



July 2024

## Gatwick Airport Development Consent Order for New Second Runway

### Is the airspace big enough for 2 runway aircraft movements as proposed by Gatwick Airport without FASIS?

1. The Northern Runway Project (NRP) would result in significant growth in flights. Gatwick seeks to go from its current figure of 285,000 flights (or air transport movements (ATMs)) a year to 386,000 in 2047 with two runway operations.<sup>1</sup> The evidence suggests this is not feasible without the modernisation of airspace, known as Future Airspace Strategy Implementation South (FASIS).
2. Work on airspace modernisation is being carried out in parallel with the NRP application. A public consultation on stage 3 of the Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) CAP1616 consultation process will take place in the first quarter of 2025. CAP1616 is the airspace change process for making a permanent change to the notified airspace design.<sup>2</sup>
3. The current airspace modernisation proposals being considered by the CAA are set out within the Airspace Change Organising Group's (ACOG) Airspace Change Masterplan.<sup>3</sup> The proposals include flight paths to the south of Gatwick for significant growth with potentially new flight paths over new communities to achieve this.
4. If Gatwick is reliant upon modernisation of airspace to reach ATM targets, then the environmental effects of the changed routes should have been assessed as part of the NRP. Without such assessment, there will be unassessed impacts on communities, particularly in the area of noise.
5. Also, it calls into question all baseline estimates without the modernisation of airspace to enable increases in airspace capacity to meet predicted ATMs.
6. CAGNE has previously referred to the Dublin Airport expansion as an example of what could happen where FASIS was not considered and the new parallel runway, once built and operating, did not conform to the proposed environmental study and scoping as the planes flew different flight paths from the new runway than predicted and stated to communities.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning Statement APP-245 at §3.5.16

<sup>2</sup> See [REDACTED]

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.acog.aero/airspace-masterplan-resource-centre/>

<sup>4</sup> See Suono's Representations in this regard at REP2-070 §1.2

7. The ExA by way of ExQ NV1.4 posed questions to the CAA as to whether airspace would require modernisation to achieve the NRP. In REP3-111, the CAA relied on the Applicant's Statement of Need and referred to analysis which would be provided by the Applicant at Deadline 3.
8. The Applicant's response at REP3-101 refers to the CAA's Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) Level assigned to ACP-2019-81. The Applicant uses this Decision by the CAA to justify their position that no airspace changes would be required to fly two runways using the same designated routes that are flown today. However, CAP 1908, the Decision on the CAP 1616 Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) Level assigned to ACP-2019-81 Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project,<sup>5</sup> states (emphasis added):

*'22. ... the proposal does not look to **increase aircraft movements** or alter traffic patterns aside from a 12m lateral shift to aircraft departures/ arrivals points to the northern runway.*

...

*23. 'It must be stressed that the objective of this proposal is not to commence dual runway operations or **increase aircraft movements**, it is solely to amend Gatwick Airport's AIP entry relating to runway use and centreline datum and amend the recorded physical distance between the two runways.*

...

*37., 'It must be stressed that the objective of this proposal is not to commence dual runway operations or **increase aircraft movements**, it is solely to amend Gatwick Airport's AIP entry relating to runway use and centreline datum and amend the recorded physical distance between the two runways.'*

9. Accordingly, it appears to CAGNE that the CAA's consideration of the NRP in CAP 1908 has only taken into consideration the physical development required in constructing the new northern runway and has not taken into account the associated ATM growth now proposed by Gatwick. CAGNE has seen no evidence that the CAA has undertaken a capacity study to understand the feasibility of the number of flights Gatwick seek to fly per hour from two runways.
10. CAGNE has not found updates from the CAA in relation to increase in capacity feasibility.
11. The airlines, who know most about the practical reality of operating at Gatwick, have told the ExA that airspace is congested and modernisation is needed.
12. EasyJet and British Airways currently account for over 60% of Gatwick's passengers. Gatwick's number one airline provider, easyJet, made clear in their relevant representations (RR) that the proposal is not feasible unless FASIS is undertaken.<sup>6</sup>
13. We quote the EasyJet RR, which states (emphasis added):  
*"GAL has provided sub-standard Air Traffic Control services in 2022 and 2023 demonstrating a clear inability to cope with the current levels of traffic, let alone an increase in capacity with a second runway....."*

*easyJet therefore questions whether GAL would be in a position to manage the increased aircraft movements that the Northern Runway would bring.....*

---

<sup>5</sup> [REDACTED] provided as Appendix A.

