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 Gatwick Airport Arrivals Connectivity Module Issue 1.3 To be read in conjunction with Master Document

NATS



# 1. Introduction

# 1.1 About this document

- 1.1.1 This document describes the arrival connectivity options for Gatwick Airport, which have been developed using the methodology described in Section 2 of the Master document.
- 1.1.2 Gatwick is a major international airport. It operates as a single runway airport and is sited 30 miles south of central London. The airport is a base for scheduled airlines including British Airways, easyJet, WizzAir and charter operators such as TUI Airways.

# 2. Baseline

- 2.1.1 This description of the current airspace around Gatwick should be considered the 'Do Nothing' option if no airspace change was to take place.
- 2.1.2 Table 1 shows actual<sup>1</sup> 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	Total Movements
2019	142,457	142,451	284,908
2020	40,167	40,143	80,310
2021	27,845	27,925	55,770
2022	108,850	108,836	217,686

### Table 1 Actual air traffic movements: Gatwick Airport 2019-2022

2.1.3 Gatwick has a number of arrival and departure procedures (STARs & SIDs), as shown in Figure 1 and described in Table 2 & Table 3. Two holds, WILLO and TIMBA, provide for delay absorption.

Airport	Hold	STARs	Associated ATS Routes
	TIMBA	BARMI 1G, TEBRA 2G, KONAN 2G, NEVIL 1G, KUNAV 1G	P7, Y4, Q63, L610, L607, M189, G27, Z273, (U)T421
Gatwick	WILLO	OTMET 1G, VASUX 1G, DISIT 1G, KIDLI 1G,	N17, (U)P88, L982, L151, N859,
		ABSAV 1G, SIRIC 1G, GWC 1G	L980, P2, Y8

# Table 2 Current arrival connectivity for Gatwick

2.1.4 Gatwick has several SIDs which join with the ATS route network at designated waypoints<sup>2</sup> (Table 3)

SIDs	Associated ATS Routes
LAM (5P/5W/6M/6V/1Z)	N57, L10, N601
TIGER (3M/3V/1X)	N57, L10, N601
DAGGA (1M/1V/1X)	L620
FRANE (1M/1V/1P/1W/1Z)	M604
WIZAD (4M/4V/1X)	L9, L10
MIMFO (1M/1V)	Y312
DVR (2P/2W)	L9, L10, L18
ODVIK 2Z	Y311
HARDY (5M/5V/1X)	M605
BOGNA (1M/1V/1X)	L612, Y47
SAM (3P/3W)	Q41, L620, N621, N866
IMVUR 1Z	N63
SFD (5M/5V/9W/9P/4Z/1X)	M605, Y47
KENET (3P/3W)	L9, N14
NOVMA (1M/1V/1Z)	L620
	TIGER (3M/3V/1X) DAGGA (1M/1V/1X) FRANE (1M/1V/1P/1W/1Z) WIZAD (4M/4V/1X) MIMFO (1M/1V) DVR (2P/2W) ODVIK 2Z HARDY (5M/5V/1X) BOGNA (1M/1V/1X) SAM (3P/3W) IMVUR 1Z SFD (5M/5V/9W/9P/4Z/1X) KENET (3P/3W)

Table 3 Current departure connectivity for Gatwick

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This is based on CFMU actual data for 2019; this may vary from airport data.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> SIDs are all below 7,000ft and will be subject to Airport ACP. NERL will ensure network connectivity.








Figure 1 Current arrival and departure procedures for Gatwick

2.1.5 Figure 2 shows a radar density plot of Gatwick arrival traffic for a typical busy summer week and indicates traffic distribution. Most of the traffic (61%) arrives from the south and southeast.





2.1.6 Medium jets are the most prevalent aircraft type at Gatwick, as shown in Table 4. easyJet was the most prevalent operator in 2019, with approximately 43% of the traffic.



Gatwick – Aircraft Type			
Aircraft Group	Movements	% traffic	
Small Jet	421	>1%	
Medium Jet	246,544	87%	
Heavy Jet	36,456	13%	
Turboprop/Piston/Prop	1,486	>1%	

Gatwick – Top 4 Aircraft Operator Usage			
Operator	Movements	% traffic	
easyJet	123,464	43%	
British Airways	50,140	18%	
Norwegian Air	25,207	9%	
TUI	14,437	5%	

Table 4 Aircraft type and top carriers - Gatwick

# 3. Design Development

3.1.1

Working with the airport, NERL developed 15 high-level concept options for Gatwick<sup>3</sup>. NERL has assessed that based on required traffic loading, Gatwick would require at least two holds, 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

# 3.2 Stakeholder engagement

- 3.2.1 We received 6 responses from 6 different stakeholders related to the Gatwick design concepts. Table 5 presents a summary of the feedback and how this has influenced the design.
- 3.2.2 Feedback recognises that Gatwick is a major airport with high traffic demand compared to others in the LTMA and suggests this should be a consideration in the design development. This feedback has been used to inform the Design Principle Evaluation.
- 3.2.3 New options were developed as a result of the stakeholder engagement and the design envelope was revised to include an area to the west and northwest. Some engaged-upon options were removed due to SME development (see paragraph 3.3.3).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Master document Section 2.2 for a detailed description of this work.



Stakeholder	Feedback ('You said')	Response ('We did')
Airspace4All	Major airports requiring flow management would benefit from PBN approaches and systemised approach structures.	Feedback was used to inform the evaluation of DP1, DP2, DP3 & DP8. The traffic demand is considered when making these assessments so the impact on individual airports is considered. The conceptual nature of the design options means that specific design decisions as a result of this feedback cannot be made until more detailed options are developed in Stage 3.
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. Biggin Hill attended the formal Stage 2 engagement briefing and received a copy of the briefing presentation and recording.
British Airways	The only viable option is to enhance and modernize the Arrival structures to the south to ensure there is no conflict with the LTMA traffic.	Arrival structures to the south are included in the long list of options.
BGA	Conclusions suggest that any new network solutions would not require additional CAS. An opportunity should also be taken to remove legacy CAS segments where possible.	No conclusions have been made at this point. We used this feedback to inform our evaluation of DP5 and DP6. The conceptual nature of the design options means that specific design decisions as a result of this feedback cannot be made until more detailed options are developed in Stage 3.
Gatwick Airport	We highlight again the potential for arrival options to the west and north of Gatwick, providing other aerodrome and TMA designs allow this.	The design envelope and viability matrix has been refined to encompass an area to the west and northwest of Gatwick. An arrival structure to the north of Gatwick is considered unviable as it will significantly restrict all LTMA departures, including Gatwick, and conflict with the Heathrow arrivals.
Ryanair	Capacity is the most important consideration.	The design envelope and viability matrix has been refined to encompass an area to the west and northwest of Gatwick.

Table 5 Engagement feedback and NERL response



### 3.3 Gatwick Design Concepts

- 3.3.1 Table 6 summarises the high-level qualitative considerations for potential locations for Gatwick arrival structures, and Table 7 summarises the viability assessment for the arrival structures suitable for Gatwick. 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, Heathrow, London City, Luton, Northolt and Stansted traffic.		
Northeast 🗙	An arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the northeast of the airfield would likely conflict with Biggin Hill, Heathrow, London City, Northolt, Southend and Stansted traffic.		
East 🗙	An arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the east of the airfield would likely conflict with Biggin Hill, Heathrow, London City, Northolt and Southend traffic.		
Southeast 🔘	An arrival structure to the southeast of the airfield is already in place within the current design. A structure in this area remains possible, subject to deconfliction with Bournemouth, Farnborough, Heathrow and Southampton traffic.		
South 🔘	An arrival structure to the south of the airfield is already in place within the current design. A structure in this area remains possible, subject to deconfliction with Bournemouth, Farnborough, Heathrow and Southampton traffic and Portsmouth DA Complex.		
Southwest 🛞	There is sufficient airspace to enable an arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the southwest of the airfield, subject to deconfliction with Bournemouth, Farnborough, Gatwick, Heathrow and Southampton traffic and the Portsmouth DA Complex.		
West 🔘	There is sufficient airspace to enable an arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the west of the airfield, subject to deconfliction with Bournemouth, Farnborough, Heathrow, Northolt and Southampton traffic.		
Northwest 🚫	There is sufficient airspace to enable an arrival structure, and associated connectivity, to the northwest of the airfield, subject to deconfliction with Bournemouth, Farnborough, Heathrow, Luton, Northolt and Southampton traffic.		
Overhead 🗙	An arrival structure, and associated connectivity, overhead the airfield would likely conflict with Heathrow traffic.		
Table 6 Catwield	Arrivals: Location viability considerations — post engagement		

Table 6 Gatwick Arrivals: Location viability considerations - post engagement

Structure	Viability Considerations
Optimised (	Optimisation of current day structures.
(inner)	There is sufficient airspace for optimised hold(s), and this would likely meet the runway
holds	throughput demands.
Point 💦	There is sufficient airspace for Point Merge, and this would likely meet the runway
merge	throughput demands.
Switch {	There is sufficient airspace for Switch Merge, and this would likely meet the runway
merge	throughput demands.

