

AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL CONSULTATION ASSESSMENT

Title of Airspace Change Proposal	Gatwick P-RNAV SIDs
Change Sponsor	NATS/GAL
DAP Project Leader	██████████
Case Study commencement date	28/06/2012
Case Study report as at	19/04/2013

Instructions

In providing a response for each question, please ensure that the 'Status' column is completed using the following options:

- **Yes**
- **No**
- **Partially**
- **N/A**

To aid the DAP Project Leader's efficient Project Management it may be useful that each question is also highlighted accordingly to illustrate what is resolved (Green), **not resolved** (Amber) or **not compliant** (Red) as part of the DAP Project Leader's efficient project management.

1.	Consultation Process	Status
1.1	<p>Is the following information complete and satisfactory?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A copy of the original proposal upon which consultation was conducted. ▪ A copy of all correspondence sent by the sponsor to consultees during consultation. ▪ A copy of all correspondence received by the sponsor from consultees during consultation. ▪ A referenced tabular summary record of consultation actions. ▪ Details of and reasons for any changes to the original proposal as a result of the consultation. ▪ Details of further consultation conducted on any revised proposal. <p>[Comments]</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>
1.2	<p>Were reasonable steps taken to ensure all necessary consultees actually received the information e.g. postal/e-mail/meeting fora?</p> <p>[Comments]</p> <p>Given that the main avenue for consultation was via GATCOM, there were adequate steps taken to ensure consultees received the required media. A number of public events were held which, on balance, proved successful</p>	<p>YES</p>
1.3	<p>What % of all operational consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p> <p>[Comments]</p> <p>This aspect was covered outside the formal consultation through direct e-mail exchange with the major carriers at Gatwick and through the FLOPSC</p>	<p>100% (7)</p>
1.4	<p>What % of all environmental consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p> <p>[Comments]</p> <p>In total 94 environmental stakeholders were involved of those 25 (26%) did not respond. 56% objected to one or more of the proposed routes, 11% had no comment or did not object and 7% supported the proposals. The majority of objections concerned Route 2 and its slight displacement towards East Grinstead</p>	<p>73% (69)</p>
1.5	<p>Were reasonable steps taken to ensure as much substantive feedback was obtained from the consultees e.g. through follow-up letters/phone calls?</p>	<p></p>

	<p>[Comments]</p> <p>It is apparent that there was close liaison between GAL and GATCOM during the consultation and the public events were instrumental in raising the profile of the consultation, although there is no evidence that hastening emails were used. That said, the relatively high response rate indicated a high level of public interest in the communities surrounding the airport beneath its departure routes.</p>
1.6	<p>Have all objections to the change proposal been resolved (or sufficiently mitigated)?</p>

YES

[Comments, with input from DAP Project Leader]

Proposal.

- Route 2 generated the most objections due to the slight displacement of the departure track towards East Grinstead. The sponsor confirmed within the Feedback Report that the design criteria for RNP SIDs did not allow for this displacement to be resolved.

Process.

- A process objection was lodged by GATCAN concerning the conduct of the consultation, mainly based on the requirements of CAP 725 (guidance rather than mandatory requirement). However, the Framework Briefing had considered that departure from the guidance was reasonable given the nature of the proposal. Specifically, the use of the Airport's Consultation Committee as a vehicle for consultation was agreed at Framework Briefing as an acceptable way of reducing the consultation burden for SID replication and the associated environmental considerations. The stakeholder list was agreed at Framework Briefing and was considered adequate. Whilst GATCAN considered that other organisations should have been concluded, the result would have been a wide consultation that was not required due to the nature of the ACP (SID Replication).
- Reference by GATCAN to the range of environmental assessments, referenced in CAP 725 that 'should' be undertaken, but in their view were not has been dealt with in the Annex E (Environmental Report). Due to the nature of the change, neither L_{eq} nor SEL footprints were required for the proposal; no other noise metrics were deemed essential by CAP 725
- A charge was initially made that the consultation was 'closed' as it was solely directed at GATCOM; however, the Consultation Media had been published on the GAL website with an invite for anyone to respond. Whilst initially this was not wholly satisfactory as the sponsor neglected to issue publicity pointing individuals to the website despite CAA advice; this was categorised as an oversight by the sponsor and duly rectified whilst the consultation was still live
- The quality of diagrams was initially poor (despite this being highlighted by the Case Officer prior to the consultation), the sponsor was required to undertake remedial work to address this issue and the diagrams were reissued mid-consultation.
- Further issues were raised as to the part played by some members of GATCOM in not passing details of the proposal on to their own organisations (councils, residents' groups) for consideration. This issue was covered in part by the sponsor independently targeting local councils to ensure that they were aware of the consultation. Moreover, GATCOM minutes clearly indicate that members were briefed on the expectation that information would be cascaded to represented organisations. Suggestions that GATCOM would take editorial control over the response to the consultation were not borne out by the responses reviewed as part of the consultation assessment that indicated a good level of transparency
- A number of public meetings were held that generated criticism from individuals associated with local noise pressure groups regarding GAL's clarity of presentation and lack of content. In their consultation submission to the CAA, GAL provided evidence of e-mail exchanges containing positive comments from the Parish Councils concerned regarding the standard of the presentations that had been provided.

Outstanding Issues		
Serial	Issue	Action Required
	N/A	

Additional Compliance Requirements (to be satisfied by Change Sponsor)	
Serial	Requirement
	N/A

Recommendations	Yes/No
Does the Consultation Report and associated material meet DAP requirements?	YES
[Comments]	
The consultation report and associated material met DAP requirements.	

General Summary

Given the high level of public interest in Gatwick operations, the level of engagement was as expected. The actions of the sponsor in conducting the consultation were adequate despite the fact that a number of issues had been raised by DAP prior to and during the consultation and these were not acted upon until further pressure was brought to bear – a somewhat reactive approach that was criticised by some of the consultees who were

opposed to some of the changes.
Comments
N/A
Observations
Given the environmental sensitivity of proposals such as these in the vicinity of airports, it was unsurprising that some respondents chose to challenge the application of the process rather than commenting on the proposals themselves. Whilst the use of the consultative committee has proved to be a suitable vehicle for consultation there have been some weaknesses that could have been mitigated by a better understanding of the limitations of using these standing forums; we will ensure that the sponsors of future consultations of this nature have specific, consistent guidance on the process, (our) expectations and the issues that may arise.

Consultation Assessment Sign-off/Approvals			
	Name	Signature	Date
Consultation Assessment completed by (APCC Representative)	██████████	██████████	19/04/2013
Consultation Assessment approved by (Head of APCC)	██████████	██████████	19/04/2013

DAP Comment/Approval		
Name	Signature	Date