<sup>6</sup> RR-1256

***UK airspace modernisation needs to be completed before airspace above London takes on additional traffic. Airspace constraints need to be addressed prior to opening a second runway. Failure to modernise the airspace coupled with increased traffic over London will result in delays for passengers, increased operating costs, and excessive fuel burn creating a sharp spike in emissions in the South East region. NATS has forecast that by 2030 passengers could face delays on average of 30 minutes on every 1 in 3 flights if no action is taken to modernise the UK airspace (see sources). This would be further exacerbated by additional capacity added through the Northern Runway if this problem is not addressed.....”***

14. As the ExA has pointed out by way of its questions at ExQ1, IAG/British Airways has also expressed scepticism in their Written Representations:<sup>7</sup> Notably, IAG/British Airways state:

*“• Our view is LGW’s current operational performance is poor and we have significant concerns about performance at its current capacity, let alone its ability to successfully manage the proposed increases brought by the Project.*

- GAL sets itself, and commits to its airlines, to an On Time Performance (OTP) target (departures within 15 minutes of schedule) of 70% in summer and 75% in winter. The airport is a long way from operating consistently at that level, particularly over the summer season, evidenced by performance across the aerodrome which in summer 2023 averaged 45% at D15 (37.4% in Q3).*
- Significant investment is required in infrastructure to reduce airfield and stand congestion, taxi times and accommodate the volumes being processed now, which is why improving operational performance has to be a critical success factor for the Project.*
- ....*
- Alongside ATC resilience at Gatwick, we have significant reservations about the current ability of airspace around London and the South East to cope with the levels of additional capacity proposed by GAL. The costs to airlines of disruption are excessive and it is very challenging to successfully deliver a non-time schedule with the current levels of aerodrome performance.*
- We are sceptical of GAL’s view that the current airspace structure and existing routes are sufficient to support future increased capacity delivered by the Project and we encourage the Planning Inspectorate to closely examine this claim.”*

15. In 2023 Gatwick Airport had delays of over half an hour for departures on 27.9% of flights, and 1.8% of flights were cancelled, according to our analysis of CAA data from 2023.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> REP1-198

<sup>8</sup> Civil Aviation Authority Punctuality Data 2023

16. Out of the London airports Gatwick Airport was the worst airport to fly from in terms of delayed and cancelled flights last year, according to data collated by the CAA.<sup>9</sup>
17. Published in the SW Londoner newspaper, a London Gatwick spokesperson said (emphasis added): “  
*The majority of delays are caused by poor weather, **airspace constraints across Europe and third party ground operations**. We are working closely with our airline partners to improve on time performance....*”<sup>10</sup>
18. In all, the evidence suggests that airspace is already congested in and around London, causing delays at Gatwick in particular. The airlines, who know best, have told the ExA that the increase in ATMs proposed by the NRP would require airspace modernisation. The Applicant’s response is to point to the CAA’s Decision CAP 1908. However, there is no evidence that involved a feasibility study of the ATM growth now proposed for the NRP. As such, there is a serious risk that the true environmental effects of the NRP have not been properly assessed as part of this application.

Est Feb 2014  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
#pledgetoflyless  
Friends of the Earth Climate Action Group  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

---

<sup>9</sup> [Redacted]  
[Redacted] provided as Appendix B.  
<sup>10</sup> [Redacted]



# Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project Airspace Change Assigned Level Decision

CAP 1908

**Published by the Civil Aviation Authority, 2020**

Civil Aviation Authority,  
Aviation House,  
Beehive Ring Road  
Crawley,  
West Sussex,  
RH6 0YR.

You can copy and use this text but please ensure you always use the most up to date version and use it in context so as not to be misleading, and credit the CAA.

**First published May 2020**

Enquiries regarding the content of this publication should be addressed to:  
Airspace and ATM Aerodromes, Safety and Airspace Regulation Group, Aviation House,  
Beehive Ring Road, Crawley, West Sussex, RH6 0YR.