Table 7 Gatwick Arrival structures: Viability considerations – post engagement

- 3.3.4 Figure 4 shows the Gatwick design envelope, developed by SMEs through collaborative workshops and formal engagement with Gatwick 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 Gatwick is the Portsmouth Danger Area as shown.





Figure 4 Gatwick Design Envelope and design constraints – post engagement and SME development

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



Figure 5 Gatwick Design Options Comprehensive Viability Matrix

3.3.7 These 11 viable options were taken forward as the comprehensive list to Design Principle Evaluation, along with 'Do Nothing'.



# 3.4 Design Principle Evaluation

3.4.1 Table 8 shows the DPE assessment criteria. SMEs<sup>4</sup>, 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
			<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
1	1 B AMS	<b>Operational</b> The airspace will enable increased operational resilience	<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	В	<b>Economic</b> 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	<b>Environmental</b> Optimise CO <sub>2</sub> emissions per flight	Track mileage GHG performance Aircraft height Method of delay absorption	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions worsened	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions similar to today	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions improved

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Where the Stakeholder Engagement Feedback tables state that feedback was used to inform the evaluation of one or more DPs, our SMEs take that feedback, add it to their wider knowledge and experience, and apply their combined judgment to the DPE for each option. The conceptual nature of the design options means that design decisions on each subject may not be possible at this stage. However, all feedback is considered by the SMEs in the round, and will also be carried forward into later stages as the concepts develop into more detailed options.



DP	Priority	Description	SME subjective assessment topics, include but not limited to	Red	Amber	Green
4	С	<b>Environmental</b> 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
5	С	<b>Technical</b> 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	<b>Technical</b> 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	<b>Technical</b> 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	В	<b>Operational</b> Systemisation will deliver the optimal capacity and efficiency benefits	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
	AMS	AMS (Note: This is about airspace capacity, not ground infrastructure capacity which could be the limiting factor to overall airport capacity).	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	<b>Technical</b> 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 (Note: The main route network is considered as FL70 - FL245. Approach structures are not considered as 'the main route network').	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	Policy Must accord with the CAA's published Airspace Modernisation Strategy (CAP1711) and any current or future plans associated with it.	AMS "Ends" Strategic Objectives Safety (DP0) Integration of diverse users (DP6 and DP7) Simplification (DP1, DP8 and DP9) Environmental sustainability (DP3)	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.

	Criteria for Rejection Status
A	1 red OR 1 amber
B	2 reds
С	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. KK) -Structure Type (e.g. Inner Hold: IH/ Point Merge: PM/ Switch Merge: SM) - Location (e.g. Northeast: NE). DN = Do Nothing. DM = Do Minimum.



DP	Priority	KK - DN	KK - IH - SE (DM)	KK - IH - S (DM) (Maybe shared)
RESULT		REJECT	ACCEPT	ACCEPT
DP0 Safety	A AMS	Maintained: Similar operation to to	Maintained: Holds are used in current day operations and are known to be safe	Maintained: Holds are used in current day operations and are known to be safe
DP1 Operational (Delay Absorption)	B AMS	Today's operation, no change from baseline	Optimised concept of current day operation, which provides similar delay absorption	Optimised concept of current day operation, which provides similar delay absorption
DP1 Operational (Disruption Recovery)	B AMS	Today's operation, no change from baseline	Optimised concept of current day operation, which provides similar disruption recovery	Optimised concept of current day operation, which provides similar disruption recovery
DP2 Economic (Fuel)	В	Today's operation, no change from baseline	Optimised concept aligned with airport traffic flows, therefore improved fuel performance	Optimised concept aligned with airport traffic flows, therefore improved fuel performance
DP3 Environmental (CO2)	B AMS	Today's operation, no change from baseline	Optimised concept of current day operation aligned with airport traffic flows, therefore CO <sub>2</sub> emissions per flight improved	Optimised concept of current day operation aligned with airport traffic flows, therefore CO <sub>2</sub> emissions per flight improved
DP4 Environmental (Noise)	С	Today's operation, no change from baseline	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)	С	Today's operation, no change from baseline	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	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	No military-use areas in the vicinity, therefore, would not require a change to MoD operations	No military-use areas in the vicinity, therefore, would not require a change to MoD operations
DP8 Operational (Capacity)	B AMS	Aligns with network traffic flows. Concept may not 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	Today's operation, no change in ATCO workload anticipated	Similar concept to today's operation, therefore no change in ATCO workload anticipated	Similar concept to today's operation, therefore no change in ATCO workload anticipated
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 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP3, DP6, DP8, DP8 Red: DP9	Green: DP0, DP3, DP7, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP6, DP8 Red: None	Green: DP0, DP3, DP7, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP6, DP8 Red: None



DP	Priority	KK - IH - SW	KK - IH - W	KK - IH - NW
RESULT		ACCEPT	REJECT	REJECT
DP0 Safety	A AMS	Maintained: Holds are used in current day operations and are known to be safe	Maintained: Holds are used in current day operations and are known to be safe	Maintained: Holds are used in current day operations and are known to be safe
DP1 Operational (Delay Absorption)	B AMS	Optimised concept of current day operation, which provides similar delay absorption	Optimised concept of current day operation, which provides similar delay absorption	Optimised concept of current day operation, which provides similar delay absorption
DP1 Operational (Disruption Recovery)	B AMS	Optimised concept of current day operation, which provides similar disruption recovery	Optimised concept of current day operation, which provides similar disruption recovery	Optimised concept of current day operation, which provides similar disruption recovery
DP2 Economic (Fuel)	В	Optimised concept, partially aligns with airport traffic flows, therefore fuel performance neutral	Does not align with airport traffic flows. Fuel performance worsened	Does not align with airport traffic flows. Fuel performance worsened
DP3 Environmental (CO <sub>2</sub> )	B AMS	Optimised concept, partially aligns with airport traffic flows, therefore CO <sub>2</sub> emissions neutral	Does not align with airport traffic flows. CO <sub>2</sub> emissions per flight worsened	Does not align with airport traffic flows. CO2 emissions per flight worsened
DP4 Environmental (Noise)	С	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)	С	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	No military-use areas in the vicinity, therefore, would not require a change to MoD operations	No military-use areas in the vicinity, therefore, would not require a change to MoD operations	No military-use areas in the vicinity, therefore, would not require a change to MoD operations
DP8 Operational (Capacity)	B AMS	Supports the required airport arrival loading, however, negatively impacts capacity on multiple network traffic flows	Supports the required airport arrival loading, however, negatively impacts capacity on multiple network traffic flows	Supports the required airport arrival loading, however, negatively impacts capacity on multiple network traffic flows
DP8 Operational (Efficiency)	B AMS	Similar concept to today's operation, therefore no change in ATCO workload anticipated	Increased workload due to complexity of airspace and multiple network flows	Increased workload due to complexity of airspace and multiple network flows
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, DP7, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP3, DP6, DP8, DP8 Red: None	Green: DP0, DP7, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP6, DP8 Red: DP3, DP8	Green: DP0, DP7, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP6, DP8 Red: DP3, DP8



DP	Priority	KK - PM - SE	KK - PM - S	KK - PM - SW
RESULT		ACCEPT	ACCEPT	REJECT
DP0 Safety	A AMS	Enhanced: Reduced controller tactical intervention required, reducing potential for human error	Enhanced: Reduced controller tactical intervention required, reducing potential for human error	Enhanced: Reduced controller tactical intervention required, reducing potential for human error
DP1 Operational (Delay Absorption)	B AMS	Similar holding capacity as today, plus delay absorption by flying the PM. Overall delay absorption similar to today	Similar holding capacity as today, plus delay absorption by flying the PM. Overall delay absorption similar to today	Similar holding capacity as today, plus delay absorption by flying the PM. Overall delay absorption similar to today
DP1 Operational (Disruption Recovery)	B AMS	Assumed contingency hold within the transition, net disruption recovery similar to today	Assumed contingency hold within the transition, net disruption recovery similar to today	Assumed contingency hold within the transition, net disruption recovery similar to today
DP2 Economic (Fuel)	В	Extended track miles to complete the PM structure. Aligns with airport traffic flows. Net neutral	Extended track miles to complete the PM structure. Aligns with airport traffic flows. Net neutral	Worsened due to extended track miles to complete the PM structure. Not aligned with airport traffic flows. Net worsened
DP3 Environmental (CO <sub>2</sub> )	B AMS	Extended track miles to complete the PM structure. Aligns with airport traffic flows. Net neutral	Extended track miles to complete the PM structure. Aligns with airport traffic flows. Net neutral	Worsened due to extended track miles to complete the PM structure. Not aligned with airport traffic flows. Net worsened
DP4 Environmental (Noise)	С	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)	С	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	No military-use areas in the vicinity, therefore, would not require a change to MoD operations	No military-use areas in the vicinity, therefore, would not require a change to MoD operations	Potential negative impact to Portsmouth DA Complex
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 on multiple network traffic flows
DP8 Operational (Efficiency)	B AMS	Reduced controller tactical intervention required, leading to reduced ATCO workload	Reduced controller tactical intervention required, leading to reduced ATCO workload	PM structure require less tactical intervention. Negatively impacts on network traffic flows; increases ATCO workload. Net neutral
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, DP7, DP8, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP3, DP6 Red: None	Green: DP0, DP7, DP8, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP3, DP6 Red: None	Green: DP0, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP6, DP7, DP8, DP8 Red: DP3



