

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Page 1 of 12

Airspace Change Proposal - Consultation Assessment

Version: 1.0/ 2016

Title of Airspace Change Proposal	Standard Terminal Arrival Route (STAR) and PRNAV – GNSS approaches
Change Sponsor	Newcastle International
SARG Project Leader	[REDACTED]
File Reference	ACP-2014-02

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.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

1.	Consultation Process	Status
1.1	Is the following information complete and satisfactory?	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of the original proposal upon which consultation was conducted. 	YES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of all correspondence sent by the sponsor to consultees during consultation. 	YES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of all correspondence received by the sponsor from consultees during consultation. 	YES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A referenced tabular summary record of consultation actions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A copy of all correspondence and the actions taken by the sponsor has been submitted as evidence – but hasn't been provided in a table format. 	PARTIALLY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of and reasons for any changes to the original proposal as a result of the consultation. 	YES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of further consultation conducted on any revised proposal. 	N/A

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

1.2	<p>Were reasonable steps taken to ensure all necessary consultees received the information e.g. postal/e-mail/meeting fora?</p>	YES
<p>A list of stakeholders (referenced as 'key consultees') were contacted for response directly – these stakeholders are listed in the original consultation material and consultation feedback report in Annex A1 and Annex A respectively).</p> <p>There were also several ways to access the consultation material as well as various channels available to submit a response, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An online survey (Survey Monkey) accessed through the airports website - Through a dedicated email address detailed on the airports website (star@newcastleinternational.co.uk) - By post - Through two public meetings (20 April and 10 May 2017) <p>All materials were available on the airports website and hard copies of the consultation material could also be accessed through local libraries</p>		
1.3	<p>What % of all operational consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p>	27% (25)
<p>The change sponsor targeted a total of 92 operation consultees, 25 of which responded to the consultation.</p> <p>The following five airlines responded with no objection to the consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jet2 - EasyJet - Emirates - Thomson - Thomas Cook <p>A total of 20 other airspace users responded directly to the consultation. NATS and Durham Tees Valley Airport (DTVA) responded raising concerns which have since been resolved by the change sponsor (see section 1.6 below and Section 5.0 of the change sponsors consultation feedback report).</p>		
1.4	<p>What % of all environmental consultees replied? (Include actual numbers).</p>	0% (0)

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

	<p>A total of eight environmental consultees were contacted directly for a response, including:</p> <p>National Park, English Heritage, Friends of the Earth, Natural England, Environment Agency, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), Aviation Environment Federation.</p> <p>All of these organisations were chased on two separate occasions for a response through direct emails, but none went on to respond to the consultation.</p> <p>However, Environmental Protection departments within local authorities contributed to their collective local authority response (e.g. Northumberland County Council). There were five Local Authority responses in total.</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>Yes – two chaser emails were sent during May 2017 to stakeholders that hadn’t responded within the list (contained within the original consultation material and consultation feedback report in Annex A1 and Annex A respectively).</p> <p>Social media was also utilised to seek responses from the public, as well as drop in sessions, the Airports Consultative Committee, Local Authorities and local press channels (resulting in coverage within local publications).</p>	YES
1.6	<p>Have all objections to the change proposal been resolved (or sufficiently mitigated)?</p> <p>Yes – four formal objections were made to the proposal from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NATS - DTVA - Two separate individuals <p>Newcastle contacted all four respondees who objected, resulting in the following resolutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One individual requested to withdraw their objection following dialogue with Newcastle Airport, but the objection has been noted in the interests of transparency. - One individual questioned the methodology for SIDS and STARS in general, rather than the proposal itself. 	YES

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

- Newcastle is committed to maintaining communication with NATS and DTVA to work together to implement the STAR PRNAV proposal and have modified the final proposal based on their feedback.

As a result of the response received from DTVA, the initial level the STAR commences was amended from FL130 to FL140 to facilitate traffic. The Letter of agreement between DTVA and Newcastle airport can be found in Appendix C of the formal ACP submission.

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Outstanding Issues – N/A

Serial	Issue	Action Required
1		
2		

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

Serial	Requirement
1	
2	

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Recommendations	Yes/No
Does the Consultation Report and associated material meet SARG requirements?	YES
The Consultation Report and associated material was well presented and comprehensive, meeting SARG regulatory requirements. See general summary below for more information.	

