

Project Title/No:	Biggin Hill ACP 2015	Meeting Ref:	CL-5108-MIN-014 Iss 1.0
Purpose:	Stage 1 - Framework Briefing	Date:	22 Apr 2015
Venue:	CAA House, Kingsway, London	Time:	1200-1425
Attendees:	<p>██████████ – Airspace Regulator (IFP)</p> <p>██████████ – Managing Director, London Biggin Hill Airport</p> <p>██████████ – Airspace Regulator (CAA Case Officer designate)</p> <p>██████████ – Analysis &amp; Intelligence, Policy Programmes Team (PPT)</p> <p>██████████ – Cyrrus Project Director</p> <p>██████████ – CAA Observer (PPT)</p> <p>██████████ – Manager Air Traffic Services</p> <p>██████████ – Cyrrus Project Lead</p> <p>██████████ – Airspace Regulator (CAA Case Officer)</p> <p>██████████ – Airspace Regulator (Consultation Co-ordinator) (<i>via teleconference facility</i>)</p>		
Apologies:	██████████ – SATCO LBHA		
Distribution:	Cyrrus and Biggin Hill attendees and ██████████ (for onward distribution)		

## Notes

Reference	Description
CL-5108-014-N1	██████████ advised that the purpose of this meeting was to conduct the Formal Framework Briefing for the ACP process. Notwithstanding that the earlier February meeting with SARG set out the intent of London Biggin Hill Airport (LBHA) to seek changes to the existing airspace arrangements in and around the Airport, ██████████ requested that all aspects expected from CAP 725 were discussed and captured in this official Framework Briefing.
CL-5108-014-N2	██████████ provided background to the requirement to establish an All Weather Operations (AWOPs) capability to both runways at LBHA. He explained that LBHA dealt predominantly with Executive, Corporate and Private jet aircraft ranging from the BBJ through Global Express and Falcon to the lighter business aircraft. Currently, an ILS was installed on RW 21 and all IFR traffic use the IAPs published for this runway and a single IAP to RW 03 which uses a RW 21 approach followed by a circling approach procedure. Historically, the RW 03 IAP was acceptable when used by light twin-engined aircraft; however, swept-wing high performance aircraft were now the norm and the current IAP for RW 03 is inadequate. Therefore, LBHA needed to establish an IAP which delivered a straight-in approach to RW 03 with significant safety benefit, better suited to aircraft with automatic flight systems and crew capability.

Reference	Description
CL-5108-014-N3	<p>█ advised that local “resident groups” had been lobbying LBHA for change to flight procedures to enable environmental benefit to be accrued. Consequently, LBHA had additional impetus to realise the change. In particular, the change envisaged would provide the neighbours living to the NE of the Airport some welcome relief from the potential noise nuisance that occasionally arises from the current arrangements. LBHA considered it was time for change despite the constraints and limiting factors that existed.</p>
CL-5108-014-N4	<p>█ asked if there was any link between the introduction of the proposed RNAV procedure and growth in air traffic. █ advised that there was no link as there had already been a natural growth in corporate and private aircraft traffic in the last decade. The RNAV procedure was not being pursued as an enabler to grow this traffic further but more as a means to deliver appropriate AWOPS for today’s modern aircraft. It should be noted that there have been 3 separate consultations with the local communities and Authorities on developments at the Airport in recent years and these had attracted significant support (circa 76-79%). During the consultation process about these plans, the community living in the NE villages had been very pleased to learn of the Airport’s proposed initiative to make changes to the airspace arrangements that, when implemented, would deliver some respite to those inhabitants that are currently overflown by all IFR inbounds. █ advised that, on average, there would be one aircraft movement per hour in the first few years increasing to 2 per hour by 2030.</p>
CL-5108-014-N5	<p>█ was invited to make a presentation on the proposal which highlighted the key points made in the ACP requirement document (CL-5108-ACP-011) which had been issued to SARG staff prior to the Briefing. █ advised that LBHA had established an Operational Requirement and planned to develop a LNAV IAP for RW03 which had significant advantage in reducing the minima over the current circling approach procedure. Since 2012, LBHA had carried out extensive ‘informal discussions’ with local and adjacent airspace users and each had identified their stakeholder requirements in the proposed change. Consequently, there were numerous airspace issues identified that needed to be addressed (and solutions found) to ensure that the equitable access to the airspace which LBHA sought was achieved.</p>
CL-5108-014-N6	<p>█ explained that LBHA would prefer to establish an APV (that was predicated on radar vectoring to final approach) on RW 03; but a discussion (17 Apr 2015) with NATS staff had determined that this was not tenable in the desired time frame for establishment. NATS had identified numerous issues which were articulated in minutes of meeting (CL-5108-MIN-013) that had been circulated to the Chairman. █ and █ had been able to review the minutes and understood the issues arising. However, █ opined that the APV option should be explored more fully as it did not appear that sufficient analysis for rejecting the option had taken place. He advised that it was important that the option be presented in the Sponsor Consultation documentation and thus needed more attention. In any event, LBHA harboured a desire to pursue this matter further and would give consideration to alternative designs for an APV. █ stated that this option would be explored further in the Focus Groups.</p>