DP	Priority	KK - SM - SE	KK - SM - S	KK - SM - SW
RESULT		ACCEPT	ACCEPT	REJECT
DP0 Safety	A AMS	Enhanced: Reduced controller tactical intervention required, reducing potential for human error	Enhanced: Reduced controller tactical intervention required, reducing potential for human error	Enhanced: Reduced controller tactical intervention required, reducing potential for human error
DP1 Operational (Delay Absorption)	B AMS	Similar holding capacity and further delay absorption by flying the SM arc; overall similar to today	Similar holding capacity and further delay absorption by flying the SM arc; overall similar to today	Similar holding capacity and further delay absorption by flying the SM arc; overall similar to today
DP1 Operational (Disruption Recovery)	B AMS	Assumed contingency hold within the transition, net disruption recovery similar to today	Assumed contingency hold within the transition, net disruption recovery similar to today	Assumed contingency hold within the transition, net disruption recovery similar to today
DP2 Economic (Fuel)	В	Track miles to complete the SM structure, aligns with airport traffic flows, SM can be orientated to runway. Net neutral	Track miles to complete the SM structure, aligns with airport traffic flows, SM can be orientated to runway. Net neutral	Extended track miles to complete the SM, not aligned with airport traffic flows. Orientated to runway. Net worsened
DP3 Environmental (CO <sub>2</sub> )	B AMS	Track miles to complete the SM structure, aligns with airport traffic flows, SM can be orientated to runway. Net neutral	Track miles to complete the SM structure, aligns with airport traffic flows, SM can be orientated to runway. Net neutral	Extended track miles to complete the SM, not aligned with airport traffic flows. Orientated to runway. Net worsened
DP4 Environmental (Noise)	С	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)	С	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	No military-use areas in the vicinity, therefore, would not require a change to MoD operations	No military-use areas in the vicinity, therefore, would not require a change to MoD operations	Potential negative impact to Portsmouth DA Complex
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 on multiple network traffic flows
DP8 Operational (Efficiency)	B AMS	Reduced controller tactical intervention. Method of operations configured to support switching runway ends.	Reduced controller tactical intervention. Method of operations configured to support switching runway ends.	Reduced controller tactical intervention required. Method of operations configured to support switching runway ends. Increased workload due to airspace complexity and network flows. Net neutral
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)	А	Green: DP0, DP7, DP8, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP3, DP6 Red: None	Green: DP0, DP7, DP8, DP8, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP3, DP6 Red: None	Green: DP0, DP9 Amber: DP1, DP1, DP6, DP7, DP8, DP8 Red: DP3

# Table 11 Design Principle Evaluation

3.4.5 'Do Nothing' and 4 design options were assessed as not meeting the DPs and were rejected at this stage. The remaining 7 viable design options progress to Step 2B Options Appraisal.



### 3.5 Initial Options Appraisal

3.5.1 The following viable options have been progressed to IOA:

Gatwick Option Concepts progressed to IOA
Inner Holds – Southeast (DM)
Inner Holds – South (DM) (Maybe shared)
Inner Holds – Southwest
Point merge – Southeast
Point merge – South
Switch merge – Southeast
Switch merge – South
Table 10 Ourses and design antions are succeed from DD

### 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 <sub>2</sub> , 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. It did not progress through the DPE however, in line with CAP1616, it must be included in the IOA for comparison purposes. Each option is described in Section 3.3 and Section 5 Appendix 1.



KK – DNL Qualita	tive Initial Impacts Assessment REJECTE
Group	Impact
Communities	Noise impact on health and quality of life
	s "at or above 7,000ftminimising of noise is no longer a priority". CAP1616 instructs sponsors to consider nois
	pacts where the proposal has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, AONBs and NPs below
	ge in airspace design – no changes to impacts.
Communities	Air Quality
	s "emissions from aircraft above 1,000ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality". No change
	n – no changes to impacts.
Wider Society	Greenhouse Gas Impacts
	there would be no change. In the long term, failure to modernise the airspace would have a negative impact on
	ue to increased likelihood of delays/holding in an unchanged design as traffic is forecast to increase.
Wider Society	Capacity / Resilience
	there would be no change. In the long term, failure to modernise the airspace would have a negative impact on
	ience due to increased likelihood of delays/holding in an unchanged design as traffic is forecast to increase.
General Aviation (	
	there would be no change in impact. In the long term, failure to modernise the airspace would lead to increased
	nercial aircraft delays and holding in an unchanged design as traffic is forecast to increase. This may lead to
	on GA access due to the busier airspace, however as GA access is currently relatively infrequent at network
	bt be a major impact.
	irlines Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity
	there would be no change in impact. In the long term, failure to modernise the airspace would have a negative
	y due to increased likelihood of delays/holding in an unchanged design as traffic is forecast to increase. This
	egative economic impact.
	irlines Fuel Burn
	there would be no change in impact. In the long term, failure to modernise the airspace would have a negative
	rn due to increased likelihood of delays/holding in an unchanged design as traffic is forecast to increase.
	es Training Costs
	change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training
	this baseline system was retained, the same flight procedures would be used, and training cost impacts would
not change.	
Commercial Airlin	
	pace design – no changes to other commercial operator costs.
Airport / ANSP	Infrastructure Costs
	pace design – 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.
Airport / ANSP	Operational Costs
No change in airs	pace design – 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.
Airport / ANSP	Deployment Costs
If this baseline sy	stem was retained, there would be no deployment, hence no associated costs.
AMS	Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS
<ul> <li>Safety:</li> </ul>	naintained
<ul> <li>Simplifi</li> </ul>	cation: worsens delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, network capacity and ATCO workload.
	t utilise aircraft performance capabilities
	ion of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA
	mental sustainability: worsens CO <sub>2</sub> emissions
Qualitative Safety	
	appraisal for this proposed option indicates that if the baseline system was retained, the existing level of safety
	ertaken within the current operation would be at least maintained. However, if there was no change to the curren
	ential increase in traffic as forecast would increase controller workload and traffic complexity within the LTMA
	al safety issues in the future. In order to mitigate any reduction in safety margins it is likely that increased flow
	asures would be required, resulting in additional delay.
Conclusion from	

### Conclusion from IOA

This option was rejected during the DPE stage. It has been included for comparison purposes only.

# Table 14 KK-DN Initial Options Appraisal



	Qualitative Initial Impacts Assessment         PROGRESSE
Group	Impact
Communities	Noise impact on health and quality of life
and tranquillity in	s "at or above 7,000ftminimising of noise is no longer a priority". CAP1616 instructs sponsors to consider nois pacts where the proposal has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, AONBs and NPs below twork-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are not considered.
Communities	Air Quality
ANG (2017) state	s "emissions from aircraft above 1,000ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality". Changes above 7,000ft, thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air quality impacts.
Nider Society	Greenhouse Gas Impacts
Additionally, this or reduce GHG emis	n is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. Option has the potential to raise the holding height. This location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, could sions through improved aircraft trajectories compared with the baseline.
Wider Society	Capacity / Resilience
capacity compare aligns with netwo	option would be implemented alongside another Inner Hold, an independent facility could maintain airport ed with the baseline. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location rk traffic flows so could maintain network capacity compared with the baseline.
	ption could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels, therefore it could maintain delay
absorption comp General Aviation (	ared with the baseline. (GA) Access
A holding facility	to the southeast would likely be within current day CAS. There is already an arrival structure in this location. As impact on GA traffic is unlikely to change compared with the baseline.
	Airlines Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity
Could enable eco capacity and eco	nomic impacts through airport capacity gains, however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall nomic gains at Gatwick.
could positively in	ork traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. This npact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA.
	Airlines Fuel Burn
Additionally, this o	n is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. option has the potential to raise the holding levels. This location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, could el burn for commercial operators.
	ly structures in this location so no change in impact is expected for GA traffic.
	ies Training Costs
-light procedures	change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators.
Commercial Airlir	
No other operato	r costs are foreseen.
Airport / ANSP	Infrastructure Costs
will require some	n is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase which systems engineering adaptations.
Airport / ANSP	Operational Costs
	n is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.
Airport / ANSP	Deployment Costs
change would inv	disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA system olve training a large number of controllers and assistants via the use of various air traffic simulators (including ement, and staffing), with additional system engineering costs.
	mance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS
	maintained
workloa	cation: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, network capacity, and ATCO d. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities
	ion of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design mental sustainability: could reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions
Qualitative Safety	
safety performan	y appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southeast would at least maintain curren ce. There are multiple holds within current UK airspace which have a proven safety performance. An arrival
Structure in this is Conclusion from	ocation would need to deconflict with Bournemouth, Farnborough, Heathrow and Southampton arrivals.
Compared to the access; it could m	baseline, this option could improve fuel burn and CO <sub>2</sub> emissions. It would maintain safety and any current MoD naintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity, network capacity, and
ATCO workload. <b>Therefore. KK – I</b> I	H – SE (DM) is progressed to Stage 3 for further development.
	ble 15 KK-IH-SE (DM) Initial Options Appraisal



#### KK - IH – S (DM) (Maybe shared) Qualitative Initial Impacts Assessment 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 1,000 ft 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 SocietyGreenhouse Gas Impacts

As either an independent or shared facility, this design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. This location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, could reduce GHG emissions through improved aircraft trajectories compared with the baseline.

