ option there will be no change to CAS above 7,000ft. Therefore, no change to GA access expected. Any GA impacts as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP. | |
| GA/Commercial Airlines | Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity | |
| | Southend’s current arrival structure is below 7,000ft; with the ‘Do Nothing’ option there will be no change to capacity above 7,000ft. Therefore, no change in economic benefits expected. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Southend. Aligns with network traffic flows, which enables potential capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. Any capacity impacts as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP. | |
| GA/Commercial Airlines | Fuel Burn | |
| | Southend’s current arrival structure is below 7,000ft; with the ‘Do Nothing’ option there will be no change to fuel burn above 7,000ft for commercial and GA. Any fuel burn impacts as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP. | |
| Commercial Airlines | Training Costs | |
| | Flight procedures change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training staff if required. If this baseline system was retained, the same flight procedures would be used, and training cost impacts would not change. Any training costs as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP. | |
| Commercial Airlines | Other Costs | |
| | No change in airspace design above 7,000ft – no changes to other commercial operator costs. Any other costs to commercial operators as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Infrastructure Costs | |
| | No change in airspace design above 7,000ft – no changes to infrastructure costs. If this baseline system was retained, the same infrastructure would continue to be used in the same way, with no additional costs. Any infrastructure costs as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Operational Costs | |
| | No change in airspace design above 7,000ft – no changes to infrastructure costs. If this baseline system was retained, the same infrastructure would continue to be used in the same way, with no additional operational costs. Any operational costs as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Deployment Costs | |
| | If this baseline system was retained, there would be no deployment above 7,000ft, hence no associated costs. Any deployment costs as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP. | |
| AMS | Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS | |
| | In the ‘Do Nothing’ there will be no change in airspace design above 7,000ft as Southend’s current hold is below 7,000ft and out of scope for this ACP. Any changes to the arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport’s ACP; these changes would have to align with the AMS. | |

| |
|--|
| <p>Qualitative Safety Assessment</p> <p>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that if the baseline system was retained, the existing level of safety performance undertaken within the current operation would be at least maintained.</p> <p>A safety assessment as a result of changes to their arrival structure, below 7,000ft, can be found in the airport's ACP.</p> |
| <p>Conclusion from IOA</p> <p>Compared to the baseline, there would be no change above 7,000ft, except for the provision of network connectivity. Any changes below 7,000ft can be found in the airport's ACP.</p> <p>Therefore, MC – DN is progressed to Stage 3 for further development.</p> |

Table 14 MC-DN Initial Options Appraisal

| MC – IH - NE Qualitative Initial Impacts Assessment | | PROGRESSED |
|---|--|------------|
| Group | Impact | |
| Communities | Noise impact on health and quality of life | |
| | ANG (2017) states “at or above 7,000ft...minimising of noise is no longer a priority”. CAP1616 instructs sponsors to consider noise and tranquillity impacts where the proposal has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, AONBs and NPs below 7,000ft. In this network-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are not considered. | |
| Communities | Air Quality | |
| | ANG (2017) states “emissions from aircraft above 1,000ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality”. Changes would occur at or above 7,000ft, thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air quality impacts. | |
| Wider Society | Greenhouse Gas Impacts | |
| | This design option is an optimised version of today which will involve holding at higher levels (above 7,000ft) and orientating optimally for airport and network traffic flows. Overall, it could reduce GHG emissions through improved aircraft trajectories compared with the baseline. | |
| Wider Society | Capacity / Resilience | |
| | Capacity: This option could maintain airport capacity, providing a similar number holding levels as the baseline below 7,000ft. This location aligns with network traffic flows so could maintain network capacity compared with the baseline. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Southend Resilience: Holds within the network will be higher up and therefore slightly further from the runway than the baseline, as holds are currently below 7,000ft. However, this should have negligible impact on disruption recovery. This option would increase the number of holding levels, therefore it could increase delay absorption compared with the baseline. | |
| General Aviation (GA) | Access | |
| | A holding facility to the northeast would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffic is unlikely to change compared with the baseline. | |
| GA/Commercial Airlines | Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity | |
| | Aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. A holding facility above 7,000ft could enable more flights to operate, which is expected to provide an economic benefit over the baseline for commercial traffic. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Southend. The additional required airspace to deconflict arrival structures could create negative economic impacts for all LTMA traffic from extended track mileage. This could negatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. | |
| GA/Commercial Airlines | Fuel Burn | |
| | This design option is an optimised version of today which will involve holding at higher levels (above 7,000ft) and orientating optimally for airport and network traffic flows. However, a new holding facility could create network inefficiencies, with additional airspace required leading to extended track distance and increased fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This location aligns with network traffic flows, so potential inefficiencies could be negligible. Overall, it could reduce fuel burn through improved aircraft trajectories compared with the baseline. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. | |
| Commercial Airlines | Training Costs | |
| | Flight procedures change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training staff if required. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators. | |
| Commercial Airlines | Other Costs | |
| | No other operator costs are foreseen. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Infrastructure Costs | |
| | This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase which will require some systems engineering adjustments. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Operational Costs | |
| | This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Deployment Costs | |
| | At this stage it is disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA system change would involve training a large number of controllers and assistants via the use of various air traffic simulators (including sim prep, management, and staffing), with additional system engineering costs. | |
| AMS | Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety: maintained • Simplification: could improve delay absorption, maintain disruption recovery, maintain airport capacity, maintain network capacity, and maintain ATCO workload. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities • Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design • Environmental sustainability: could reduce CO₂ emissions | |