Reference	Description
CL-5108-014-N7	<p>The impact of the LNAV procedure on the SIDs published for Gatwick was considered. ■ asked that if the vertical profile of the SIDs had to be adjusted to assure standard separation was achieved procedurally would this require an ACP? ■ stated that he did not view that a change to the climb profile of the affected SIDs should precipitate an ACP for something that reflected reality.</p>
CL-5108-014-N8	<p>Discussion then turned to the impact on the airspace within which the future LNAV IAP would lie. AR explained that several years previous Gatwick had offered to modify part of the Gatwick CTA and revert it back to Class G; however this was not the most elegant of solutions and could give rise to ‘unintended consequences’ in regards its usage by others. It should be noted that LBHA did not use surveillance equipment in the delivery of its ATS. However, as part of the change it was intended to introduce enhanced ATM for monitoring flights. ■ advised that the technological improvement would not change the flight rules applied in Class G but would give a better ‘air picture’ and improve awareness for controllers at LBHA. To mitigate the potential ‘unknown usage’ of the airspace, ■ suggested that the segment of airspace removed from the existing CTA be replaced with Radio Mandatory Airspace (RMA). There had also been views expressed that a portion of the CTA could be ‘delegated airspace’ or the entry by the LNAV approach co-ordinated with the controlling authority.</p>
CL-5108-014-N9	<p>It was agreed that, during the Safety Assurance HAZID and the Focus Group sessions, stakeholders should determine how the IAP should be flown and determine which agency would exercise appropriate control over it. ■ advised that whilst the principle of establishing a RMA might be used in the Focus Group sessions to encourage debate, the determination of volume and lateral extents of such airspace should be subject to separate discussion. ■ requested guidance on RMA design criteria with respect to developing the proposals as – not being controlled airspace (CAS) <i>per se</i> – the guidance in the CAA’s Policy Statement on airspace design could be considered by some as not applicable; in the interim ■ was using the guidance applicable to CAS. ■ was asked to send an email to SARG staff (■, ■, ■ and ■) setting out the requirements for the RMA so that a policy position could be developed.</p>
CL-5108-014-N10	<p>■ advised that proper coding would be essential to guarantee that the aircraft flies the profile as published and to ensure that the profile met the requirements of the various control agencies. ■ suggested that this would be best assessed during the Focus Group work and would feature in the IAP design. ■ remarked that he would, if necessary, consider facilitating the installation of RTF equipment to the airframes of certain airspace users to enable the RMA to be introduced. It was agreed that the various options to resolve control and airspace configuration should be explored further as part of the ACP during Focus Group activities.</p>