#### Wider Society Capacity / Resilience

Capacity: As this option would be implemented alongside another Inner Hold, an independent facility could maintain airport capacity compared with the baseline. If the facility is shared, airport capacity could be worse than the baseline. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so could maintain network capacity compared with the baseline.

Resilience: As either an independent or shared facility, this option could maintain disruption recovery. If an independent facility, this option could maintain a similar number of holding levels, therefore maintaining delay absorption compared with the baseline. If the Inner Hold is a shared facility, there could be a reduction in holding levels available to Gatwick compared with the baseline.

#### General Aviation (GA) Access

As either an independent or shared facility, a holding facility to the south would likely be within current day CAS. There is already an arrival structure in this location. 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

As either an independent or shared facility, this option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design.

A shared facility may limit capacity resulting in increased likelihood of delays/holding. This could lead to a negative economic impact for commercial operators.

As an independent facility it could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains, however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick.

# No impact on GA is expected.

### GA/Commercial Airlines Fuel Burn

As either an independent or shared facility, this design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. This location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, could reduce GHG emissions through improved aircraft trajectories. There are currently structures in this location so no change in impact is expected for GA traffic.

#### 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, either shared or independent, is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators.

#### Commercial Airlines Other Costs

No other operator costs are foreseen, as either an independent or shared facility.

#### Airport / ANSP Infrastructure Costs

This design option, either shared or independent, is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase which will require some systems engineering adaptations.

#### Airport / ANSP Operational Costs

This design option, either shared or independent, 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, either an independent or shared. 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
AMS Assessment – Independent Option
Safety: maintained
• Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, network capacity, and ATCO
workload. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities
<ul> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the</li> </ul>
design
<ul> <li>Environmental sustainability: could reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions</li> </ul>
AMS Assessment – Shared Option
Safety: maintained
Simplification: could maintain disruption recovery, network capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worsen delay
absorption and airport capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities
Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the
design
<ul> <li>Environmental sustainability: could reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions</li> </ul>
Qualitative Safety Assessment
A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the south 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 Bournemouth arrivals, Heathrow departures, and all
Farnborough and Southampton traffic.
Conclusion from IOA
Compared to the baseline, an independent facility could maintain delay absorption and airport capacity. A shared facility
would worsen delay absorption and airport capacity compared to the baseline. As either a shared or independent facility,
the option could improve fuel burn and CO <sub>2</sub> emissions. It would maintain safety and any current MoD access; and could
maintain disruption recovery, network capacity, and ATCO workload.
Therefore, KK – IH – S (DM) (Maybe shared) is progressed to Stage 3 for further development.
Table 16 KK-IH-S (DM) (Maybe shared) Initial Options Appraisal



