

London Airspace Consultation Question Summary

This document lists the questions presented in the London Airspace Consultation document. It has been provided at the request of GATCOM.

The consultation document has been split into separate parts to help stakeholders focus on their areas of interest and on the questions that specifically relate to those areas. Not all questions are relevant to all areas.

The full list of questions presented here are in the order they arise when reading the document fully through from Part A to G.

It is recommended that the online response form is used to submit answers (select the 'leave your feedback' button at www.londonairspaceconsultation.co.uk). This allows you to select areas of interest and tailors the questions accordingly.

Should you wish to have the opportunity to answer all the questions, please select all the options offered in the online form on the page labelled Part 2: Consultation Questions.

List of consultation questions:

1

Gatwick Airport is seeking to realign all Runway 26 departure routes below 4,000ft to help make best use of the existing runway.

Please indicate the extent to which you support or oppose this objective to realign all Runway 26 departure routes below 4,000ft to help make best use of the existing Runway.

Please state the reasons why you support or oppose this objective.

2

This proposal is considering extra routes to enable periods of respite. This would mean implementing two routes in a particular direction instead of one, with a schedule for using each route to provide periods of relative respite for people living in the area beneath the routes. While this would provide respite, it would also increase the geographic area regularly exposed to noise.

Please indicate the extent to which you support or oppose this objective of providing respite routes, given that it potentially impacts more people in order to offer respite.

Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the objective of providing respite routes.

3

Please indicate which, if any, place(s) or area(s) within the consultation swathes you think require special consideration in the on-going design process. Please describe the characteristics of these locations, stating whether they should be considered due to concerns about noise impact, visual impact and/or any other impact.

4

In what, if any, geographic locations should options be considered for altering routes for respite purposes?

What should the criteria be?

5

Altering routes to fly around environmentally sensitive areas rather than overhead is likely to mean more fuel burn and more CO₂ emissions because the altered route would usually be longer. In general, which should take precedence - minimising overflight of sensitive areas by flying a longer route around them, or flying the direct route overhead the area to keep the route shorter and minimise fuel burn and CO₂?

- Flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas should always have greater precedence than flying overhead on shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/ CO₂
- Flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas should generally have greater precedence than flying overhead on shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/ CO₂
- Flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas should be given equal weighting to flying overhead on shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/ CO₂
- Flying shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/CO₂ should generally have precedence over flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas
- Flying shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/CO₂ should always have precedence over flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas
- Don't know

What, if any, factors should be taken into account when determining the appropriate balance of flying around environmentally sensitive areas versus overhead (for instance the altitude of the aircraft may be a factor, or the frequency/timing of flight)?

6

This proposal is seeking to change the way aircraft use airspace by developing a system for managing arrivals based on Point Merge, rather than the holding stacks/vectoring currently in use.

Please indicate the extent to which you support or oppose our objective of providing a future arrival system based around Point Merge.

Please provide any additional information you think is relevant to our objective to redesign arrival routes around a Point Merge system.

7

Procedures for accommodating operators who are not compliant with the RNAV1 standard are yet to be finalised. Accommodating non-compliant operators will reduce overall system efficiency for the majority of the fleet which is RNAV1 approved.

To what extent should non-certified aircraft be accommodated (NB you may wish to highlight more than one of these options)?

- Accommodated with time restrictions
- Accommodated but with restricted route availability
- Accommodated but with potential delay
- Accommodated without restriction (and therefore reducing efficiency for all)
- Should not be accommodated at all

What, if any, comments do you have on accommodating non-certified aircraft?

8

Should fuel for the Point Merge arcs be considered part of the *contingency* fuel uplift, or part of the *flight plan* fuel uplift?

Please state the reasons why you believe fuel for the Point Merge arcs should be considered part of the *contingency* fuel uplift or part of the *flight plan* fuel uplift.

9

This proposal seeks to reduce overall fuel burn across the fleet by as much as possible even if it means some individual routes may be less fuel efficient as a consequence.

Please indicate the extent to which you support or oppose this *objective*.

Please state the reasons why you support or oppose this objective.

10

This proposal is seeking to lower some areas of controlled airspace to accommodate arrival flows

To what extent would the proposed changes affect General Aviation (GA) operations? Would they have a large impact, a medium impact, a small impact or no impact at all?

If you believe it would have an impact, please describe the operation that would potentially be affected.

11

Please provide any other information that you feel is relevant to the on-going development of the airspace covered by this consultation.

**Please go to the online questionnaire at
www.londonairspaceconsultation.co.uk to give your answers to these
questions**