

Framework Meeting for Proposed GNSS Approaches for Shoreham Aerodrome (Brighton City Airport Ltd (BCAL))

Location: CAA House, London

Date: Wednesday 24th August 2016 @ 13:30.

Attendees:

CAA ()
CAA ()
CAA ()
CAA () by telephone
BCAL ()
BCAL ()
BCAL ()

Introductions & [] outlined agenda of selecting and discussing parts of CAP725.

[] – Powerpoint presentation of proposed GNSS approaches (Steep approach)

- **History of GNSS Approaches at Shoreham**
- **Environmental impact including noise plan**
[] interjected with confirmation of 3-monthly BCAL meetings with the Aerodrome Consultative Committee – very few noise complaints.
- **Simulations of proposed steep approach and feedback**
- **Weather statistics & topography of local area**
[] asked whether there is data on how many missed approaches due to weather. [] replied no data exists. [] confirmed that Flying Time Aviation (FTA) train for Missed Approaches in VMC and FTA policy is to fly the RWY02 RNAV approach and circle to land RWY20 if cloud base is close to minimum.
- **Location of new GNSS Hold and aircraft routings**

[] – Does this project count as an ACP?

Does it require new material for the AIP – Yes

Does it introduce new or changed Holds – Yes

The ACP process needs to be followed.

[] agreed that it meets the ACP criteria. BCAL need to look at the scale of the impact and proportionate requirements. Consultation with the local populace, eg. councils, newspaper adverts and to prompt replies prior to the deadline. If no-one replies then BCAL have made a valid effort. Noise effects are now considered up to 7000ft; any changes in traffic patterns up to this altitude may have a noise impact and so consideration of that should be reflected.

[] – Other aerodromes in Class G have gone through this process so their consultation documents may be found via Google or CAA website.

[] – Also consider that the current percentage of IFR movements (~5%) may increase, e.g. through an increase in training flights, or through an reduction in days when the runways cannot be used. The current air quality conclusions are fair. The South Downs NP and other Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty need to be considered separately. In the proposal explain the rationale and context for your conclusions on each of the typical environmental impacts (noise, CO₂ emissions, local air quality). The consultation and proposals should reflect a consideration of the scale of any change (e.g. in traffic dispersion, traffic pattern or frequency) and then an explanation of the extent of any assessment of the anticipated environmental impacts. When setting out the rationale for the noise impacts, it may be possible to use the noise assessments in the latest Noise Action Plan as illustrations of the current noise contours.

[] both stated that the CAA would need to see the consultation proposals prior to them being issued to the public to ensure that they were satisfactory.

Steep Approaches

■ – Currently there is no CAA policy for steep approaches (>4.5°).

■ – The original GNSS procedures for Shoreham were designed so as not to go into the Steep Approach criteria and limited due to the aerodrome's infrastructure which would need to be addressed. EASA have their requirements to be fulfilled. IR qualification does not include the special training to fly steep approaches and EASA regulations apply to all flight crews regardless of whether private or commercial. Advise looking at and discussing London City with its management and with the other European aerodromes that have approved steep approaches.

■ – Requested that a question posed to the aerodrome at an earlier meeting with CAA, as to what has changed infrastructure wise at the aerodrome to reverse the CAA decision of 2003, which was to limit IAPs to a VPA of 4.45°, be addressed formally by the aerodrome. Also the EASA steep approach requirements as published today should be assessed and addressed by the aerodrome.

The discussion passed to the PAPI angles which would be different to the approach path. ■ showed during the presentation that there are European aerodromes that have this anomaly and clearly state the difference in their documentation. This is one method to be included in the proposal.

■ - Raised the point that this could be a safety issue, where at minimums a pilot seeing 3 to 4 whites could increase the rate of descent on an already steep approach to become aligned with PAPIs that are not matched to the proposed steep approach.

■ – Offered options to be added to documentation, eg. warning boxes, pilots to book in and provide proof of qualification. Stressed that is not the aerodrome's responsibility to check pilots but the pilot to decide whether themselves and the aircraft can fly this type of approach. There has been a lot of money and time put into this already.

■ – Stated that BCAL could either progress with the airspace change to introduce new GNSS approaches to both runways, or submit separate airspace changes for each Runway.

Post Meeting Note:

If the decision is taken to split the airspace changes, then a single consultation on both runway ends would be acceptable for both proposals provided the latter proposal is received by the CAA within 12 months or so of the first proposal submission.

■ – Requested clarification of whom the procedure designers were as sub-contractors were involved. Also, looking at the Missed Approach on the current chart, a turn to the left to climb up the valley is included whereas the proposed does not have this. There is no rationale as to why this should be different.

■ – Enquired whether BCAL may make representations to the policy committee to include the whole of aviation rather than base a policy around what EGLC does and the aircraft that uses it.

■ - This is a work in progress and BCAL are in the unique position to be able to input into this discussion. BCAL will be kept informed of progress.

■ suggested that BCAL should consider how the requirements of the EU Ops regulation on steep approaches could be addressed between operator and aerodrome as part of any contribution to policy development.

■ - Stated a formal letter or email would be required stating how BCAL wish to proceed with this project.

Meeting Closed at 16:00.