CommunitiesNoise impact on health and quality of lifeANG (2017) states "at or above 7,000ftminimising of noise is no longer a priority". CAP1616 instructs sponsors to consider noiseANG (2017) states "at or above 7,000ftminimising of noise is no longer a priority". CAP1616 instructs sponsors to consider noiseand tranquillity impacts where the proposal has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, AONBs and NPs below7,000ft. In this network-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are not considered.CommunitiesAir QualityANG (2017) states "emissions from aircraft above 1,000 ft 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 SocietyGreenhouse Gas ImpactsThis design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location only partially aligns with airport traff lows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions compared with the baseline.		itative Initial Impacts Assessment PROGRESSEI
NNG (2017) states "at or above 7,0001. minimising of noise is no longer a priority". CAP1616 instructs growness or consider noi and tranquility mapacts where the proposal, changes would not occur below 7,0001 therefore these impacts are not considered. <b>Communities</b> Ar Quality ANG (2017) states "emissions from aircraft above 1,000 ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality". Change would occur at or above 7,0001, thus a some accurate with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air quality impacts. <b>Mider Society</b> Greenhouse Gas impacts This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,0001. <b>Middionally</b> , this option has the potential to traise the holding height. However, this location only partially aligns with airont traff lows acuing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain AHG emissions compared with the baseline. <b>Mider Society</b> Capacity / Reselinee Capacity As this option would be implemented alongside another Inner Hold, an independent facility could maintain airport appacity compared with the baseline. <b>Change on cisical in any</b> Inder overall capacity gains at Cawick. This locatio bas not align with network traffic flows and could hinder network capacity compared with the baseline. <b>Society cound and set on align acute any wither overall capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. Could enable positive economic impracts through airport capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. <b>Could enable positive economic impracts through airport capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. <b>Could enable positive economic impracts through airport capacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic impracts through airport capacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overally gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. <b>Could enable positive economic impracts through air</b></b></b></b>	Group	
and transulling impacts where the proposal has the potential to change overfliph of inhabited areas, ADNBs and NPS below 2007 in this retrork level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are not considered. 2007 until the intervolk level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are not considered. 2007 until the design potion is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. 1016 doscue and a dost 7,000ft, thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air quality. Change 2006 the discussion of the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location only partially algoes with heigh approach 2006 dost 2007 Capacity / Realiance 2006 the discussion of the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location only partially algoes with heigh 2007 the 2006 dost 2007 Capacity / Realiance 2006 dost 2007 capacity / Realiance 2006 dost 2007		
Communities         Air Quality           Add (2017) states remissions from aircraft above 1.000 ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality. Change would ocur at or above 7.000 ft, thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air quality. The design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000 ft. This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000 ft. This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000 ft. This design option would be for this on air action would could maintan differ demissions compared with the baseline.           Neer Society         Capacity. A this for the baseline. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gativick. This location does not align with network traffic flows and could hinden retwork capacity as the advects. The society design account orugared with the baseline.           Sereal Avation (CA)         Access           A holding facility to the southwest would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffic is unlikely having compared with the baseline.           AVCommercial Aritines         Count here were all Gativick. This could pain by the could by advection and traffic and the retwork traffic flows. Auchick Mark Towes and the pain with a social opacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and is social opacity all specific and traffic a commercial and GA.           AVCommercial Aritines         Count metreased Effective Capacity           AV		
AMA (2017) states *emissions from aircraft above 1.000 fi are unlikely to have a significant impact on local ar quality." Change would occur ator above 7.000ft. Hus in accordance with AMS (2017) there would be no change in local air quality impacts.         Wide Society       Greenhouse Gas Impacts         Wide Society       Greenhouse Gas Impacts         Wide Society       Capacity 7.10M aircraft. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions compared with the baseline.         Wider Society       Capacity 7.16M aircraft. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions compared with the baseline.         Wider Society       Capacity 7.16M aircraft. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions compared with the baseline.         Wider Society       Capacity 7.16M aircraft. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions and Gatwick. This location designed with the baseline.         Society       Capacity 7.16M aircraft. Overall a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain airport traff.         Society       Capacity 7.16M aircraft. Overall a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain levely baseption compared with the baseline.         Society       Capacity 7.16M aircraft. Overall acquidt hinder potential capacity gains across the LTMA from an microal maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain for Unotation design.         Aldromerold Alfines       Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity gains across the LTMA from an microal maintain with inder voreal capacity and economic impact through protein target acquidt andex and thexels accomomic impact through protein tack b	7,000ft. In this netw	ork-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are not considered.
would occur at or above 7.000ft. thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air quality impacts. Mider Society Greenhouse Gas Impacts This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000ft. Idditionality, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location only partially aligns with airport traff lows: acusing additional track miniphemented alongside another inner Hold, an independent facility could maintain infer Rapacity. As this potion would be implemented alongside another inner Hold, an independent facility could maintain infer apacity to compared with the baseline. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location does not align with network traffic flows and could hinder network capacity capacity desile. Healtence: This option would be those soline. Setter low and could hinder network capacity flows, which could hinder potential capacity gains at cost of GA traffic is unlikely hange compared with the baseline. SAVCommercial Airlines Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity This location does not align with network traffic flows, which could hinder potential capacity gains however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. AVCommercial Airlines Fuel Bum This design optional track mised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000ft. Hidditional track mised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000ft. Hidditional track mised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000ft. Hidditional track mised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000ft. Hidditional track mised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000ft. Hidditional track mised tra	Communities	Air Quality
Mider Society Greenhouse Gas Imgadis This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000rt. Hiddionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location only partially aligns with airport traff Carsa causing additional track miles for LTM alicraft. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions compared with the baseline. Mider Society Capacity / Regiment of the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location only partially aligns with airport traffic agaolty, compared with the baseline. Beelilence: This option could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain align with network traffic flows and could hinder network capacity compared with the baseline. Beelilence: This option could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain level abaryotion compared with the baseline. MACOmmercial Antines Economic Impact from increased Effective Capacity This location does not align with network traffic flows which could hinder potential capacity gains across the LTMA from an mproved network design. Could enable positive economic impacts through airport capacity gains, however other non-arspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. MACOmmercial Alfines Fuel Burn This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000rt. Kddinonally, this option has the optimist of traffic discusted and increased network fuel burn compared with the baseline. Astrocurre Astrocurre Astrocurre Mater ANSP Negativel ITMA traffic - commercial and GA. Commercial Alfines Traffic is unified with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training taffir frequired. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost spected	ANG (2017) states "	emissions from aircraft above 1,000 ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality". Changes
This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.0001. Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location only partially aligns with airport traffic tows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could mantain GHG emissions compared with the baseline. Wider Society Capacity A this implemented alongside another Inner Hold, an independent facility could maintain airport apacity to stin betwork traffic flows and could hinder network capacity compared with the baseline. This option could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain aliey absorption compared with the baseline. <b>Beneral Aviation (GA)</b> Access Another hold hinder network capacity compared with the baseline. <b>Beneral Aviation (GA)</b> Access A commercial Alifines Economic impact from Increased Effective Capacity This location does not align with network traffic flows, which could hinder potential capacity gains across the LTMA from an mproved network design. Could enable positive economic impacts through airport capacity gains, however other non-airspace commercial Alifines Fuel Bum This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.0001. Edditionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location paced with the baseline. <b>BACOmmercial Alifines</b> Fuel Bum This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.0001. Edditional track the structure Costs <b>BACOmmercial Alifines</b> Cuel Alifer and AlACC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training tagit if required. This option has the potential to raise the AlARAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training tagit if required. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts. <b>Diptr (ANSP)</b> Inf		
Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location only partially aligns with airport traffic aliaves acusing additional track mells for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions compared with the baseline. Mider Society Capacity / Resilience Capacity As this option would be implemented alongside another inner Hold, an independent facility could maintain airport traffic flows and could hinder network capacity compared with the baseline. Chen consumisance constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This locatio does not align with network traffic flows and could hinder network capacity compared with the baseline. <b>Second Mither Society Capacity As this could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels.</b> Therefore, it could maintain align the baseline. <b>Second Mither Society Mither Mith</b>		
Capacity As this option would be implemented alongside another Inner Hold, an independent facitity could maintain airport         capacity compared with the baseline.       Ther non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This locatio foces not align with network traffic flows and could hinder network capacity compared with the baseline.         Personance: This option could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain idely absorption compared with the baseline.         Personance: This option could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels. Therefore, it could maintain disruption recovery and a similar number of holding levels.         Avison compared with the baseline.       Second Capacity and conomic impacts through airport capacity gains across the LTMA traffic – sommercial and GA.         Avison is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000ft.       This design optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7.000ft.         Additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall could maintain fuel bur compared with the baseline.       Avison avis	Additionally, this opt	tion has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location only partially aligns with airport traffic
spacity compared with the baseline. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This locatio does not align with network traffic flows and could hinder network capacity compared with the baseline. <b>Beeliance:</b> This option compared with the baseline. <b>Beeral Aviation (GA)</b> Access A holding facility to the southwest would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffic is unlikely shange compared with the baseline. <b>SACCOMMERCIAL Altines</b> Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity <b>SACCOMMERCIAL Altines</b> Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity <b>SACCOMMERCIAL Altines</b> Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity gains across the LTMA from an mproved network design. Could enable positive economic impacts through airport capacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. <b>SACOMMERCIAL Altines</b> Fuel Burn This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic Tows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure his location could lead to extended track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This cou regatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. <b>Sommercial Alfines</b> Training Costs <b>Diph to recdures</b> 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. <b>Dirpotr Costs</b> are foresen. <b>Nipotr (ANSP Deployment Costs</b> <b>Nipotr (ANSP Deployment Costs</b> <b>Nipotr (ANSP Deployment Costs</b> <b>Nipotr (ANSP Deployment Cost</b>	Wider Society	Capacity / Resilience
Is a societ of the second seco	capacity compared	with the baseline. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location
Seneral Aviation (GA)       Access         holding facility to the southwest would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffic is unlikely hange compared with the baseline.         SA/Commercial Alfines       Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity         This location does not align with network traffic flows, which could hinder potential capacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic impacts through aliport capacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA.         SA/Commercial Alfines       Fuel Burn         This design option is an optimised version of today which could maintoir the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft.         Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic flows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure floatous causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This could regatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA.         Commercial Alfines       Training Costs         Pilipt procedures change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training taff if equired. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators.         Wipport / ANSP       Infrastructure Costs         Not other operator costs are foresee		
A holding facility to the southwest would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffic is unlikely change compared with the baseline. AVCommercial Airlines Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity This location does not align with network traffic flows, which could hinder potential capacity gains across the LTMA from an mproved network design. Could enable positive economic impacts through airport capacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – SMCommercial Airlines Fuel Burn This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic hows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraff. Overall. could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure his location could lead to extended track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This cou regatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. <b>Dommercial Airlines</b> Training Costs <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Training Costs <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Other Costs <b>No other operator</b> costs are foreseen. <b>Airport / ANSP</b> 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 adaptations. <b>Airport / ANSP</b> Deparational Costs This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts. <b>Airport / ANSP</b> Deployment Costs <b>ANS</b> Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS • Safety: maintiand • Samplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity, Will utilies aircraft performance capabilities integra		
hange compared with the baseline.  GAVCommercial Airlines Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity  This location does not align with network traffic flows, which could hinder potential capacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA.  GAVCommercial Airlines Fuel Burn  This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft.  Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic  Tows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure is location could lead to extended track tolistance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This cou uegatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA.  Commercial Airlines Training Costs  Town could lead to extended track tolistance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures.  This obtin so not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators.  Commercial Airlines Other Costs  No other operator costs are foreseen.  Airport / ANSP Infrastructure Costs  Niport / ANSP Deprotional costs  Airport / ANSP Deprotional costs  Airport / ANSP Deprotional costs  Airport / ANSP Deprotional costs  At this stage it is disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA system shange would involve training a large number of controllers and assistants via the use of various air traffic ismulators (including imprex. maintaind  Safety maintaind  Safety maintaind  Safety maintaind  At this stage it is disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA system shange would involve training a large number of controllers and assistants via the use of various air traffic ismulators (inc		
GA/Commercial Airlines         Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity           This location does not align with network traffic flows, which could hinder potential capacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial airlines           SA/Commercial Airlines         Fuel Burn           This besign option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft.           Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partielly aligns with airport traffic flows: causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure fines causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure this location could lead to extended track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This could required. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators.           Dommercial Airlines         This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators.           Dommercial Airlines         There Costs           Not operator costs are foreseen.         Airport / ANSP           Dirport / ANSP         Deployment Costs           This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.         Airport / ANSP           Deployment Costs         Airstructure Costs           Nins design op		
mproved network design. Could enable positive economic impacts through airport capacity gains, however other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial <b>airlines</b> Fuel Burn This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic lows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure this location could lead to extended track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This coule egatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Training Costs Elight procedures change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training taff if required. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Other Costs World the operator costs are foreseen. <b>Niport (ANSP</b> 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 adaptations. <b>Niport (ANSP</b> Operational Costs At this stage it is disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA system hange 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. <b>AMS</b> Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilies aircraft performance capabi		
constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. SA/Commercial Airlines Fuel Burn This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic lows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure his location could lead to extended track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This cou legatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. Commercial Airlines Training Costs Training Costs Tight 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 No other operator costs are foreseen. Airport / ANSP Operational Costs This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase which will require soure soytems engineering adaptations. Airport / ANSP Deployment Costs 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 ismulators (including sim prep, management, and staffing), with additional system engineering costs. <b>MNS</b> Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS Safety maintained Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will uti	This location does r	ot align with network traffic flows, which could hinder potential capacity gains across the LTMA from an
commercial and GA.         GAVCommercial Airlines       Fuel Burn         This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft.         Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic         Tows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure his location could lead to excleded track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This could regatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA.         Commercial Airlines       Training Costs         Tight procedures change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training ost on operator costs are foreseen.         No other operator costs are foreseen.         Niport / 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 adaptations.         Airport / ANSP       Deprational Costs         This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.         Airport / ANSP       Deployment Costs         Air this stage it is disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA system thange would involve training a large number of controllers and assistants via the use of various air traffic simulators (including sim pre-, management, an		
GA/Commercial Airlines         Fuel Burn           This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft.           Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic           Tows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure this location could lead to extended track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This could regatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA.           Commercial Airlines         Training Costs           Tight 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.         Niport / ANSP           Infrastructure Costs         Infrastructure Costs           Airport / ANSP         Operational Costs           Airport / ANSP         Operational Costs           Airport / ANSP         Operational 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.	constraints may hin	der overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This could positively impact all LTMA traffic –
This design option is an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft. Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic lows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure his location could lead to extended track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This cou negatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Training Costs Tight 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. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Other Costs No other operator costs are foreseen. <b>Airport / ANSP</b> 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 adaptations. <b>Airport / ANSP</b> Operational Costs This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts. <b>Airport / ANSP</b> Deployment Costs <b>At</b> this stage it is disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA system shange 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. <b>AMS</b> Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS • Safety: maintained • Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities • Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the des	commercial and GA	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Additionally, this option has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic lows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure his location could lead to extended track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This could regatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Training Costs Tight procedures change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training taff if required. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Other Costs No other operator costs are foreseen. <b>Niport / ANSP</b> 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 adaptations. <b>Niport / ANSP</b> Operational Costs <b>Niport / ANSP</b> Deployment costs and assistants via the use of various air traffic simulators (including im prep, management, and staffing), with additional system engineering costs. <b>NMS</b> Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS • Safety: maintained • Singhification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. 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 Co <sub>2</sub> emission <b>Qualitative Safety Assessment</b> • Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design • Enviro	GA/Commercial Airl	ines Fuel Burn
lows causing additional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure his location could lead to extended track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This cou legatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Training Costs Tight procedures change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, training taff if required. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Other Costs To other operator costs are foreseen. <b>Nirpotr / ANSP</b> 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 adaptations. <b>Nirpotr / ANSP</b> Operational Costs This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts. <b>Nirpotr / ANSP</b> Operational Costs This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts. <b>Nirpotr / ANSP</b> Deployment Costs <b>Nirpotr / ANSP</b> Deployment Costs <b>Nirp</b>	This design option is	s an optimised version of today which could improve the approach phase from the hold to 7,000ft.
his location could lead to extended track distance and increased network fuel burn to deconflict the arrival structures. This couregatively impact all LTMA traffic – commercial and GA. Commercial Airlines Training Costs Commercial Airlines Other Costs Commercial Airlines Other Costs Vo other operator costs are foreseen. Airport / ANSP Infrastructure Costs Commercial Costs Commercial Airlines Other Costs Commercial Airlines Control Air Commercial Costs Commercial Airlines Commercial Costs Commercial Costs Commercial Airlines Commercial Costs Comme	Additionally, this opt	tion has the potential to raise the holding height. However, this location partially aligns with airport traffic
negatively 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         Namercial Airlines       Infrastructure Costs         No other operator costs are foreseen.       Airport / ANSP         Operational Costs       Infrastructure Costs         This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase which will require some systems engineering adaptations.         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         Safety: maintained       Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport cap	flows causing additi	ional track miles for LTMA aircraft. Overall, could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline. A structure i
Commercial Airlines       Training Costs         Fight 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       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 adaptations.         Airport / ANSP       Operational Costs         This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.         Airport / ANSP       Deployment Costs         This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.         Airport / ANSP       Deployment 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 chanage 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		
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.       No         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 adaptations.         Airport / ANSP       Operational Costs         This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.         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         • Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities         • Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and securit	negatively impact al	Il LTMA traffic – commercial and GA.
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 adaptations. 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. MMS Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS  • Safety: maintained • Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse     network capacity. 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 CO <sub>2</sub> emission Cualitative Safety Assessment A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curre 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough ar Conclusion from IOA Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		
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 adaptations.         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         •       Safety: maintained         •       Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. 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 emission         Qualitative Safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curre safety performance. There are multiple holds within current UK air		
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 adaptations.           Airport / ANSP         Operational Costs           This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.           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           •         Safety: maintained           •         Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities           •         Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design           •         Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design </td <td></td> <td></td>		
<ul> <li>Airport / ANSP Infrastructure Costs</li> <li>This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase which will require some systems engineering adaptations.</li> <li>Airport / ANSP Operational Costs</li> <li>This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.</li> <li>Airport / ANSP Deployment Costs</li> <li>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.</li> <li>AMS Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS</li> <li>Safety: maintained</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curres afety 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough ar Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen net</li></ul>		
This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase which will require some systems engineering adaptations. 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 Safety: maintained Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. 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 CO <sub>2</sub> emission Cualitative Safety Assessment A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curres afety 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough ar Southampton traffic. Conclusion from IOA Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.	No other operator c	
<ul> <li>will require some systems engineering adaptations.</li> <li>Airport / ANSP Operational Costs</li> <li>This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.</li> <li>Airport / ANSP Deployment Costs</li> <li>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.</li> <li>AMS Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS</li> <li>Safety: maintained</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curre 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough ar Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.</li> </ul>	Airport / ANSP	Infrastructure Costs
<ul> <li>Airport / ANSP Operational Costs</li> <li>This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.</li> <li>Airport / ANSP Deployment Costs</li> <li>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.</li> <li>AMS Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS</li> <li>Safety: maintained</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain currer 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough ar Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>This design option is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.</li> <li>Airport / ANSP Deployment Costs</li> <li>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.</li> <li>AMS Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS</li> <li>Safety: maintained</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curres 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough ar Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Airport / ANSP Deployment Costs</li> <li>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.</li> <li>AMS Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS</li> <li>Safety: maintained</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curres aftery 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough ar Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.</li> </ul>		•
<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>AMS Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS</li> <li>Safety: maintained</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> </ul> Qualitative Safety Assessment A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curres afety 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough ar Southampton traffic. Conclusion from IOA Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		
<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>AMS Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS</li> <li>Safety: maintained</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain currer 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough ar Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>sim prep, management, and staffing), with additional system engineering costs.</li> <li>AMS Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS</li> <li>Safety: maintained</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curres 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough ar Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>AMS Performance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS</li> <li>Safety: maintained</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curree 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough an Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Safety: maintained</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> </ul> Qualitative Safety Assessment A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curres 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough an Southampton traffic. Conclusion from IOA Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		
<ul> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worse network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curres 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough an Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curres 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough an Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.</li> </ul>	Simplifica	tion: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and ATCO workload. Could worser
<ul> <li>Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO<sub>2</sub> emission</li> <li>Qualitative Safety Assessment</li> <li>A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain currer 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough an Southampton traffic.</li> <li>Conclusion from IOA</li> <li>Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.</li> </ul>		
Qualitative Safety Assessment         A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curres         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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough an         Southampton traffic.         Conclusion from IOA         Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption,         disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		
A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that an Inner Hold to the southwest would at least maintain curre 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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough an Southampton traffic. Conclusion from IOA Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		
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 Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough an Southampton traffic. Conclusion from IOA Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		
structure in this location would need to deconflict with Gatwick and Heathrow departures, and all Bournemouth, Farnborough an Southampton traffic. Conclusion from IOA Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		
Southampton traffic. Conclusion from IOA Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		
Conclusion from IOA Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Compared to the baseline, this option would maintain safety and any current MoD access. It could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		
disruption recovery, access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.		
	disruption recovery,	access to other users, airport capacity and ATCO workload. This location could worsen network capacity.
Table 17 KK-IH-SW Initial Options Appraisal		