| |
|--|
| <p>Qualitative Safety Assessment</p> <p>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an inner hold to the northeast would at least maintain current safety performance. There are multiple holds within current UK airspace which have a proven safety performance. An arrival structure in this location would need to deconflict with London City and Stansted departure traffic.</p> |
| <p>Conclusion from IOA</p> <p>Compared to the baseline, this option could improve delay absorption, fuel burn, and CO₂ emissions. It would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, airport capacity, network capacity, and ATCO workload. The negative impact on transiting GA traffic may be worse than the baseline.</p> <p>Therefore, MC – IH – NE is progressed to Stage 3 for further development.</p> |

Table 15 MC-IH-NE Initial Options Appraisal

| MC – IH - E Qualitative Initial Impacts Assessment | | PROGRESSED |
|--|--|------------|
| Group | Impact | |
| Communities | Noise impact on health and quality of life | |
| | ANG (2017) states “at or above 7,000ft...minimising of noise is no longer a priority”. CAP1616 instructs sponsors to consider noise and tranquillity impacts where the proposal has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, AONBs and NPs below 7,000ft. In this network-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are not considered. | |
| Communities | Air Quality | |
| | ANG (2017) states “emissions from aircraft above 1,000ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality”. Changes would occur at or above 7,000ft, thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air quality impacts. | |
| Wider Society | Greenhouse Gas Impacts | |
| | This design option is an optimised version of today which will involve holding at higher levels (above 7,000ft) and orientating optimally for airport and network traffic flows. Extended track miles due to DA avoidance. Overall, it could maintain GHG emissions compared with the baseline. | |
| Wider Society | Capacity / Resilience | |
| | Capacity: This option could maintain airport capacity, providing the same number of holds as the baseline below 7,000ft. This location aligns with network traffic flows so could maintain network capacity compared with the baseline. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Southend. Resilience: Holds within the network will be higher up and therefore slightly further from the runway than the baseline, as holds are currently below 7,000ft. However, this should have negligible impact on disruption recovery. This option would increase the number of holding levels, therefore it could increase delay absorption compared with the baseline. | |
| General Aviation (GA) | Access | |
| | A holding facility to the east would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffic is unlikely to change compared with the baseline. | |
| GA/Commercial Airlines | Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity | |
| | Aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. A holding facility above 7,000ft could enable more flights to operate, which is expected to provide an economic benefit over the baseline for commercial traffic; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Southend. The additional required airspace to deconflict arrival structures could create negative economic impacts for all LTMA traffic from extended track mileage. This could negatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. | |
| GA/Commercial Airlines | Fuel Burn | |
| | This design option is an optimised version of today which will involve holding at higher levels (above 7,000ft) and orientated optimally for airport and network traffic flows. Airport arrivals may have extended track miles due to DA avoidance. A new holding facility could create network inefficiencies, with additional airspace required leading to extended track distance and increased fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. However, this location aligns with network traffic flows, so potential inefficiencies could be negligible. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. | |
| Commercial Airlines | Training Costs | |
| | Flight procedures change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training staff if required. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators. | |
| Commercial Airlines | Other Costs | |
| | No other operator costs are foreseen. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Infrastructure Costs | |
| | This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase which will require some systems engineering adjustments. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Operational Costs | |
| | This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Deployment Costs | |
| | At this stage it is disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA system change would involve training a large number of controllers and assistants via the use of various air traffic simulators (including sim prep, management, and staffing), with additional system engineering costs. | |
| AMS | Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety: this option maintains safety • Simplification: Could improve delay absorption, maintain airport capacity, maintain network capacity, and maintain ATCO workload. Could worsen disruption recovery. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities • Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design • Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO₂ emissions | |