The latest version of this document is available in electronic format at 

# Contents

---

## Contents

<b>Background</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Objective of the Proposal</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Chronology of Proposal Process</b> .....	<b>7</b>
Statement of Need and Assessment Meeting .....	7
<b>CAA Analysis of the Material Provided</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>CAA Consideration of Factors Material to our Decision</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Explanation of statutory duties .....	8
Conclusions in respect of safety .....	8
Conclusions in respect of securing the most efficient use of airspace .....	8
Conclusions in respect of taking into account the Secretary of State's guidance to the CAA on environmental objectives .....	9
Conclusions in respect of aircraft operators and owners .....	9
Conclusions in respect of the interests of any other person .....	9
Integrated operation of ATS .....	10
Interests of national security .....	10
International obligations .....	10
<b>CAA's Regulatory Decision</b> .....	<b>11</b>
CAA's Regulatory Decision .....	11

## Chapter 1

# Executive Summary

---

## Background

---

1. Gatwick Airport currently operates in a single runway configuration, predominantly using the southern runway (08R/26L). The northern runway (08L/26R) is used when the southern runway is temporarily non-operational owing to maintenance or incident. Both runways share the same conventional Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs).
2. In July 2019 Gatwick Airport Ltd announced its intention to prepare a planning application (Development Consent Order (DCO)) to bring into operation the routine use of its existing northern runway (currently the standby / emergency runway) at the same time as its existing southern runway.
3. Whilst not a requirement of the CAP 1616 Process, owing to significant public interest surrounding any developments at Gatwick Airport and the unusual nature of the proposal the CAA has decided to publish its detailed reasons (this document) and the ACP Level assigned to the proposal after the Assessment Meeting. Details on Levels assigned to Airspace Change Proposals (ACPs) to scale the process can be found in Table 2 of CAP 1616 located [here](#).

## Objective of the Proposal

---

4. The proposal seeks to amend Gatwick Airport's entry in the Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) Part 3 – Aerodromes (AD) at 'EGKK AD 2.20 Local Aerodrome Regulations, 6. Use of Runways'. This entry currently states that the northern runway will only be used when the southern runway is non-operational for maintenance or incident. It also states that the northern runway cannot be used simultaneously with the southern runway due to insufficient separation between the two runways.
5. To achieve the required separation between the two runways and conform with runway certification regulations<sup>1</sup>, the proposal seeks to move the runway centreline datum for the

---

<sup>1</sup> EASA Specification CS ADR-DSN.B.050



- northern runway (08L/26R) 12 metres to the north. This will require an amendment to AIP Part 3 EGKK AD 2.12 Runway Physical Characteristics. It does not seek to change any Standard Instrument Departures or Standard Terminal Arrival Routes or any other aspect of airspace design.
6. Prior to amending the AIP, infrastructure works are required to physically move the northern runway 12 metres to the north. The impact of these works may require additional AIP Part 3 entries to EGKK AD 2.9 Surface Movement Guidance and Control System and Markings; AD 2.10 Aerodrome Obstacles; AD 2.11 Meteorological Information provided; AD 2.13 Declared Distances; and AD 2.14 Approach and Runway Lighting, and associated charts.
  7. It must be stressed that the objective of this proposal is not to commence dual runway operations, it is solely to amend Gatwick Airport's AIP entry relating to runway use and centreline datum and amend the recorded physical distance between the two runways. It does not approve any physical works or change to operations.
  8. This proposal is one element which facilitates a potential move towards dual runway operations being a possibility in the future, it does not authorise them. The introduction of dual runway operations at Gatwick Airport is a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project as detailed in Section 23 of the [Planning Act 2008](#), and as such the airport is required to submit a Development Consent Order (DCO) to authorise changes to the physical infrastructure and use. The DCO process is front-loaded with a number of pre-application consultation requirements and will be subject to environmental assessment. Gatwick Airport are in the DCO pre-application stage but have confirmed their intention for public consultation on their DCO in 2020. Further information on Gatwick Airport's Future Plans can be found on their website [here](#), where the links to their DCO consultation webpages will also be published in due course.
  9. In addition a separate [ACP](#) from Gatwick Airport regarding the redesign of departure and arrival routes and procedures which is part of the much larger Future Airspace Strategy Implementation South (FASI-S) development is currently in the Develop and Assess stage<sup>2</sup>. This ACP is a Level 1 and will also be subject to public consultation and environmental assessment.

