

## ANNEX O TO PIR REPORT DATED APRIL 2017

### **Complaints/Feedback received by the CAA**

In reviewing all of the correspondence received by the CAA, it was necessary to undertake an analysis of that which was addressed to the CAA's Chair, Chief Executive Officer and Group Director, Safety and Airspace Regulation in addition to that which was submitted via the Airspace Use Report (FCS 1521) form between the 26 May and 30 November 2016. In doing so, we adopted a two-phased approach by initially collating all of the relevant correspondence and then cross-checking our records with the dataset provided by GAL in accordance with our PIR requirements.

Firstly, our analysis of the correspondence addressed to the CAA Chair, Chief Executive Officer and Group Director, Safety and Airspace Regulation confirmed that during the time period specified above, we received a total of 70 items of correspondence related to Route 4 at Gatwick airport. Each item of correspondence would have received a response, with our reply offering a summary of the situation and encouragement to address the concerns raised directly with GAL. Of the 62 individuals that sent correspondence, 53 contacted GAL directly and consequently, their details are included on the dataset that has been analysed by GAL and submitted to the CAA for our assessment (see Section 8b below). Our analysis of the remaining 9 individuals that **did not contact GAL** has confirmed the following:

- 2 were from MP's who had contacted the CAA with general observations/comments related to Route 4 on behalf of their constituents – no specific postcode was provided in each case;
- 2 provided postcodes that were duplicated within the GAL dataset; and
- 5 provided postcodes that were not duplicated within the GAL dataset, but their location (village/town name) is duplicated within it.

In addition to the correspondence detailed above, the Civil Aviation Authority (Air Navigation) Directions gives the CAA a function to *“provide a focal point for receiving and responding to aircraft related environmental complaints from the general public”*. This function is exercised through the Airspace Use Report (FCS 1521), an online form which can be accessed via the CAA website. Upon receipt, the enquiry/complaint is actioned accordingly and in most cases individuals will receive a response from the CAA and would be encouraged to engage directly the relevant airport operator should it be apparent that their enquiry/complaint

concerns aircraft operations at a specific airport. Our analysis of the FCS 1521 submissions made between the 26 May and 30 November 2016 confirms that we received a total of 32 enquiries/complaints related to Gatwick airport from 26 different individuals; 28 of those enquiries/complaints (from 21 individuals) specifically concerned aircraft operations related to Route 4. Having cross-checked our records with that provided by GAL, we can confirm that 14 of those individuals contacted GAL directly and consequently, their details are included on the dataset that has been provided by them. Our analysis of the remaining 7 individuals that **did not contact GAL** has confirmed the following:

- 1 was from an individual that was representing the interests of a campaign group and therefore they did not provide a specific postcode;
- 5 provided postcodes that were not duplicated within the GAL dataset, but their location (village/town name) is duplicated within it.
- 1 provided a postcode/location (village/town name) that was not duplicated within the GAL dataset. Further analysis has been undertaken and we note that the postcode is located approximately 5.5 miles to the west-north-west of the Route 4 centreline; having cross-checked their location with the track data provided by GAL, it is reasonable for us to conclude that this individual's property is not directly affected by aircraft operating on Route 4.

To summarise, we have analysed all of the relevant correspondence received by the CAA and we are satisfied that both the content and source (i.e. the postcode/location) of each enquiry/complaint has been adequately assessed and reviewed during the course of our assessment of the modification requirements and modified RNAV 1 SID.