

Doncaster Sheffield Airport: Airspace Change Proposal

Proposal to introduce RNAV Standard Instrument Departure and Instrument Approach Procedures

PART D

Overview of the Stakeholder Consultations

19th August 2019

CPJ-5237-RPT-172-V2

www.cyrrus.co.uk

info@cyrrus.co.uk



Contents

- CONTENTS..... 1
- 1. INTRODUCTION 2
- 2. CONSULTATION REVIEW MATRIX 3

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Part D of the DSA ACP Submission document is covered in the two Post Consultation Reports noted as **Document 30 and Document 72**. The Post Consultation Documents provide an analysis and overview of the respective consultations.
- 1.2. In preparation and validation of the ACP Submission a Review Matrix has been included in Section 2 of this document.

2. Consultation Review Matrix

1.	Consultation Process	Status
1.1	<p>Is the following complete and satisfactory?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of the original proposal upon which the consultation was conducted; • A copy of all correspondence sent by the sponsor to the consultees; • 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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>N/A</p>
	<p>No changes were made to the proposed SID procedures as a consequence of the Consultation however minor amendments were required for IFP technical design reasons. These changes are detailed in the Impact Assessment (Document 62). The airspace was given further consideration in the Supplementary Consultation and the original proposal of Class D was amended to Class E (TMZ/RMZ) based upon the findings.</p>	
1.2	<p>Were reasonable steps taken to ensure all necessary consultees actually received the information, e.g. postal/telephone/e-mail/meeting fora?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>The primary method of contacting consultees was e-mail. Adequate follow-up processes were in place to ensure that all consultees were informed of the consultation.</p> <p>Drop-in sessions were made available and advertised.</p> <p>Advertisements were placed in local media on several occasions.</p> <p>Where one additional consultee organisation was identified towards the end of the consultation, additional response time was given.</p> <p>The Supplementary Consultation process was enhanced with two Focus Groups to facilitate both an understanding of the available airspace classifications and a healthy discussion on the matter.</p>	
1.3	<p>What % of aviation consultees replied? (Include actual numbers)</p>	<p>38.6%</p> <p>22.4%</p>
	<p>34 responses were received from 88 consultees in the 2017 Stakeholder Consultation.</p> <p>19 responses were received from 85 consultees in the 2019 Supplementary Consultation.</p>	

	Detailed statistical analysis of responses given in the two <u>Reports of the Consultations</u>	
1.4	What percentage of non-aviation consultees replied? (Include actual numbers)	25.6%
	86 non-aviation consultees. 22 responses Non-aviation stakeholders were not consulted in the Supplementary Consultation Detailed statistical analysis of responses given in the <u>Report of the Sponsor Consultation</u> .	
1.5	Were reasonable steps taken to ensure as much substantive feedback was obtained from consultees, e.g. through follow-up letters/phone calls?	Yes
	A review of responses received was undertaken six weeks prior to the end of the Consultation and, for those who had not responded, a reminder e-mail or letter was sent. Subsequently this was followed up a further three times, at weekly intervals, leading up to the end of the Consultation. The notification process, following the launch, was followed up an additional four times. Supplementary Consultation – Responses were reviewed as they were received, and a hastener was sent out on Monday 3 June 2019 via email to all those that were yet to respond. There were no queries seeking clarification received.	
1.6	Have all objections to the change proposal been resolved or sufficiently mitigated?	Yes
	A comprehensive analysis of all responses and issues raised by consultees was undertaken and documented in the two <u>Reports of the Consultations</u> . No issues were found that would justify withdrawal of the proposal. No issues were found, taking due regard of the safety and procedure design requirements, that would justify a change to any of the procedures as submitted to consultation. Supplementary Consultation – The airspace proposal has been amended in light of the second consultation from Class D to Class E (TMZ/RMZ).	
2.	Outstanding Issues	Status
		None
3.	Additional Compliance Requirements	Status
3.1	SID procedure design details are to be submitted to SARG IFP Regulation section for CAP785 approval	Yes
	Already submitted.	

COPYRIGHT © 2019 Cyrrus Projects Limited

This document and the information contained therein is the property of Cyrrus Projects Limited. It must not be reproduced in whole or part or otherwise disclosed to parties outside of Cyrrus Projects Limited without written consent.

Cyrrus Projects Limited is a company registered in England and Wales: Company Number 06828433. Registered Office: Cyrrus House, Concept Business Court, Thirsk, YO7 3NY.