



AIRSPACE MODERNISATION

AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL

STEP 2B APPENDIX D - OPTIONS SHORTLISTING WORKSHOP



Stage 2 Re-submission: Workshop on Shortlisting of Options

Wednesday 22 May 2024

Attendees:

- █ (HAL, ACP Lead)
- █ (HAL, ATC Expert)
- █ (Independent aviation consultant & stakeholder engagement expert)
- █ (Trax consultant, ATC and ACP Expert)
- █ (NCL consultant, Noise Assessment Expert)

1.1	█	Thanked everyone for attending and introduced the purpose of the session: to meet steps 2, 3 and 4 as set out in the CAA's letter
1.2	█	Clarified that all decisions taken today would be: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reviewed by our legal advisor for consistency against policy and guidance, and 2. Ratified by Heathrow's Airspace and ATM Governance Group
<i>Step 2: Take into account any views on the proposed shortlisting methodology received from those stakeholders</i>		
2.1	█	Took the group through the summary of feedback received from stakeholders in relation to our shortlisting methodology.
2.2	█	Interesting that feedback on moving Tests 4 and 5 to Stage 3 was mixed. It's good to have support for the proposal, but we need to understand the objections more carefully.
2.3	█	Objections generally related to a feeling that Heathrow was placing less importance on AONBs or on Richmond Park by not using these as factors for discontinuation at Stage 2.
2.4	█	We know this is not the case and that we have made strong commitments regarding minimising the impacts to these specific areas at Stage 3. We want to make decisions based on more robust data, and when we have system options so that we better understand how these areas might be overflowed by the complete system.
2.5	█	Some of the stakeholders made statements regarding the importance of AONBs or of Richmond Park. They also asked that we consider potential new legislation for AONBs and potential expansions to these areas.
2.6	█	Ok. At Stage 3 we will have a much stronger evidence base on which to assess these areas for tranquillity and amenity impacts. And we will of course continue to review and monitor for changes in legislation.
2.7	█	Quite a few stakeholders queried the definition of 'local circumstances' and asked whether we could consider treating their local park in the same way we are treating Richmond Park.
2.8	█	It's right that we commit to looking at these suggestions. We have compiled a list based on stakeholder feedback and a review of these locations can be undertaken at Stage 3.
2.9	█	I agree. We have databases with information on all the parks in the south-east of England so we can support this exercise.

2.10	■	Are we all content that Stage 3 is the right time to do this? Or should we be incorporating this into our methodology now?
2.11	■	It makes sense for us to consider these specific areas at Stage 3 when we are compiling system options and considering tranquillity impacts, since all of these suggested locations are parks or gardens. The time of day that the flight path would be in operation is also relevant and we will know more about that at Stage 3 when we are looking at options for how respite will be overlaid onto the options.
2.12	■	These potential local circumstances were not suggested to us before now so we won't have DPE or IOA data for them. Stage 3 is going to require a more accurate geographical assessment of the options so it makes sense for us to consider these at that stage.
2.13	■	We also had some feedback that we should not be prioritising Richmond Park over the people who live nearby and don't want aircraft disturbing their sleep.
2.14	■	That is interesting and further supports the need for further investigation of impacts to both the park and the surrounding area at Stage 3.
2.15	■	Tests 1 – 3 have no regard for who is overflown: they treat everyone equally. This is appropriate at this early stage of route assessment where the routes have been prepared having regard to the design principles. Specific local circumstances can be better considered at Stage 3 once we have route options within a system.
2.16	All agreed that none of the feedback indicates that we should reinstate consideration of Tests 4 and 5 at Stage 2	
3.1	■	Took the group through the wider feedback on our proposed shortlisting approach.
3.2	■	A few stakeholders queried our definition of "significant" when shortlisting options. These comments were also linked to feedback that stakeholders would like greater transparency in how we undertook the shortlisting.
3.3	■	That's understandable. I think we should review and update the Stage 2 documents with this mind, so that stakeholders (and the CAA) can easily see the results for each runway set, rather than needing to look at all of the dashboards.
3.4	All agreed that the shortlisting process should be transparent to stakeholders.	
3.5	■	We also need to demonstrate to the CAA that the shortlisting has been undertaken transparently, consistently and objectively. This should be evident to our stakeholders too.
	■	We do need to be clear that in declaring something "significant" these tests are being applied in the context of the specific set of options for arrivals/departures to/from a specific runway end. Significance is assessed based on a percentage change and is a relative assessment for this stage of the ACP only.
3.6	■	It will never be possible to identify one threshold for "significant" across the various options – we know that the impacts from easterly operations differ to those from westerly ops, and that arrivals and departures have different impacts.

3.7	■	Yes agree. It would make sense for us to use percentage changes in presenting the shortlisting so it is clear that we are comparing each option to the relevant baseline in a relative comparison, rather than comparing absolute numbers.
3.8	■	Agree. I think this will be easier for stakeholders to understand as well – if we say that X thousand fewer people are experiencing noise events based on an option then it holds less context than if we say 20% fewer people experience noise.
3.9		All agreed that the shortlisting process would be based on percentage changes to the baseline and each set of options would be assessed as an independent runway set., Also agreed that the results would be shown in tables by runway set.
4.1	■	Took the group through the feedback on our approach to engagement and through other feedback/queries.
4.2	■	I think the proposed Heathrow responses in here cover all of the points we can make.
4.3	■	Is there anything else in here that anyone thinks we should take account of when deciding what our shortlisting approach will be?
		<i>Step 3: Make a fresh decision on a shortlisting methodology</i>
5.1	■	Reminded the group of the proposed shortlisting methodology. Does anything in here indicate that the proposed approach we shared in the engagement material is not appropriate?
5.2		All agreed that the proposed shortlisting approach was considered appropriate.
		<i>Step 4: Apply the chosen shortlisting methodology to our flight path options objectively, consistently and transparently</i>
6.1	■	Shared a spreadsheet with all of the relevant IOA data, shown by runway set. Suggest we start with departures and work through each runway end, applying each of the Tests 1-4 in turn.
6.2		SIDS 27L: All agreed that 3 options should be discontinued (B, C, D)
6.3		SIDS 27R: All agreed that 3 options should be discontinued (B, C, D)
6.4		SIDS 09L: All agreed that no options should be discontinued due to there being no baseline data to compare against (runway 09L isn't routinely used for departures today). These options should all be further assessed at Stage 3 when we can better understand their relative impacts compared with each other (and once they are considered in a system).
6.5		SIDS 09R: All agreed that 4 options should be discontinued (A, D, E, H)
6.6		All reviewed the runway sets and agreed that 10 departure options should be discontinued at this stage. The remaining 26 departure options should be shortlisted for consideration and assessment at Stage 3.
6.7		PBN Arrivals 27L: All agreed that 3 options should be discontinued (I, J, K)
6.8		PBN Arrivals 27R: All agreed that 1 option should be discontinued (L)
6.9		PBN Arrivals 09L: All agreed that 11 options should be discontinued (D-L, S, U)
6.10		PBN Arrivals 09R: All agreed that 3 options should be discontinued (I, K, R)
6.11		All reviewed the runway sets and agreed that 18 arrival options should be discontinued at this stage. The remaining 71 arrival options should be shortlisted for consideration and assessment at Stage 3.
6.12	■	Agreed to present the shortlisting decisions for legal review and for approval by the relevant Heathrow governance group.