
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 May 2013 13:20
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Stansted Phase 1A ACP requirements

[REDACTED]

The answer to all your questions is yes. (Number 4 is a yes at the moment although if the extant trial is successful then stansted may wish to make an application to make this permanent. If this happens then we/ they will come back to you for guidance as to what is required wrt acp)

Thanks for the responds
Regards

[REDACTED]

Sent from mobile

On 10 May 2013, at 13:09 [REDACTED] wrote:

[REDACTED]

On the basis your answers are yes to my queries below (please confirm) here is the response to your query of 3 May.

The doubling of the number of aircraft overnight which will use the Stansted CLN SID is a unique change and not a gradual growth of traffic. Therefore, in the interests of all parties, this proposal is best catered for by using the Airspace Change Process where this situation may be classified under the CAP 725 Introduction paragraph vii (h) which states:

h) Changes to existing published terminal patterns and procedures where the net effect results in changes to the lateral dispersion or lowering in altitude of traffic within controlled airspace;

Here is what Stansted need to do:

Carry out noise modelling to determine the impacts to the Leq noise contours in the vicinity of the CLN and DVR SIDs (both runways) given the anticipated redistribution in traffic

Brief DfT (**before going to consultation**) on the impacts of this change and advise DfT that DAP has advised that this change is being subjected to consultation using the Stansted Airport Consultative Committee (ACC) and will include any interested parties, thus meeting the principles of CAP 725.

Conduct a consultation though the ACC, and any authorities they feel necessary to consult, including any organisations representing the interests and any persons in the locality to describe the impacts illustrating:

The justification for the change of use.

The increased utilisation.

Times of use.

That there is no change to the design of the SID.

Impacts to Leq contours (if any).

Any other environmental impact to include some kind of assessment of the noise impact beyond the Leq contours for those residents beneath the increased traffic, at 4,000ft or below. It will also have to include some consideration of whether or not the proposal will result in any increase in traffic over any tranquil areas (NPs and AONBs), and any impact on LAQ (though I expect that this will not be an issue). Obviously if any NPs or AONBs are affected then they will become consultees.

The net gains of using the re-route (I presume as per slide shown at the NATS Stakeholder event on 28 March but should include extra track miles and net fuel saving due improved climb profiles).

Notes:

1. We do not expect that a lengthy document for consultation and the Stansted part of the ACP is required given that it is an increased use causing the impacts.
2. In the ACC consultation, it must be made clear to members of that Consultative Committee (and recorded in the subsequent ACC Minutes of any associated meetings) that its members have an obligation to represent their organisations' view rather than their own and disseminate/engage as necessary to gain that view. In doing that, the sponsor will fulfil its obligation to engage even if committee member choose not to discharge that responsibility.

Issue a feedback report.

Provide the details as per consultation to NERL for NERL to include with the Lamp Phase 1a ACP package.

Specific advice is available from [REDACTED] regarding consultation and Env impacts, and of course, we need to see the consultation material before consultation commences.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 May 2013 11:07
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Stansted Phase 1A ACP requirements - Further Request
Importance: High

[REDACTED]

Further to my last, just to consolidate and confirm the complete picture, please confirm the following:

1. STN DVR/DET Conv SIDs will remain published and will only to be used at specific periods.
2. The periods of re-routing via the STN CLN SID (LCY Opening Hours or otherwise?).
3. There are no changes to the existing conventional SID designs.

4. There is no new RNAV CLN SID for STN.
5. That RAD restrictions will indicate when re-routing via CLN is required.
6. Availability of STN DVR & LYD will be indicated on the SID chart Gen Info.

On the assumption the answer is yes to all questions, I am preparing the response and will send following your confirmation.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 May 2013 08:37
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Stansted Phase 1A ACP requirements - Further Request

[REDACTED]

Thanks for the helpful clarification. LCY is of course closed on Sat afternoons and Sunday mornings, so it will important to make it clear when consultation is conducted, that the additional use of the CLN SIDs is going to take place at particular times. I hope to get back to you on this later today.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 May 2013 16:26
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Stansted Phase 1A ACP requirements - Further Request

Answers from the design team and also clarification of the LYD issue.

H24 – no need to RAD restrict it when LCY is closed so would be available at night

Rad restriction in daytime would be for all flights except Gatwick positioning flights and potentially LYD departures both of which would be subject to release.

Regarding LYD the design team have been looking into this because of the fuel implications that you noted. It is only 2 cargo flights a day but it would mean an extra 700kg of fuel. Therefore the team are considering options – either it is these are sent out via CPT which would be less additional route miles or sent via the DET SID subject to release as per above.

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 May 2013 16:15
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Stansted Phase 1A ACP requirements - Further Request
Importance: High

█

Another after thought: please confirm this will be an H24 scenario, and secondly that the STN DVR/LYD SIDs will be withdrawn, or if not H24 for example, would the DVR/LYD SIDs continue to be used when LCY is closed! Answer by 0900 tomorrow would be helpful!

Regards,

█

From: █
Sent: 07 May 2013 14:35
To: █
Subject: RE: stansted phase 1A ACP requiremnst

Yes there are winners and losers with the change. There is also some extra miles for DVRs but they benefit from better climb profile.

LYD SIDs will be worse but they are not that common therefore overall they don't effect the net benefits significantly.

Regards

█

From: █
Sent: 07 May 2013 14:30
To: █
Subject: RE: stansted phase 1A ACP requiremnst

█

Just for interest, I calculated the extra NMs for the LYD SIDs if they are re-routed via CLN – quite significant if LYD traffic re-routed via CLN?

█

From: █
Sent: 07 May 2013 14:01
To: █
Subject: RE: stansted phase 1A ACP requiremnst

█

Tried to call since we spoke. Just to clarify, you refer to the DET SIDs on a re-route via M189 to DVR. DVR and LYD SIDs currently route via DET (there is no DET SID per se). Is your proposal therefore to re-route all DVR and LYD SIDs via CLN and M189?

Regards,

█

From: █
Sent: 03 May 2013 16:42

To: [REDACTED]
Subject: stansted phase 1A ACP requiremst

[REDACTED]

At the LAMP briefing a few weeks back we spoke about whether an ACP is required for the changes at Stansted required for Phase 1A.

To remind you these are RAD restriction on use of the DET departure route, with connectivity instead being provided by following the extant CLN SID and then picking up link extant link route M189 from CLN to DVR.

This does not need RNAV redseign or replication nor changes to the SID plates themselves, it is simply a RAD restriction.

The consequence will be that all the DET traffic will instead fly the CLN SIDs as shown below (routes with red xs would not be flows except for positioning flights on LAM SID, with all DET traffic instead transferred to the routes marked with the green ticks).

This would result in the traffic numbers on the CLN routes approximately doubling.

Stansted have asked what you would require for this. There is no change to the route structure but it will change environmental impacts.

As it is a RAD restriction I dont think it srctly falls into the CAP725 remit as it doesnt change the published procedures.

- Does it reuire an ACP?
- If so what would you require to see regarding consultation? Would the process established for replication suffice - ie consultation through the ACC? Or would you expect a more far reaching consultation?
- Also what about noise analysis - would we be required to do Leq and SEL analyses?

A response on this ASAP would be appreciated - planning with Stansted is stalled on this and a few other issues and we do not have much time within which to sort them out. I am keen for an answer for Stansted by then end of next week- wll that be possible (10th)

I will be up in town on wednesday next week meeting [REDACTED] If it will help I could discuss some of this then.

Regards

[REDACTED]