| |
|---|
| <p>Qualitative Safety Assessment</p> <p>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an inner hold to the east would at least maintain current safety performance. There are multiple holds within current UK airspace which have a proven safety performance. An arrival structure in this location would need to deconflict with other Biggin Hill and London City arrival traffic.</p> |
| <p>Conclusion from IOA</p> <p>Compared to the baseline, this option could improve delay absorption and could maintain delay absorption, fuel burn, CO₂ emissions, airport capacity, network capacity, and ATCO workload. The negative impact on transiting GA traffic may be worse than the baseline.</p> <p>Therefore, MC – IH – E is progressed to Stage 3 for further development.</p> |

Table 16 MC-IH-E Initial Options Appraisal

| MC – IH - SE Qualitative Initial Impacts Assessment | | PROGRESSED |
|---|--|------------|
| Group | Impact | |
| Communities | Noise impact on health and quality of life | |
| | ANG (2017) states “at or above 7,000ft...minimising of noise is no longer a priority”. CAP1616 instructs sponsors to consider noise and tranquillity impacts where the proposal has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, AONBs and NPs below 7,000ft. In this network-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are not considered. | |
| Communities | Air Quality | |
| | ANG (2017) states “emissions from aircraft above 1,000ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality”. Changes would occur at or above 7,000ft, thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air quality impacts. | |
| Wider Society | Greenhouse Gas Impacts | |
| | This design option is an optimised version of today which will involve holding at higher levels (above 7,000ft) and orientated optimally for airport and network traffic flows. Overall, it could reduce GHG emissions through improved aircraft trajectories compared with the baseline. | |
| Wider Society | Capacity / Resilience | |
| | Capacity: This option could maintain airport capacity, providing the same number of holds as the baseline below 7,000ft. This location aligns with network traffic flows so could maintain network capacity compared with the baseline. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Southend. Resilience: Holds within the network will be higher up and therefore slightly further from the runway than the baseline, as holds are currently below 7,000ft. However, this should have negligible impact on disruption recovery. This option could increase the number of holding levels, therefore it could increase delay absorption compared with the baseline. | |
| General Aviation (GA) | Access | |
| | A holding facility to the southeast would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffic is unlikely to change compared with the baseline. | |
| GA/Commercial Airlines | Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity | |
| | Aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. A holding facility above 7,000ft could enable more flights to operate, which is expected to provide an economic benefit over the baseline for commercial traffic; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Southend. The additional required airspace to deconflict arrival structures could create negative economic impacts for all LTMA traffic from extended track mileage. This could negatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. | |
| GA/Commercial Airlines | Fuel Burn | |
| | This design option is an optimised version of today which will involve holding at higher levels (above 7,000ft) and orientating optimally for airport and network traffic flows. However, a new holding facility could create network inefficiencies, with additional airspace required leading to extended track distance and increased fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This location aligns with network traffic flows, so potential inefficiencies could be negligible. Overall, it could reduce fuel burn through improved aircraft trajectories compared with the baseline. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. | |
| Commercial Airlines | Training Costs | |
| | Flight procedures change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training staff if required. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators. | |
| Commercial Airlines | Other Costs | |
| | No other operator costs are foreseen. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Infrastructure Costs | |
| | This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase which will require some systems engineering adjustments. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Operational Costs | |
| | This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts. | |
| Airport / ANSP | Deployment Costs | |
| | At this stage it is disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA system change would involve training a large number of controllers and assistants via the use of various air traffic simulators (including sim prep, management, and staffing), with additional system engineering costs. | |
| AMS | Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety: maintained • Simplification: could improve delay absorption, maintain disruption recovery, maintain airport capacity, and maintain network capacity. Could worsen ATCO workload. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities • Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design • Environmental sustainability: could reduce CO₂ emissions | |

