

## Meeting held on 21 Jul 15 and attended by:

### *External*

- [REDACTED] (Airport/ ATS Manager)
- [REDACTED] (CEO)
- [REDACTED] (Skybus Chief Pilot)
- [REDACTED] (GNSS Consultant)
- [REDACTED] (by telephone)

### *Internal*

- [REDACTED] (Project Officer)
- [REDACTED] (Consultation)
- [REDACTED] (Consultation)
- [REDACTED] (Environment)
- [REDACTED] (Procedure Design)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The meeting was the first Stage 1 Briefing held following an earlier meeting held at Gatwick on 7 May 15. [REDACTED] led the introductions, stating the objectives and preferred outcome of the meeting; this was clarity on the way forward with this proposal.

## 2. OPERATIONAL

- 2.1. At the start of the presentation (attached) CP described the aim of this change was to introduce IAPs and associated lower LNAV and LPV minima, in order to improve regularity of Skybus services to the Isles of Scilly. The reduced minima would offer a poor weather contingency approach option using a much safer procedure.
- 2.2. The development of the ACP was not predicated on increasing traffic volumes; since the flying school closure the movements had reduced by ~ 75%. There was no plan to increase either the numbers of movements or the types of aircraft routinely operating from Land End Airport. The ACP would introduce some new tracks over areas devoid of habitation or in sparsely populated areas. Currently there were 400 approaches a year to all runways and significant parts of the current and planned procedures are oversea. Coordination would be required with RNAS Culdrose, Newquay and St Marys.
- 2.3. [REDACTED] described the role of Lands End Airport as providing a 'life-line' service to the Scilliy Isles. The community was based on 140 small islands, was 85% reliant on tourism and economically was surviving on a knife edge; it was essential to maintain the service. The Steamship Group provided the only communication links to the island from Newquay and Lands End in the winter and Exeter in the summer. It was also necessary to rebuild the islanders' confidence in the transport system since the closure of the Penzance helo service in 2012. Tarmac runways built last year had gone some way to mitigate poor weather and flooding that previously had closed the current service down for 3 months.
- 2.4. [REDACTED] stated it was essential to upgrade the service and expedite its introduction to minimise the impact on the islanders' economy. It was hoped the changes could be phased-in during Q1 2016. It was expected that the introduction of the GNSS procedures would reduce passenger disruption by about 50%. There was a strong political imperative to improve the resilience of this transport link.
- 2.5. It was understood that the change could possibly be made under the CAP 1122 process rather than following the full ACP process that was designed for change within a controlled airspace environment.

- 2.6. The IAP concept was described by the team and the following significant points were highlighted:
- The Rwy 07 approach oversea with no lateral or altitude change from the current visual procedure. It was agreed that there was no requirement to consult on this change.
  - The Rwy 16 approach introduced a longer overland leg, but this was free of populated areas until it passed St Just, a small hamlet already inside the existing ATZ.
  - The Rwy 25 approach will be a 4.5<sup>o</sup> glide slope with an IF at 2,000 ft amsl, one km north of Penzance.
  - The Rwy 34 approach did introduce a new ground track between 1,000 and 2,000 ft. There was a requirement to clarify the level of consultation required for this change.

### 3. CONSULTATION

- 3.1. Lands End Airport do not have a formally identified Airport Consultative Committee.
- 3.2. There was a high level of support for the intended change because the benefit to the Scilly Isles and the local community was well understood.
- 3.3. ■ advised that a full 12-week consultation was necessary on those potentially controversial aspects of the proposal.
- This was necessary to ensure sufficient time for consultees to respond.
- 3.4. It was possible to complete the consultation within the 12-week period if a highly proactive approach was taken and once all consultees had submitted their responses.
- ■ stated that 12-weeks was government best practice, but a significant level of pre-engagement would provide the best chance of eliciting swift consultee responses.
- 3.5. It was agreed that consultation was only necessary for the change relating to Rwy 34.
- 3.6. It was recognised by that any level of consultation was unlikely to change the intended proposal.
- 3.7. ■ advised that the consultation document should be extremely clear on what aspects of the proposal were subject to consultation and what elements were not. It should show what other options had been considered and why these had been discounted. Statistics should be used where possible to support the case, but also to be open about the impacts. It should clearly show the heights of any new tracks and the communities that would be affected positively or negatively.
- 3.8. ■ stated he would draft a letter for NATMAC to justify a shorter (8-week) consultation period and also help identify any additional consultees.

**4. ENVIRONMENT**

- 4.1. Lands End Airport sits within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- 4.2. Although the procedures are planned for contingency use, the proposal and consultation document should refer to any increase in time and fuel burn associated with the new procedures.
- 4.3. There should be clarity on how noise will change as a result of the new procedures; any redistribution of noise should highlight any positive and negative aspects.
- 4.4. [REDACTED] advised that the production of LEQ noise contours would not be necessary for this change as there would be no modification to existing noise levels during current procedures. However, a simple statement to this effect should be made.
- 4.5. The dis-benefits of increased fuel burn conducting the procedure could be offset against the fuel burn associated with a diversion; the net effect was likely to be marginal.
- 4.6. [REDACTED] advised it was important to demonstrate that there would be little change in local air quality below 1,000 ft. The documentation must show that this was considered.

**5. PROJECT TIMESCALES**

- 5.1. Given the submission of the ACP at the beginning of Oct 15, the critical path depicting a trimmed down 8-week assessment (if it can be achieved) would dictate a double AIRAC publishing window of approximately 5 Feb 16 to 26 May 16 (see attached). Having said that the Sponsor should not rely on early publication.
- 5.2. Final designs should be submitted to the CAA procedure designers as soon as they become available to allow this work to progress in parallel. It was indicated that the final designs and supporting data would be submitted during Aug 15.



[REDACTED]

Airspace Regulator  
Airspace, ATM & Aerodromes  
Civil Aviation Authority

