

Sywell Aerodrome - RNAV Approaches Framework Briefing Minutes

CAA House 16 February 2017 13.00 – 15.30

ATTENDEES

CAA

██████████ – Airspace Regulation, Principal Regulator
██████████ – Airspace Regulation, Business Coordinator
██████████ – Airspace Regulation, Case Officer
██████████ – Airspace Regulator
██████████ – Principal, Airspace Change Environment
██████████ – Environment Dept

Sywell Aerodrome

██████████ Accountable Manager
██████████, IFP Designer
██████████ Consultant
██████████, Consultant

MEETING NOTES

Introductions

██████████ leading for CAA opened the meeting and asked his colleagues to introduce themselves. ██████████ leading for Sywell responded and his team introduced themselves.

██████████ outlined that the object of the meeting was to examine Airspace Change proposals relating to the establishment of RNAV(GNSS)LNAV & LPV instrument approach procedures (IAPs) in relation to CAP725.

Sywell/Pildo presentation

██████████ gave a comprehensive presentation using the attached PowerPoint slides. ██████████ explained the current status of the airfield and detailed the history of establishing a 1200m concrete runway along with the types of aircraft operating and the major stakeholders. Of note are Sloane Helicopters with Leonardo (formerly AgustaWestland) A109 and Robinson R44/R66 fleets performing training, charter and Air Ambulance services. The major fixed-wing based operator is 2Excel Aviation with a diverse fleet which includes Raytheon King Airs, Piper PA31 Navajos along with the Blades Formation Team who operate Extra 300 aerobatic aircraft. Both of these organisations fully support the project and will use and benefit from these IAPs.

The timeline for the project shows that the original award of European Funding to help accelerate the uptake of SBAS APV came in Autumn 2015 with submission to the CAA using form DAP1916 occurring on 22 January 2016. CAA Ref No ██████████ was issued forthwith. The funding deadline is set at ██████████.

██████████ highlighted to ██████████ that Runway 03L/21R will be reclassified as 'Instrument' following a detailed appraisal of the obstacle limitation surfaces (OLS).

Slides showing the general arrangement of the IFPs, traffic stats detailing the decline from 62K to 35k movements per year and the numbers of average movements per segment of operators were discussed. RG enquired about routine use of the procedures by the resident flying school. ■ responded to clarify that this was not going to be possible due to the need to book IAP slots and close the visual circuit which made little commercial sense to the aerodrome.

■ handed over to ■ to explain technical details of the procedures from the design point of view. The main points being adherence to PANSOPS Doc 8168 VII, the low TAAs, constant descent profile and 12m threshold crossing height due to the short runway. At the moment, initial design conclusions produce the following obstacle clearance heights (OCH):

R03L LNAV 350' LPV250'
R21R LNAV 360' LPV250'
VMc(OCH) approximately 400' to 500'

Both missed approach tracks will employ a first straight-in climb followed by a direct to fix (DF) terminator back to the IAFs. No air holding is required. He also mentioned that Pildo Labs have developed a flight validation tool which they will offer as part of their service. ■ also highlighted the aerodrome's location below the Daventry CTA and lack of nearby airspace.

Discussing charting, ■ confirmed a preference for feathered arrows to help identify the presence of IFPs and ■ pointed out the ones established at Cranfield which were clearly visible. ■ explained that the IAP designs were not finalised allowing alterations to be incorporated still. He also asked for advice on the proposed missed approach for R21R and the allocation of 5-letter codes for the fixes. ■ outlined the procedure for establishing these and suggested four would be necessary.

Environmental Impact

■ continued the presentation to explain some of the facts about current operations. He pointed to Sywell's experience of key issues having spent many years obtaining planning permission for the hard runway. This included expensive and wide-ranging studies most of which remain valid today. He pointed out that 2Excel fixed-wing aircraft already fly an 8-mile-long approach due to operational reasons associated with recovery from an airways descent. This means that areas under the proposed procedures are already overflowed by the same aircraft that will use the approaches.

In terms of geography to avoid ■ confirmed there are no AONB, National Parks and the SSSI nearby has not changed since the runway study was submitted. He stressed that these studies had been based on traffic volumes of 62k movements per annum and so were almost double the present level. Although CO2 emissions were not significant it could be argued that flying directly to the IAP would use less fuel than many of the cloud break procedures at Cranfield with the subsequent low level transit to Sywell.

Public Consultation

■ explained the rationale behind the choice of stakeholders to be consulted and the desire to proportion this to the extent of track overflights. These were listed as:

Sywell Parish Council
Pytchley Parish Council
Borough Council of Wellingborough
Northamptonshire County Council
NATMAC
Alphabet organisations etc

■ finished the presentation by reminding the meeting of the looming deadline for funding drawdown. ■ mentioned that in the case of a similar project in Scotland, the GSA relied upon the CAA acceptance decision as the trigger. ■ acknowledged this information.

CAA Response

█ responded to the presentation by stating his opinion that it was a low impact scheme and as aircraft are already flying over these areas what will change? He offered advice that in the submission it would help to quantify what any change actually meant. He also suggested it would help to explain the extra 1000 movements per annum in terms of additional instrument approaches. Another helpful line of enquiry would be to work out the effect of prevailing winds on the percentage of approaches to each runway end over a year. He concluded by saying he didn't want an onerous process.

█ agreed with █ that Sywell needs to consider and reflect the degrees of change focusing on such things as the reduction of track miles flown, number of aircraft that will be using the procedures (including training) and any increase in traffic. It will be a qualitative argument not too focused on a quantitative assessment, as a reflection of the anticipated scale of the environmental impacts. He felt that using the previous extensive environmental studies as the baseline was overkill and should be avoided; point to the scale of the changes, don't try to quantify if a robust rationale can be provided that adequately explains that the scale of any impacts are small (or even non-existent).

█ mentioned concentration and █ added evidence of previous track keeping would assist. █ agreed to enquire as to what historic evidence 2Excel may have. █ also suggested that the number of missed approaches operators have flown would be helpful.

Both █ and █ stated there might not be a need to conduct a non-aviation consultation and that an Impact Assessment could suffice. For this to happen, Sywell will have to submit sufficient evidence to the CAA to demonstrate that the impacts of the change on non-aviation stakeholders are so small that the consultation part of the process would not be required. █ did remind the meeting that there was a possibility that Consultation might be required.

█ advised that should any challenge to the CAA's decision arise, the CAA would have to demonstrate the evidence that it had used in coming to that decision. For that reason, the Impact Assessment must provide a clear justification and robust rationales for the scale of all anticipated impacts.

█ said to look at what the actual missed approach design could be as opposed to the designer's current proposals. █ suggested possibly moving the missed approach point further back from the threshold and █ commented that it would be helpful to explain the rationale behind doing so. █ also reminded █ that a new 1560c Declared Distances form will be required for the new instrument coding.

Conclusion

█ thanked the Sywell Team for their attendance and █ responded in kind