General Summary

The consultation material provided by the change sponsor (Newcastle International) is considered to be positioned in a way that is audience appropriate, and the consultation itself has allowed respondents to make informative, valuable contributions to the proposal development. The consultation was promoted using a variety of methods, including direct communication with stakeholders (evidenced in Appendix H of the ACP submission), social media and online outlets (evidenced in Appendix G of the ACP submission), libraries across the city, local press coverage, the Airport Consultative Committee and through Local Authority meetings/channels.

The consultation material was clear, written in plain English – and was suitable for non-aviation audiences. There were sections covering ‘What is RNAV’ (section 2.2) set out in laypersons terms, there were two sections (2.3 and 2.4) clearly explaining RNAV (GNSS) approach procedures, as well as what is meant by Standard arrival routes (STARS). The consultation material detailed the drivers for the change including modernisation, equipment reliability, safety and economic factors. Although it also contained a section (3.2.3) covering environmental concerns, highlighting that RNAV reduces the ‘scattering of noise’, this section could’ve been presented in a more balanced way by describing the potential impacts on stakeholders of concentrating noise (a point that could also have been covered in section 7.4 Environmental impacts).

Options were clearly set out in the consultation material, with easy to understand diagrams, maps and charts. The document contained a reference list, a glossary of terms and a section covering FAQs.

Both postal and online responses (including an online survey and dedicated email address) were accepted, with most of the respondents submitting feedback through the online platform ‘Survey Monkey’.

Out of the 92 responses, four formal objections were made, one of which was subsequently withdrawn following the sponsor providing clarification around the objecting points to the individual. Newcastle has demonstrated that it has listened to the objections made, and undertaken further engagement to mitigate these concerns. This includes ongoing dialogue with NATS and DTVA, who both objected to the proposal. This dialogue has already resulted in a modification being made to the initial level of the STAR from FL130 to FL140 to facilitate traffic, demonstrating that feedback from stakeholders has been considered and that it has subsequently influenced the final proposal brought forward.

Out of the 92 responses to the consultation, 88 were in favour – A large percentage of those were individual residents (56 responses), as well as major airlines (such as Jet2, EasyJet, Thomson and Thomas Cook), Local Authorities, Parish Councils (through the ACC) and collective resident groups.

As a result of our assessment of the consultation associated with this ACP, it can be concluded that the consultation exercise has:

- Taken place when the proposal was at a formative stage
- Presented the consultation material clearly and outlined the potential impacts that needed to be considered
- Provided a sufficient timeframe to allow considered responses (10 March 2017 – 2 June 2017, a period of 12-weeks)
- Taken into account the product of the consultation– evidenced through the engagement with NATS and DTVA which resulted in a modification to the final proposal that was formally submitted to the CAA.

Comments & Observations

Additional engagement with aviation stakeholders – proposals for procedures in the event of a loss of communication

In addition to their wider public stakeholder consultation, Newcastle International undertook targeted engagement activities with industry which focussed on the options for procedures an aircraft would follow if it lost communication with an air traffic controller. This engagement included a preferred option to develop a hold at ETSES. The engagement ran by Newcastle International took place from 15 October – 23 November 2018, and the purpose of this activity was to inform other airspace users of their preferred option and provide stakeholders with the opportunity to submit their feedback. Requests for feedback were made via email to various airlines, private operators and other airspace users (including NaJets, Northumbria gliders and Peterlee Paradropping Centre) as well as other ANSPs in the local area (including Durham Tees Valley airport and RAF Leeming). In addition to email correspondence, a meeting was held with the base captains of Jet2, Thomas Cook, Tui and EasyJet who all responded positively to the proposal of a hold at ETSES in the event of a communications failure.

All materials used in the engagement and the stakeholder emails and correspondence that were received during the targeted engagement period have been supplied to the CAA. It is concluded that the responses were either positive or recognised the fact that the proposals would not significantly affect/impact their own operations (due to the limited frequency of the procedure being implemented).

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Consultation Assessment Sign-off/ Approvals	Name	Signature	Date
Consultation Assessment completed by:	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> AR Representative	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 100%;"></div>	04/02/2019
Consultation Assessment approved by:	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> Mgr AR	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 100%;"></div>	14/02/2019
Mgr. AR Comments:			

Head of AAA Comment/ Approval	Name	Signature	Date
Consultation Assessment Conclusions approved:	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> Head of AAA	<div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 100%;"></div>	19.02.2019
Head of AAA Comments: This consultation is approved as meeting all requirements of the CAP 725 process.			