---

<sup>2</sup> CAA CAP 1616 Airspace Change - Stage 2 (of 7) Develop and Assess

10. The DCO proposal seeks to physically move the northern runway 12 metres to the north to achieve the required safety separation between the two runways and this proposal seeks to update the AIP to reflect those physical changes. Whilst in use when the main southern runway (08R/26L) is non-operational, the associated arrivals/departures from the northern runway will be shift laterally by 12 metres. A displacement of movements may be considered a Planned and Permanent Redistribution (PPR) of air traffic and can be subject to an Airspace Change Proposal in its own right, as detailed in CAP 1616 Part 2. However, Government policy states that only certain types of PPR, known as a 'relevant PPR', which have the potential to have a particular noise impact on the ground should be subject to the CAP1616 ACP process and a CAA decision. The minimum requirement for a relevant PPR is a lateral shift of flight track greater than 300 metres at 1000 feet altitude. Therefore, this proposal is not a 'relevant PPR' as defined by Government policy, as the air traffic lateral movement is significantly less than the minimum distance required. Additional information on what is considered a 'relevant PPR' can be found in CAP 1616 at Appendix I.

## Chapter 2

# Decision Process and Analysis

---

## Chronology of Proposal Process

---

### Statement of Need and Assessment Meeting

11. Gatwick Airport Ltd submitted a Statement of Need (SoN) on 12 November 2019. An Assessment Meeting was held on 15 January 2020 at which Gatwick Airport Ltd (GAL) outlined the following drivers for the ACP:
  - In July 2019 GAL announced its intention, in accordance with Government Policy on making best use of existing runways ('Beyond the Horizon – The Future of UK Aviation' June 2018) to prepare a Development Consent Order to bring into operation the routine use of its existing standby/emergency runway at the same time as the existing main runway.
  - To enable dependant dual runway operations, it was proposed the northern runway centreline datum be repositioned 12 metres to the north to ensure European Aviation Safety Agency specifications for required centreline spacing is adhered to.
  - To allow for the future application for dual runway operations and the repositioning of the runway centreline datum, amendments to Gatwick Airport's AIP entry are required.
12. The CAA determined that the proposal was in scope of the ACP process but elected not to provide an indicative Level at the meeting as they required more time to assess this in detail. A Decision Letter (this document) was created detailing the CAA's decision on the assigned ACP Level. Minutes of the Assessment Meeting together with a copy of the slide presentation were published on the CAA Airspace Change Portal.

### CAA Analysis of the Material Provided

---

13. As a record of our analysis of this material the CAA has produced this Decision Letter which will be published on the CAA Airspace Change Portal.

## **CAA Consideration of Factors Material to our Decision**

---

### **Explanation of statutory duties**

14. The CAA's statutory duties are laid down in Section 70 of the Transport Act 2000.

### **Conclusions in respect of safety**

15. The CAA's primary duty is to maintain a high standard of safety in the provision of air traffic services and this takes priority over all other duties.<sup>3</sup>

16. In this respect, with due regard to safety in the provision of air traffic services, the CAA is satisfied that the proposals maintain a high standard of safety for the following reasons:

- a. Movement of the northern runway centreline datum is in accordance with European Aviation Safety Agency specifications.
- b. Operations will continue in their current form with the northern runway only being used when the main southern runway is non-operational owing to maintenance or incident.
- c. Displacement of the northern runway is only 12 metres from its present location enabling the current conventional SIDS to continue to be used.
- d. Displacement for arrivals/departures to the northern runway is not a 'relevant PPR'.

### **Conclusions in respect of securing the most efficient use of airspace**

17. The CAA is required to secure the most efficient use of the airspace consistent with the safe operation of aircraft and the expeditious flow of air traffic.<sup>4</sup>

18. The CAA considers that the most efficient use of airspace is defined as 'secures the greatest number of movements of aircraft through a specific volume of airspace over a period of time so that the best use is made of the limited resource of UK airspace'.

19. The CAA considers the expeditious flow of air traffic to involve each aircraft taking the shortest amount of time for its flight. It is concerned with individual flights.

20. In this respect, the CAA is satisfied that the proposal offers no change to current operations in regard to efficient use of airspace.

---

<sup>3</sup> Transport Act 2000, Section 70(1).

<sup>4</sup> Transport Act 2000, Section 70(2)(a).

