



CAP 1616 – Stage 1 ‘DEFINE’ Gateway

Checklist of Requirements

ACP Reference Number	ACP-2023-033
ACP Title	London Oxford Airport - Instrument Approach Procedures - RWY01 and RWY19
Change Sponsor	Oxford Aviation Services Ltd
Consultancy (if applicable)	This ACP is currently being conducted and written by OASL; Merlin Aerospace Consulting Ltd is providing guidance as to the process
Approved Procedure Design Organisation (if applicable)	TBC
Gateway Date	28 June 2024

This checklist has been developed to ensure that Change Sponsors address relevant regulatory requirements when compiling their submissions to the CAA. Completion of this form does not in itself guarantee CAA approval. The CAA will review and assess the actual content of the Change Sponsor's submission, before making a regulatory decision on whether the relevant regulatory requirements have been addressed satisfactorily. Change Sponsors should refer to the contents of CAP 1616 and CAP 1616f for further guidance on the requirements listed below.

Gateways

To help Change Sponsors and affected stakeholders track how a proposal is progressing and to give greater certainty that the Change Sponsor is following the process correctly, the CAA applies a series of three Gateway sign-offs during the seven-stage process. A sign-off provides the CAA's

approval that relevant process requirements and guidance have been correctly followed up to that point, and gives the Change Sponsor the CAA's approval to move to the next stage in the process. The purpose is to minimise any work having to be repeated, particularly in getting the supporting documentation for consultation right.

Passing a Gateway does not predetermine the CAA's later final decision on whether to accept the Airspace Change Proposal. Where the CAA is not satisfied that the relevant process requirements have been met, it is likely that the Change Sponsor would need to revisit the stage(s) concerned. It is entirely at the CAA's discretion whether to give approval for the Change Sponsor to move beyond the Gateway.

Stage 1 'DEFINE' Gateway Requirements

Requirement		YES/N/A	Document/Section [Change Sponsor to signpost the relevant document/section]
1.	Have you provided a clear description of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives and intended outcomes • Airspace issues or opportunities • Current airspace design • History of any related previous airspace design changes • Current prevailing air traffic situation • Indication of estimated forecast traffic growth over a period of 10-years from the intended year of implementation • Potential area of impact, including any local urban and geographical features 	Yes	Statement of Need and Stakeholder Engagement Documentation ¹ , Pages 21-23; airspace requirements not known.
		Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 16
		Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 3
		Yes	There are no related design changes
		Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Pages 2-16
		Yes	Gateway Submission Document page 10, paragraph 22
		Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 1 and others

¹ The Stakeholder Engagement Document is on the Airspace Portal and within the Gateway submission document at Annex C Appendix 6.

	Requirement	YES/N/A	Document/Section [Change Sponsor to signpost the relevant document/section]
2.	Have you agreed a timeline detailing target dates for each Gateway, submission of the Formal Airspace Change Proposal and implementation with the CAA?	Yes	Airspace Portal
3.	<p>Have you provided a clear description of the Current-Day Scenario which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • airspace design: current structures, routes, flight procedures and flight behaviours/patterns • airspace usage survey and analysis: current airspace users, aircraft types, frequency/number of movements and typical altitudes • overflight and operational diagrams • operational efficiency, complexity, delays and choke points • any potential safety risks • local features below 7,000 feet: designated areas such as Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA), National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), National Scenic Areas (NSA), designated Quiet Areas etc. • European sites overflowed below 3,000 feet: Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and possible SACs, Special Protection Areas (SPA) and potential SPAs, Ramsar sites (wetlands of international importance) and proposed Ramsar sites; and compensatory habitat (areas secured to compensate for damage to SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites) • environmental impacts including current day noise and local air quality impacts on people, greenhouse gas emissions, tranquillity and biodiversity • local context: planning agreements, conditions and other relevant agreements (for example Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 agreements), noise action plans, Noise Preferential Routes or noise abatement procedures 	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 3-7</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Pages 8-14</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Pages 14 & 15</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 16</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 16</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 17</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 18</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 19-20, in addition, a noise report has been published on 13 June 2024</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 21 and Annex C</p>

Requirement		YES/N/A	Document/Section [Change Sponsor to signpost the relevant document/section]
4.	Have you developed a list of Design Principles to provide a framework against which Design Options can be developed and evaluated?	Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 19, second Stakeholder Engagement documentation, and Gateway Submission document Pages 11-22
5.	Have you explained how the Design Principles were developed? (the use of Mandatory, Discretionary and/or Bespoke Design Principles and related stakeholder engagement)	Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 19, second Stakeholder Engagement documentation, and Gateway Submission document Pages 11-22
6.	Have you explained how local context and national policy were considered when developing the Design Principles?	Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 20 for Local Context and AMS
7.	Have you explained how local circumstances and competing priorities were considered when developing the Design Principles?	Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 2 Current Day Scenario
8.	Do the Design Principles cover the criteria that will be used to inform the development of the Design Options, Initial Options Appraisal and Design Principle Evaluation?	Yes	Submission documentation and Engagement Documents
9.	Have you identified relevant stakeholders and considered their unique requirements?	Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation, Page 2 Current Day Scenario. Though some chose not to engage
10.	Have you shared the Current-Day Scenario and Design Principles with relevant stakeholders and given them the opportunity to provide related feedback?	Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation for a period of 6 weeks from 13/03/2024
11.	Have you explained and provided a rationale for the engagement approach/methodology used throughout Stage 1?	Yes	CAP1616 and Stakeholder Engagement Documentation

Requirement		YES/N/A	Document/Section [Change Sponsor to signpost the relevant document/section]
12.	Have you provided relevant engagement evidence (materials distributed, meeting/workshop presentations and minutes (where relevant), and copies of related correspondence)	Yes	Stakeholder Engagement Documentation and the Stage 1 Engagement submission
13.	Have you demonstrated what you have heard and how this feedback has or has not informed the development of the Current-Day Scenario and Design Principles?	Yes	We have taken account of Feedback with minor errors in local airfield data being corrected in the Current Day Scenario and a second 2-week Stakeholder Engagement explained what we had heard and what we proposed to change. Both the Current Scenario and DPs were fed back into the Submission document.
14.	Have you demonstrated if the Airspace Change Proposal is aligned with the Airspace Modernisation Strategy (CAP 1711) and where applicable, the relevant iteration of the airspace change masterplan.	Yes	Statement of Need and Stakeholder Engagement Documentation
15.	Have you published the relevant Stage 1 'Define' Gateway documents (redacted as appropriate) on the Airspace Change Portal?	Yes	N/A
	If the proposal been given a provisional Level 1 status, has a potentially affected area been uploaded to the Airspace Change Portal? (CAP 2385)	Yes	N/A

Please provide any additional information below which is relevant to the Stage 1 'Define' Gateway submission.

Noise Report.

Oxford does not have the capability to actively monitor noise (this is not a requirement for an airport the size of Oxford and this will not change unless it becomes a regulatory requirement) and noise contours have never been previously produced before at Oxford. To meet the needs of CAP1616, WPS has been contracted to produce a noise report and noise contours based on the current operation. Whilst it was expected that the report would be completed by the end of May 2024, the draft report contained a few textual and model errors and had to be re-run; however, owing to booked holidays within WPS, the report was issued to Oxford until 13:00 on 13 June 2024. The report has not been distributed to stakeholders as part of the engagement and the CAA has advised that if noise is included as part of the current operation that the report could be introduced at Stage 2. However, as the report is now available, it is our intent to include it as part of the Stage 1B submission to both the CAA and upload the report onto the Airspace Portal.