Reference	Description
CL-5108-014-N11	<p>█ presented the proposed list of consultees. █ advised that LBHA should include known ‘pressure groups’ and also identify how other members of the public can get access to the Sponsor Consultation. █ explained how one ‘pressure group’ operated and stated that LBHA would make every effort to encourage their participation. █ remarked that the Sponsor must make it clear that the consultation was a ‘stakeholder’ consultation conducted in accordance with CAP 725 and not a ‘public’ consultation. In addition, █ advised that it was essential to adhere to the process as published and also state what subject matters were <i>not</i> included. █ advised that the local residents and in particular, Bromley Residents Against Airport Development (BRAAD) would be consulted and that the SARG advice would be applied. █ suggested that an open day for GA to present the case for the change might prove useful. LBHA noted the comment and would consider the merits of such an initiative.</p>
CL-5108-014-N12	<p>The conference call connection with █ was terminated before the agenda item on environmental matters was discussed. █ briefed LBHA that the environmental element of the consultation process was important and in the absence of specific issues, LBHA should follow the generic guidance contained in CAP 725. █ remarked that generally business jets are not audible from the ground when operating at circa 3000ft and above; therefore, these aircraft were unlikely to be heard against the ambient background noise. The planned approach path for the LNAV procedure would avoid most built-up areas (although it was acknowledged that Coulsden would be overflown) and generally it followed major arterial roads. LEQ contour work (57 and above) along the route and SEL footprints should feature in the consultation document; this included the leg from the ALKIN hold to overhead LBHA, because any noise impacts below 7,000ft should be considered even if the conclusion is that the impacts are not significant. █ advised that nothing on the approach would reach this limit as nearly all aircraft into and out of LBHA were DFT-exempt types. █ advised that LBHA would engage Bickerdyke Allan to complete the necessary technical works and submit the results to SARG for advice prior to issuing the consultation documentation. █ advised that given the consultees and their concerns that it would be advisable to explain what the potential impact would be. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify how the tracks used now would differ from those proposed;</li> <li>• Explain the anticipated concentration of tracks;</li> <li>• Explain the improved profile (i.e. aircraft higher for longer).</li> </ul> <p>█ stated that there was an ongoing initiative to measure SEL to obtain real data and that LBHA intended to undertake a PR exercise using 3D computer animation to demonstrate the comparison between profiles (before and after) on the LBHA website. In addition, more technical written material would be used to support the graphical output. █ acknowledged that this would be useful. █ advised that LBHA should state that it recognised that the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from increased track mileage would be a factor; but also explain how this is expected to be mitigated to some extent by any improvement in vertical profile. If the CO<sub>2</sub> impact cannot be assessed, LBHA should explain why. It should be noted that DfT place a greater priority on the impact of noise over the fuel burn for any Airspace Changes that affect traffic below 4,000ft. For changes between 4,000ft and 7,000ft, the impacts of noise and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are balanced.</p>

Reference	Description
CL-5108-014-N14	<p>█ remarked that the current circling approach had no defined ground track and that the new IAP would provide more regularity of route. █ advised that the numbers of aircraft that might be expected to use the IAP should be articulated. █ advised that the existence of National Parks and AONB in the vicinity of the planned aircraft track should be checked and any impacts considered.</p>
CL-5108-014-N15	<p>█ advised the flyability of the IAP can be done at any time. █ remarked that, to meet the desired timeline, the ACP and design works would be run in parallel. █ considered that ideally the IAP design should be evaluated before consultation. █ requested that the IAP (in final form) should be submitted as soon as practicable, but LBHA should consult SARG on the expected delivery date (as soon as possible) so that it might be inserted into the busy SARG schedule. █ stated that it was essential that suitably-qualified crew fly the procedure and that an objective-based report on the flight simulation and its results should be submitted. █ agreed that an ‘independent crew’ would be engaged to fly the procedure. █ advised that the simulator assessment would be adequate supporting evidence for the flyability of the IAP unless the simulation reveals an issue demanding that a flight check be undertaken. █ remarked that the procedure design must enable an average pilot to fly the procedure without intervention (e.g. excessive use of speedbrake) and, therefore, the simulation of the profiles tested should include ‘variables’. █ agreed that a ‘test schedule’ would be developed and a proper and thorough briefing provided to the crew prior to the simulation. █ said that “aircraft failures” need not form part of the simulated events in the checking of the IAP as it was not a requirement. █ asked if one or more aircraft types should be checked and, in response, █ advised that if the customer base demands that a wider evaluation should take place then the sponsor should consider the viability of undertaking the check on various types. Of import was that the parameters used for evaluating the IAP should be realistic. █ suggested that the flyability check should be included as a separate work package in the overall schedule for delivery of the ACP in case it becomes a ‘critical path’ item. This was acknowledged and would be included.</p>

## Decisions

Reference	Subject	Description
CL-5108-014-D1	IAP Design	The selected procedure for the ACP would be the ‘self-contained’ procedural LNAV IAP to RW03 outlined in the FWB ACP Proposal document
CL-5108-014-D2	IAP Design	LBHA would continue their investigation into the viability of introducing an APV on RW03 using the Focus Group
CL-5108-014-D3	CAP 725	CAA SARG did not view that a change to the climb profile of a SID (which left the nominal track unaffected) should precipitate an ACP for something that reflected reality



## Actions

Reference	Description	Owner	Due Date
CL-5108-014-A1	Initiate discussion on the policy statement to be applied to the design of RMA Airspace	■	30 Apr 2015
CL-5108-014-A2	Flyability check of the IAP to be included in the ACP Schedule	■	30 Apr 2015
CL-5108-014-A3	Progress NATS radar vectored APV aspiration as a secondary medium term aspiration?	■	As Required

## Next meeting

Date:	TBN	Time:	TBN
Venue:	TBN		