## **Conclusions in respect of taking into account the Secretary of State's guidance to the CAA on environmental objectives**

21. In performing the statutory duties, the CAA is obliged to take account of the extant guidance provided by the Secretary of State,<sup>5</sup> namely the 2017 Guidance to the CAA on Environmental Objectives.
22. The proposal does not look to increase aircraft movements or alter traffic patterns aside from a 12 metre lateral shift to aircraft departure/arrival points to the northern runway. The shift will not be differentiable from ordinary traffic dispersion of aircraft utilising a conventional SID and there will therefore be no change to tracks over the ground. In this respect, the environmental impact relating to this proposal is assessed as nil.
23. It must be stressed that the objective of this proposal is not to commence dual runway operations or increase aircraft movements, it is solely to amend Gatwick Airport's AIP entry relating to runway use and centreline datum and amend the recorded physical distance between the two runways. It does not approve any physical works as these are a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project and require Gatwick Airport to submit a DCO. It is the DCO submission which will apply to physically move the runway 12 metres to the north, and the DCO process which has the public consultation requirements and is subject to environmental assessment. This ACP is solely seeking to update the AIP to reflect the DCO changes if they take place and after they are approved.

## **Conclusions in respect of aircraft operators and owners**

24. The CAA is required to satisfy the requirements of operators and owners of all classes of aircraft.<sup>6</sup>
25. In this respect, the CAA is content that the lateral movement to the northern runway (08L/26R) and 12 metre displacement of departures/ arrivals to this runway does not impact the current requirements of owners and operators of all classes of aircraft.

## **Conclusions in respect of the interests of any other person**

26. The CAA is required to take account of the interests of any person (other than an owner or operator of an aircraft) in relation to the use of any particular airspace or the use of airspace generally.

---

<sup>5</sup> Transport Act 2000, Section 70(2)(d)

<sup>6</sup> Transport Act 2000, Section 70(2)(b).

27. In this respect, the CAA considers that the impact of the proposal will not be discernible to other persons as there will be no change to aircraft tracks over the ground.
28. As already stated a maximum displacement of aircraft by 12 metres is not a relevant PPR as defined by Government Policy, and it is significantly contained within the swathe of the conventional SIDs for this runway. A change to tracks over the ground of this distance will not be discernible as this is less than the length of a single aircraft wing of the most popular aircraft types operating out of Gatwick<sup>7</sup>. With the normal effects of wind and pilot/aircraft input taken into consideration, variations of this small a magnitude will already be present today; therefore, it is the opinion of the CAA that in this instance there is no change to tracks over the ground.

### **Integrated operation of ATS**

29. The CAA is required to facilitate the integrated operation of air traffic services provided by or on behalf of the Armed Forces of the Crown and other air traffic services.<sup>8</sup>
30. In this respect, the CAA is content that the proposal will not impact the operational requirements of the MoD or impact on other Air Traffic Service Providers.

### **Interests of national security**

31. The CAA is required to take account of the impact any airspace change may have upon matters of national security.<sup>9</sup>
32. In this respect, the CAA is satisfied that the proposal has no impact on national security.

### **International obligations**

33. The CAA is required to take account of any international obligations entered into by the UK and notified by the Secretary of State.
34. In this respect, the CAA is satisfied that the proposal has no impact on international obligations.

---

<sup>7</sup> Airbus A320 and Boeing 737 wingspan 35.8 metres; Airbus A319 and A321 wingspan 34 metres.

<sup>8</sup> Transport Act 2000, Section 70(2)(e).

<sup>9</sup> Transport Act 2000, Section 70(2)(f).

## Chapter 3

# CAA's Regulatory Decision

---

## CAA's Regulatory Decision

---

### CAA's Regulatory Decision

35. Noting the anticipated impacts on the material factors we are bound to take into account, and that the proposal will not alter traffic patterns, we have decided to assign the Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project Airspace Change Proposal as a Level 0 ACP.
36. The CAA is satisfied that in accordance with the requirements of CAP 1616<sup>10</sup> as a Level 0 ACP there is no requirement for the sponsor to conduct consultation for this proposal. The CAA notes that public consultation and environmental assessment will be required for the DCO application and the Level 1 FASI-S ACP.
37. It must be stressed that the objective of this proposal is not to commence dual runway operations or increase aircraft movements, it is solely to amend Gatwick Airport's AIP entry relating to runway use and centreline datum and amend the recorded physical distance between the two runways. It does not approve any physical works as these are a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project and require Gatwick Airport to submit a DCO. It is the DCO submission which will apply to physically move the runway 12 metres to the north, and the DCO process which has the public consultation requirements and is subject to environmental assessment. This ACP is solely seeking to update the AIP to reflect the DCO changes if they take place and after they are approved.