KK - PM - SE         Qualitative (initial impacts Assessment)         PROGRESS           Group         Impact         Impact         Communities         Noise impact on health and quality of life           ANG (2017) states 'at or above 7.000ftminimising 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, AON and NPs below 7.000ft. In this network-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7.000ft thread in an at occursible and tranquility.           Communities         Air Quality         Communities         Air Quality           ANG (2017) states 'arrissions 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 could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline.           However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions compared with the baseline.         Wider Society         Capacity / Resilience           Capacity: This option could maintain airport capacity, providing capacity actoday plus additional delay absorption by flying the point Merge structure. This option could provide similar holing capacity at cotaly plus additional delay absorption by flying the Point Merge facility to the southeast would hikely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffi is unlikely to change
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 roise and transquillty impacts where the proposal, has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, ANN and NPs below 7,000ft. In this network-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts ar 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 mages.           Wider Society         Greenhouse Gas Impacts           This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline.           However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, 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. Other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so coul aintain network capacity compared with the baseline.           Resilience: Disruption recovery could be similar to the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>6</sup> utilised in the event of unplanee runway closure. This option could provide similar holding capacity as today plus additional delay absorption by flying the point Merge structure. Therefore, it could maintain delay absorptio
ANG (2017) states "at or above 7,000ftminimising of noise is no longer a priority". CAP1616 instructs sponsors to consider noise and tranquillity impacts where the proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts at not considered. Communitie 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 quali impacts. Wider Society Greenhouse Gas Impacts Wider Society Capacity / Resilience Capacity This location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions compared with the baseline. Gapacity: This option could maintain airport capacity, providing the same number of holds as the baseline. Other non- airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so coul maintain network capacity compared with the baseline. Resilience: Disruption recovery could be similar to the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>5</sup> utilised in the event of unplane runway closure. Therefore, it could maintain airpot capacity as today plus additional delay absorption by flying the Point Merge facility to the southeast would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffit is unlikely to change compared with the baseline. GA/Commercial Airlines Evended Track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with be baseline. A Point Merge could enable positive economic impact sthrough capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option could provide similar total capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option could result in extended track mil
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 and the state of the
Changes would occur at or above 7,000ft, thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air qual impacts. Wider Society Greenhouse Gas Impacts This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, 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. Other non- airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so coul maintain network capacity compared with the baseline. Resilience: Disruption recovery could be similar to the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>5</sup> utilised in the event of unplane. Resilience: Disruption recovery could provide similar holding capacity as today plus additional delay absorption by flying the Point Merge structure. Therefore, it could maintain delay absorption compared with the baseline. General Aviation (GA) Access A Point Merge 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 A Point Merge could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. No impact on GA is expected. GA/Commercial Airlines Fuel Burn This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with baseline for commercial operators. No change in impact is e
This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, could maintain GHG emissions compared with the baseline Wider Society Capacity / Resilience Capacity: This option could maintain airport capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so could maintain network capacity compared with the baseline. Resilience: Disruption recovery could be similar to the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>5</sup> utilised in the event of unplanner runway closure. This option could provide similar to the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>5</sup> utilised in the event of unplanner runway closure. This option could provide similar holding capacity as today plus additional delay absorption by flying the Point Merge structure. Therefore, it could maintain delay absorption compared with the baseline. General Aviation (GA) Access A Point Merge 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 A Point Merge could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. No impact on GA is expected. GA/Commercial Airlines Fuel Burn This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for 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
However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, 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. Other non- airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so could maintain network capacity compared with the baseline. Resilience: Disruption recovery could be similar to the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>5</sup> utilised in the event of unplanner runway closure. This option could provide similar holding capacity as today plus additional delay absorption by flying the Point Merge structure. Therefore, it could maintain delay absorption compared with the baseline. General Aviation (GA) Access A Point Merge facility to the southeast would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffi is unlikely to change compared with the baseline. GA/Commercial Airlines Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity A Point Merge could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. No impact on GA is expected. GA/Commercial Airlines Fuel Burn This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for 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. No other operator costs are foreseen.
Capacity: This option could maintain airport capacity, providing the same number of holds as the baseline. Other non- airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so could maintain network capacity compared with the baseline. Resilience: Disruption recovery could be similar to the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>5</sup> utilised in the event of unplanner runway closure. This option could provide similar holding capacity as today plus additional delay absorption by flying the Point Merge structure. Therefore, it could maintain delay absorption compared with the baseline. <b>General Aviation (GA)</b> Access A Point Merge facility to the southeast would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffi is unlikely to change compared with the baseline. <b>GA/Commercial Airlines</b> Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity A Point Merge could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. No impact on GA is expected. <b>GA/Commercial Airlines</b> Fuel Burn This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators. No change in impact is expected for GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> 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. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Other Costs No other operator costs are foreseen.
airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so coul maintain network capacity compared with the baseline. Resilience: Disruption recovery could be similar to the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>5</sup> utilised in the event of unplanner runway closure. This option could provide similar holding capacity as today plus additional delay absorption by flying the Point Merge structure. Therefore, it could maintain delay absorption compared with the baseline. <b>General Aviation (GA)</b> Access A Point Merge facility to the southeast would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffi is unlikely to change compared with the baseline. <b>GA/Commercial Airlines</b> Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity A Point Merge could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. No impact on GA is expected. <b>GA/Commercial Airlines</b> Fuel Burn This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with baseline for commercial operators. No change in impact is expected for GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> 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. No other operator costs are foreseen.
General Aviation (GA)       Access         A Point Merge facility to the southeast would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffi         is unlikely to change compared with the baseline.         GA/Commercial Airlines       Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity         A Point Merge could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick.         This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design.         No impact on GA is expected.         GA/Commercial Airlines       Fuel Burn         This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline.         However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators.         No change in impact is expected for 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.         No other operator costs are foreseen.       No other operator costs are foreseen.
A Point Merge facility to the southeast would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffi is unlikely to change compared with the baseline. <b>GA/Commercial Airlines</b> Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity A Point Merge could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. No impact on GA is expected. <b>GA/Commercial Airlines</b> Fuel Burn This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators. No change in impact is expected for GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> 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. No other operator costs are foreseen.
is unlikely to change compared with the baseline. <b>GA/Commercial Airlines</b> Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity A Point Merge could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. No impact on GA is expected. <b>GA/Commercial Airlines</b> Fuel Burn This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators. No change in impact is expected for GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> 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. No other operator costs are foreseen.
GA/Commercial Airlines       Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity         A Point Merge could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick.         This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design.         No impact on GA is expected.         GA/Commercial Airlines       Fuel Burn         This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline.         However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators.         No change in impact is expected for GA.         Commercial Airlines         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.         No other operator costs are foreseen.
A Point Merge could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. No impact on GA is expected. <b>GA/Commercial Airlines</b> Fuel Burn This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators. No change in impact is expected for GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> 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. No other operator costs are foreseen.
may hinder overall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. No impact on GA is expected. <b>GA/Commercial Airlines</b> Fuel Burn This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators. No change in impact is expected for GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> 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. No other operator costs are foreseen.
No impact on GA is expected. GA/Commercial Airlines Fuel Burn This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators. No change in impact is expected for 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. No other operator costs are foreseen.
GA/Commercial Airlines       Fuel Burn         This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline.         However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators.         No change in impact is expected for 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.
This design option could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline. However, this location aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators. No change in impact is expected for GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> 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. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Other Costs No other operator costs are foreseen.
No change in impact is expected for GA. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> 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. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Other Costs No other operator costs are foreseen.
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.
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. <b>Commercial Airlines</b> Other Costs No other operator costs are foreseen.
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 adaptations.
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> <li>Safety: could enhance</li> <li>Simplification: could maintain delay absorption, disruption recovery, airport capacity, and network capacity. Cou improves ATCO workload. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Integration of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the design</li> </ul>
Environmental sustainability: could maintain CO <sub>2</sub> emissions