| |
|---|
| Qualitative Safety Assessment |
| A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an inner hold to the southeast would at least maintain current safety performance. There are multiple holds within current UK airspace which have a proven safety performance. An arrival structure in this location would need to deconflict with all Biggin Hill and London City traffic as well as Heathrow departures. It would also add complexity to an already complex area, resulting in increased ATCO workload. |
| Conclusion from IOA |
| Compared to the baseline, this option could improve delay absorption, fuel burn, and CO ₂ emissions. It would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain airport capacity and network capacity. The negative impact on transiting GA traffic and ATCO workload may be worse than the baseline. |
| Therefore, MC – IH – SE is progressed to Stage 3 for further development. |

Table 17 MC-IH-SE Initial Options Appraisal

4. Step 2B Conclusion and Next Steps

4.1.1 There is not yet enough detailed quantified data to make a statement on preferred option(s). Compromises and trade-offs may be necessary between airports taking part in the FASI regional airspace change. Appropriate quantitative assessments and trade-offs will be carried out as part of Stage 3 to allow a preferred option to be selected prior to consultation.

4.1.2 This table provides a summary of design option concepts for Southend, showing how the number of design options has changed through the design development stages as described above.

| Module | Initial Long List | Comprehensive List | Progress to IOA | Progress to Stage 3 |
|----------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Southend | 15 | 8 | 4 | 4 |

Table 18 Count of Design Option Concepts for each module through option development stages

4.1.3 These shortlisted viable options have been carried forward to Stage 3:

| Southend Option Concepts progressed to Stage 3 |
|--|
| 'Do Nothing' |
| Inner Holds – Northeast |
| Inner Holds – East |
| Inner Holds - Southeast |

Table 19 Summary of design options progressed to Stage 3

5. APPENDIX 1: Arrival Structure Concepts

5.1.1 Arrival structure types identified as being viable options for potential airspace designs across the LTMA airports:

| Structure | Diagram | Description |
|--|---------|---|
| Optimised⁵ Holds <small>Illustration of network/airport boundary (indicative c.7,000ft)</small> | | <p>A holding pattern is used to delay aircraft from landing, in a vertically separated stack. ATC control entry to, and exit from, the stack; and aircraft are vectored to the runway or may use a transition. Linked with either a traditional Radar Manoeuvring Area (RMA) or Transitions. This design is for holds within c.30nm of the airport.</p> |
| Holds Further Out <small>Illustration of network/airport boundary (indicative c.7,000ft)</small> | | <p>As above but would typically be higher. This design is for holds c.30nm-60nm from the airport.</p> |
| Point Merge <small>Illustration of network/airport boundary (indicative c.7,000ft)</small> | | <p>Point merge (PM) is a systemised method for sequencing arrival flows, allowing controllers to sequence and merge arrivals without vectoring, whilst enabling continuous descent operations and maintaining runway throughput. This design has a fixed location regarding the merge legs and merge point.</p> |
| Switch Merge <small>Illustration of network/airport boundary (indicative c.7,000ft)</small> | | <p>SM is a concept not currently in UK operation, whereby two separate PM structures exist within a given airspace volume to serve different runway directions for the same airport. The merge legs and merge point (the tip of each triangle) is angled to favour the runway in use, but only one of the merge structures is in operation at any time; they are 'switched' when the runway direction changes. The holds do not change.</p> |
| Trombone <small>Illustration of network/airport boundary (indicative c.7,000ft)</small> | | <p>A 'snake-like' PBN transition which can be closed (fixed) which aircraft must fly; or open, whereby tactical flexibility is retained with defined short cuts.</p> |

Figure 6 Arrival structure concepts (at and above 7,000ft)

⁵ See paragraph 2.2.10 of Master document for explanation of 'Optimised'

End of document