### Conditions

38. The sponsor will provide data required by the CAA to confirm regulations, aeronautical data quality and safety assurance are adhered to when implementing the change. This includes, but is not limited to, the 5 yearly Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) review of the runway 08L/26R SIDs and Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) being conducted in accordance with CAP 785 prior to reintroduction of the newly located northern runway (08L/26R). This is to ensure the obstacle environment of the IFPs is reassessed for the amended IFP obstacle protection areas, and the 08L/26R RNAV IAP waypoint

---

<sup>10</sup> CAP 1616, Appendix A, A14.

coordinates are amended as required for the 12 metre offset. The Gatwick Airport Aerodrome AIP entry and associated charts are to be updated accordingly.

### **Period Regulatory Decision Remains Valid for Implementation**

39. The ACP is to be implemented in accordance with the target date of AIRAC 01/2026, 22 January 2026. The sponsor may request to amend this implementation date.
40. If this decision has not been implemented by 23 January 2029, it will cease to be valid unless the sponsor requests and the CAA accepts an extension to that date, subject to such conditions or modifications as the CAA sees fit.

### **Implementation**

41. Implementation of the AIP amendments can be notified by Gatwick Airport Ltd to AIS through a single AIRAC cycle. However, the AIP amendment cannot occur until after the physical infrastructure changes; which are subject to planning process and construction projects. The sponsor does not anticipate this occurring until AIRAC 01/2026 and will become effective on 22 January 2026. Owing to the significant lead in time this date is subject to change.
42. The revised AIP entry will become effective on 22 January 2026 unless amended. Any queries are to be directed to the SARG Project Leader via [airspace.policy@caa.co.uk](mailto:airspace.policy@caa.co.uk).

### **Post Implementation Review**

43. In accordance with CAP 1616 a Level 0 ACP is not subject to a Post Implementation Review.

Civil Aviation Authority

*25 March 2020*



# Punctuality Statistics



Aberdeen, Belfast City (George Best), Belfast International, Birmingham, Bournemouth, Bristol, Cardiff Wales, Doncaster Sheffield, East Midlands International, Edinburgh, Exeter, Gatwick, Glasgow, Heathrow, Isle Of Man, Jersey, Leeds Bradford, Liverpool (John Lennon), London City, Luton, Manchester, Newcastle, Southampton, Southend, Stansted, Teesside International Airport.

## Full and Summary Analysis

Annual 2023



## Disclaimer

The information contained in this report has been compiled from various sources of data. CAA validates this data, however, no warranty is given as to its accuracy, integrity or reliability. CAA cannot accept liability for any financial loss caused by a person's reliance on any of these statistics. No statistical data provided by CAA maybe sold on to a third party. CAA insists that they are referenced in any publication that makes reference to CAA Statistics.

## FOREWORD

### 1 CONTENT

1.1 Punctuality Statistics: Aberdeen, Belfast City (George Best), Belfast International, Birmingham, Bournemouth, Bristol, Cardiff Wales, Doncaster Sheffield, East Midlands International, Edinburgh, Exeter, Gatwick, Glasgow, Heathrow, Isle Of Man, Jersey, Leeds Bradford, Liverpool (John Lennon), London City, Luton, Manchester, Newcastle, Southampton, Southend, Stansted, Teesside International Airport - Full and Summary Analysis is prepared by the Civil Aviation Authority with the co-operation of the airport operators and Airport Coordination Ltd. Their assistance is gratefully acknowledged

### 1.2 COVERAGE

Data has been published as follows :-

for Heathrow, Gatwick, Manchester, Birmingham, Luton and Stansted from April 1989

for Glasgow from July 1993

for Edinburgh and Newcastle from April 1996

for London city from April 1997

for Aberdeen, Belfast City (George Best), Belfast International, Bournemouth, Bristol, Cardiff Wales, Doncaster Sheffield, Durham Tees Valley, East Midlands International, Jersey, Leeds Bradford, Liverpool (John Lennon) and Southampton from October 2014

for Exeter from November 2014

### 2 ENQUIRIES

2.1 **Statistics** Enquiries concerning the information in this publication should be sent to: [aviation.intelligence@caa.co.uk](mailto:aviation.intelligence@caa.co.uk)

2.2 Enquiries concerning further analysis of punctuality or other UK Civil Aviation Statistics should be addressed to;

Tel: 020 7453 6258

or 020 7453 6252

or e-mail [aviation.intelligence@caa.co.uk](mailto:aviation.intelligence@caa.co.uk)

Please note that we are unable to publish statistics or provide ad hoc extracts at lower than monthly aggregate level.