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The positioning and altitude of this contingency hold would be the subject of collaborative work with the airport in Stage 3.



A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that a Point Merge to the southeast could enhance current safety performance. There is already a Point Merge within current UK airspace which has a proven safety performance. A Point Merge may decrease controller workload by reducing the requirement for tactical intervention due to aircraft following a systemised structure. An arrival structure in this location would need to deconflict with Bournemouth, Farnborough, Heathrow and Southampton traffic.

#### Conclusion from IOA

Compared to the baseline, this option could improve safety, and ATCO workload. It would maintain any current MoD access and could maintain delay absorption, resilience, fuel burn, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, airport capacity, network capacity, and access to other users.

Therefore, KK – PM – SE is progressed to Stage 3 for further development.

Table 18 KK-PM-SE Initial Options Appraisal



	litative Initial Impacts Assessment PROGRESSE
Group	Impact
Communities	Noise impact on health and quality of life
	s "at or above 7,000ftminimising of noise is no longer a priority". CAP1616 instructs sponsors to
consider noise an	d tranquillity impacts where the proposal has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, AONB
and NPs below 7,0	000ft. In this network-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are
not considered.	
Communities	Air Quality
	s "emissions from aircraft above 1,000ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality".
	ccur 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
	n would result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline.
	ation aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain GHG emissions compared with the
baseline.	
Wider Society	Capacity / Resilience
	ion could maintain airport capacity, providing the same number of holds as the baseline. Other non-
airspace constrair	nts may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so could
maintain network	capacity compared with the baseline.
Resilience: Disrup	tion recovery could be maintained compared with the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>6</sup> utilised in the
	d runway closure. This option could provide similar holding capacity as today plus additional delay
	ng the Point Merge structure. Therefore, it could maintain delay absorption compared with the baseline.
General Aviation (	
	ility to the south would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffic is
	e compared with the baseline.
	irlines Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity
	uld enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however other non-airspace constraints
	I capacity and economic gains at Gatwick.
	with network traffic flows, which could enable capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved
network design.	
No impact on GA	
	irlines Fuel Burn
	n could result in extended track miles to complete the Point Merge structure, compared with baseline.
However, this loca	ation aligns with airport traffic flows. Overall, it could maintain fuel burn compared with the baseline for
commercial opera	itors.
No change in imp	act is expected for GA.
Commercial Airlin	es Training Costs
	change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly,
	quired. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators.
Commercial Airlin	
	costs are foreseen.
Airport / ANSP	Infrastructure Costs
	n is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase
	some systems engineering adaptations.
Airport / ANSP	Operational Costs
This design optior	n is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.
Airport / ANSP	Deployment Costs
•	disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA
	ould involve training a large number of controllers and assistants via the use of various air traffic
	ling sim prep, management, and staffing), with additional system engineering costs.
	mance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS
	ould enhance
	ation: could improve ATCO workload, maintain delay absorption, maintain disruption recovery, maintain
	apacity, and maintain network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities
	on of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the
-	on or diverse users, continues to integrate detence and security and on, subject to constraints of the
design	nental sustainability: could maintain $CO_2$ emissions

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The positioning and altitude of this contingency hold would be the subject of collaborative work with the airport in Stage 3.