2.3 **Website** - Our tables are available on the internet free of charge [www.caa.co.uk/punctuality](http://www.caa.co.uk/punctuality)



## INTRODUCTORY NOTES

- 1 These figures are compiled by the Civil Aviation Authority with the co-operation of airports and Airport Coordination Ltd.
- 2 The figures cover both arrivals and departures aggregated, except in the case of the Full Analysis with Arrival – Departure Split. In this table, arrivals and departures are stated separately.
- 3 Actual times of operation are derived from the flight by flight air transport movement returns made by airports to the CAA. The planned times supplied by Airport Coordination Ltd include changes made up to 30 minutes before operation.
- 4 Only obvious mismatches between the two sources have been reconciled.
- 5 When the two sets of data are matched, if an airline appears to operate a series of flights significantly “off slot”, the Data Collection-Flight Data Team will substitute information from published timetables (where such are available) in place of the ACL slot data.
- 6 Prior to April 1998, Luton planned times of operation were taken from daily flight plans provided by the airport. These were completed before the week in question and, therefore, did not reflect any changes to the plan made at short notice.
- 7 Because the planned time of operation relates to the arrival/departure at the stand, whilst the actual time of operation relates to wheels on/off the runway, the following taxi time assumptions have been built in following information provided by Airport Coordination Ltd or the airport.

		Until end 2008	From 2009		Until end 2008	From 2009
Heathrow	Arrivals Departures	10 minutes (i) 20 minutes (i)	10 minutes (i) 25 minutes (i)	Birmingham	0 Arrivals (iii) 0 Departures (iii)	0 Arrivals (iii) 0 Departures (iii)
Gatwick	Arrivals Departures	10 minutes (i) 15 minutes (ii)	10 minutes (i) 17 minutes (i), (ii)	Glasgow	5 Arrivals 10 Departures	7 Arrivals 10 Departures
Stansted	Arrivals Departures	5 minutes 10 minutes	10 minutes 13 minutes	Edinburgh	5 Arrivals 10 Departures	8 Arrivals 10 Departures
Luton	Arrivals Departures	5 minutes 10 minutes	6 minutes 12 minutes	Newcastle	5 Arrivals 10 Departures	5 Arrivals 8 Departures
Manchester	Arrivals Departures	10 minutes (i) 20 minutes (i)	11 minutes (i) 15 minutes (i)	London City	3 Arrivals 6 Departures	3 Arrivals 15 Departures

		From 2014			From 2014
Aberdeen	Arrivals Departures	6 minutes 7 minutes	Durham Tees Valley	Arrivals Departures	6 minutes 5 minutes
Belfast City (George Best)	Arrivals Departures	7 minutes 6 minutes	East Midlands International	Arrivals Departures	8 minutes 8 minutes
Belfast International	Arrivals Departures	0 minutes (iii) 0 minutes (iii)	Exeter	Arrivals Departures	8 minutes 10 minutes
Bournemouth	Arrivals Departures	6 minutes 7 minutes	Jersey	Arrivals Departures	8 minutes 3 minutes
Bristol	Arrivals Departures	7 minutes 7 minutes	Leeds Bradford	Arrivals Departures	7 minutes 11 minutes
Cardiff Wales	Arrivals Departures	9 minutes 5 minutes	Liverpool (John Lennon)	Arrivals Departures	10 minutes 6 minutes
Doncaster Sheffield	Arrivals Departures	7 minutes 7 minutes	Southampton	Arrivals Departures	7 minutes 9 minutes

- (i) No account is taken of the different taxi-ing times associated with the terminal building used.
- (ii) Prior to October 2003 Gatwick recorded the departure time from the stand.
- (iii) Birmingham Airport and Belfast International record actual time of operation as arrival/departure at the stand.
- (iv) A general review of the taxi times was undertaken during 2008, and the amendment values were implemented wef January 2009 (see table above). For comparison purpose 2008 data shown in 2009 tables have been re-calculated using this new taxi-times.

8 The number of unmatched actual flights represented those air transport movements which actually took place at the airport but for which no corresponding planned flight was found. The reason for this would normally be:

- (a) the flight was a diversion from another airport;



- (b) the flight was not recorded with Airport Coordination Ltd or airport (see notes 4 and 5);
  - (c) the flight was a short-haul more than one hour before the planned time;
  - (d) the flight was planned to take place in the previous month;
  - (e) the planned time or the air transport movement record contained an incorrectly reported item data causing the flight not to match.
- 9 The number of unmatched planned flights represents those Airport Coordination Ltd or airport flights planned (see notes 4 and 5) for which a corresponding Air Transport Movement return has been found. The reason for those would normally be;
- (a) the flight was diverted to another airport;
  - (b) the flight was cancelled;
  - (c) planned time was for a short haul flight more than one hour after flight;
  - (d) the flight took place in the following month;
  - (e) either the planned time or the air transport movement record contained an incorrectly reported item of data causing it not to match.
- 10 With effect from January 2000 data month, early flights are set to zero delay. Prior to this, an early flight will show a negative delay. This will affect the 'average delay' column. Average delays from January 2000 onwards should not be compared to average delays prior to January 2000. Tables for January to December 2000 inclusive do not include columns relating to the corresponding month the previous year for this season. These tables should also not be compared with previously published tables.
- 11 Route - airline combinations are only shown where there is more than one match flight. However, lines omitted for this reason will still be included in total figures. For this reason, the totals shown may not always exactly match the data in the table.
- 12 All-cargo services and air taxi services are excluded from the analysis.
- 13 Positioning, private, corporate, military, local and other non air transport movements are excluded from the analysis.
- 14 Figures for domestic shuttle services should be treated with caution. Only the main flights are notified to Airport Coordination Ltd. Back-up flights are not and are therefore recorded as unmatched actual flights.



- 15 Flight are allocated to airlines according to the flight prefix of the service. Therefore, in the case of a sub-charter service, the flight is shown against the airline commercially responsible for the eservice. In the case of franchise operations, the service is recorded against the operating carrier.
- 16 The aircraft origin/destination represents the final point on the service. An aircraft serving more than one point on the route is therefore shown once only in the tables.
- 17 Some domestic routes listed in this publication may be domestic sectors of the international service.
- 18 Flights between any two of the ten airports (e.g. Heathrow-Manchester) are counted twice.
- 19 Care should be taken in comparing the average delays during the current year, with the average delays during the previous year. The number of flights may change from one year to the next, and the average may also be calculated on a small number of flights in either year.





## ROUTE/AIRLINE ANALYSIS - FULL FOR 2023

Reporting Airport: GATWICK (Full Analysis)

ORIGIN/DESTINATION	AIRLINE	CHAR/ SCHED	NUMBER OF FLIGHTS		PERCENTAGE OF FLIGHTS LATE													2022			
			MAT	UNMAT	CAN	More than 15 m early	15 m to 1 m early	0 m to 15 m late	16 m to 30 m late	31 m to 60 m late	61 m to 120 m late	121 m to 180 m late	181 m to 360 m late	More than 360 m late	Unmat	Can	Avg Delay (mins)	% Early to 15 m	Avg Delay (mins)	Mat	
<b>VIETNAM</b>																					
HANOI	BAMBOO AIRWAYS	S	88	0	4	13.0	20.7	39.1	12.0	6.5	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	11	100.0	2	18	
<b>TOTAL HANOI</b>			<b>88</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>39.1</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	
HO CHI MINH CITY	BAMBOO AIRWAYS	S	76	0	0	21.1	28.9	32.9	7.9	6.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9	87.5	6	8	
<b>TOTAL HO CHI MINH CITY</b>			<b>76</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21.1</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>87.5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	
<b>TOTAL VIETNAM</b>			<b>164</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>26</b>	
<b>ZIMBABWE</b>																					
ROBERT GABRIEL MUGABE INTERNATIONAL	HI FLY MALTA	C	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	69	1	
<b>TOTAL ROBERT GABRIEL MUGABE INTERNATIONAL</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>TOTAL ZIMBABWE</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>TOTAL GATWICK</b>			<b>252991</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4767</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>57.9</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>21399</b>	