A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that a Point Merge to the south could enhance current safety performance. There is already a Point Merge within current UK airspace which has a proven safety performance. A Point Merge may decrease controller workload by reducing the requirement for tactical intervention due to aircraft following a systemised structure. An arrival structure in this location would need to deconflict with all Bournemouth, Farnborough, Heathrow and Southampton traffic.

#### Conclusion from IOA

Compared to the baseline, this option could improve safety, and ATCO workload. It would maintain any current MoD access and could maintain delay absorption, resilience, fuel burn, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, airport capacity, network capacity, and access to other users.

Therefore, KK – PM – S is progressed to Stage 3 for further development.

Table 19 KK-PM-S Initial Options Appraisal



	Qualitative Initial Impacts Assessment PROGRESSE
Group	Impact
Communities	Noise impact on health and quality of life
consider noise	tes "at or above 7,000ftminimising of noise is no longer a priority". CAP1616 instructs sponsors to and tranquillity impacts where the proposal has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, AONB 7,000ft. In this network-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are
Communities	Air Quality
	tes "emissions from aircraft above 1,000ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality". occur at or above 7,000ft, thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air qualit
Wider Society	Greenhouse Gas Impacts
	ion could result in extended track miles to complete the Switch Merge structure, compared with baseline.
However, this lo	ocation aligns with airport traffic flows and the structure can be orientated to the runway in use. Overall, it GHG emissions compared with the baseline.
Wider Society	Capacity / Resilience
Capacity: This c airspace constr maintain netwo Resilience: Disr runway closure	option could maintain airport capacity, providing the same number of holds as the baseline. Other non- aints may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so could rk capacity compared with the baseline. uption recovery could be similar to the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>7</sup> utilised in the event of unplanned . This option could provide similar holding capacity as today plus additional delay absorption by flying the tructure. Therefore, it could maintain delay absorption compared with the baseline.
General Aviatio	
A Switch Merge	e facility to the southeast would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA y to change compared with the baseline.
	I Airlines Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity
	e could enable positive economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints
may hinder ove	rall capacity and economic gains at Gatwick. This option aligns with network traffic flows, which could gains across the LTMA from an improved network design. No impact on GA is expected.
	I Airlines Fuel Burn
This design opt However, this lo could maintain	ion could result in extended track miles to complete the Switch Merge structure, compared with baseline. ocation aligns with airport traffic flows and the structure can be orientated to the runway in use. Overall, it fuel burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators. npact is expected for GA.
	lines Training Costs
Flight procedur	es change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly, required. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators.
Commercial Air	lines Other Costs
No other opera	tor costs are foreseen.
Airport / ANSP	Infrastructure Costs
	ion is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase re some systems engineering adaptations.
Airport / ANSP	Operational Costs
	ion is not expected to change airport or ANSP operational cost impacts.
Airport / ANSP	Deployment Costs
system change	s disproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA would involve training a large number of controllers and assistants via the use of various air traffic uding sim prep, management, and staffing), with additional system engineering costs.
	formance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS
	: could enhance
• Simpli	fication: could improve ATCO workload, maintain delay absorption, maintain disruption recovery, maintain capacity, and maintain network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities
<ul> <li>Integradesign</li> </ul>	ation of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the
<ul> <li>Enviro</li> </ul>	nmental sustainability: could maintain CO $_2$ emissions

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The positioning and altitude of this contingency hold would be the subject of collaborative work with the airport in Stage 3.



A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that a Switch Merge to the southeast could enhance current safety performance. Although there are not currently any Switch Merges used within UK airspace, there is already a Point Merge which has a proven safety performance. A Point Merge may decrease controller workload by reducing the requirement for tactical intervention due to aircraft following a systemised structure. Method of operation will be configured to support switching runway ends. An arrival structure in this location would need to deconflict with all Bournemouth, Farnborough, Heathrow and Southampton traffic.

#### Conclusion from IOA

Compared to the baseline, this option could improve safety, and ATCO workload. It would maintain any current MoD access and could maintain delay absorption, resilience, fuel burn, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, airport capacity, network capacity, and access to other users.

Therefore, KK – SM – SE is progressed to Stage 3 for further development.

Table 20 KK-SM-SE Initial Options Appraisal



	tative Initial Impacts Assessment PROGRESSE
Group	Impact
Communities	Noise impact on health and quality of life
	"at or above 7,000ftminimising of noise is no longer a priority". CAP1616 instructs sponsors to
	I tranquillity impacts where the proposal has the potential to change overflight of inhabited areas, AONB
not considered.	00ft. In this network-level proposal, changes would not occur below 7,000ft therefore these impacts are
Communities	Air Quality
	Air Quality "emissions from aircraft above 1,000 ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality".
	cur at or above 7,000ft, thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local air quality.
impacts.	cur at of above 7,000H, thus in accordance with ANG (2017) there would be no change in local all qualit
Wider Society	Greenhouse Gas Impacts
	could result in extended track miles to complete the Switch Merge structure, compared with baseline.
	tion aligns with airport traffic flows and the structure can be orientated to the runway in use. Overall, it
	G emissions compared with the baseline.
Wider Society	Capacity / Resilience
	on could maintain airport capacity, providing the same number of holds as the baseline. Other non-
	ts may hinder overall capacity gains at Gatwick. This location aligns with network traffic flows so could
	capacity compared with the baseline.
	ion recovery could be similar to the baseline, with a contingency hold <sup>8</sup> utilised in the event of unplanned
	nis option could provide similar holding capacity as today plus additional delay absorption by flying the
	cture. Therefore, it could maintain delay absorption compared with the baseline.
General Aviation (G	· ·
-	cility to the south would likely be within current day CAS. As a result, the access impact on GA traffic is
	compared with the baseline.
	rlines Economic Impact from Increased Effective Capacity
	uld enable economic impacts through capacity gains; however, other non-airspace constraints may
	city and economic gains at Gatwick.
	with network traffic flows, which enables capacity gains across the LTMA from an improved network
	in impact is expected for GA.
GA/Commercial Ai	
	could result in extended track miles to complete the Switch Merge structure, compared with baseline.
	tion aligns with airport traffic flows and the structure can be orientated to the runway in use. Overall, it
	I burn compared with the baseline for commercial operators. No impact on GA is expected.
Commercial Airline	•
	change worldwide with each AIRAC cycle and operators would update their procedures accordingly,
	uired. This option is not anticipated to impose additional training cost impacts for operators.
Commercial Airline	s Other Costs
No other operator (	costs are foreseen.
Airport / ANSP	Infrastructure Costs
	is not expected to change airport or ANSP infrastructure impacts, beyond the initial deployment phase
which will require s	ome systems engineering adaptations.
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 d	isproportionate to attempt to quantify deployment costs per design option. However, a large LTMA
system change wo	uld involve training a large number of controllers and assistants via the use of various air traffic
simulators (includi	ng sim prep, management, and staffing), with additional system engineering costs.
	nance against the vision and parameters/strategic objectives of the AMS
	uld enhance
	tion: could improve ATCO workload, maintain delay absorption, maintain disruption recovery, maintain
	pacity, and maintain network capacity. Will utilise aircraft performance capabilities
	n of diverse users: continues to integrate defence and security and GA, subject to constraints of the
design	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> The positioning and altitude of this contingency hold would be the subject of collaborative work with the airport in Stage 3.



A high-level safety appraisal for this proposed option indicates that a Switch Merge to the south could enhance current safety performance. Although there are not currently any Switch Merges used within UK airspace, there is already a Point Merge which has a proven safety performance. A Point Merge may decrease controller workload by reducing the requirement for tactical intervention due to aircraft following a systemised structure. Method of operation will be configured to support switching runway ends. An arrival structure in this location would need to deconflict with Gatwick and Heathrow departures and all traffic from Bournemouth, Farnborough and Southampton.

### Conclusion from IOA

Compared to the baseline, this option could improve safety, and ATCO workload. It would maintain any current MoD access and could maintain delay absorption, resilience, fuel burn, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, airport capacity, network capacity, and access to other users.

#### Therefore, KK – SM – S is progressed to Stage 3 for further development.

Table 21 KK-SM-S 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 Gatwick, 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
Gatwick	15	11	7	7

 Table 22 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:

Gatwick Option Concepts progressed to Stage 3			
Inner Holds – Southeast (DM)			
Inner Holds – South (DM) (Maybe shared)			
Inner Holds – Southwest			
Point merge – Southeast			
Point merge – South			
Switch merge – Southeast			
Switch merge – South			

Table 23 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:

Diagram	Description
Diagram	Description
A A A	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.
	As above, but would typically be higher. This design is for holds c.30nm-60nm from the airport.
	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.
	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.
6 Arrival structure concepts (at and above	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.
	Diagram

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See paragraph 2.2.10 of Master document for explanation of 'Optimised'



End of document