Focus Group 2 - Minutes

Project Title	[redacted]
Client	[redacted]
Purpose of Meeting	Design Principles Focus Group – Aviation Stakeholders
Date of Meeting	13 June 2019
Held at	Exeter Airport Conference Room
Present	[redacted] Exeter Airport Consultative Committee <ACC> [redacted] National Trust <NT> [redacted] ACC/Exeter City Council <ECC> [redacted] NATS <NATS> [redacted] ACC/Bishops Clyst Parish Council <BCPC> [redacted] ACC/East Devon District Council Environmental Health <EDDC> [redacted] Exeter Airport Operations Director <EDAL> [redacted] Exeter Airport Air Traffic Services Manager <EDAL> [redacted] Osprey CSL <OSP> [redacted] Osprey CSL <OSP>
Osprey Reference	71189/018
Issue	Issue 1 Draft B

Glossary

Acronym	Meaning
ACC	Airport Consultative Committee
ACP	Airspace Change Proposal
ATC	Air Traffic Control
ATZ	Air Traffic Zone
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority
CAS	Controlled Airspace
CAT	Commercial Air Transport
ft	feet
GA	General Aviation
GESP	Greater Exeter Strategic Plan
GNSS	Global Navigation Satellite System
NT	National Trust

Meeting Summary

Item	Action
Opening introductions [redacted]<EDAL> welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance. He then provided an introduction which described the purpose of the Focus Group and outlined the current operations at Exeter Airport. [redacted] <EDAL> then described the reasons why Exeter Airport is seeking an airspace change before [redacted] <OSP> provided further information on the CAP 1616 process and the requirement for Design Principles. [redacted] <ECC> stated that he was extremely unaware of the regulations around aviation and asked whether all aircraft that fly have to submit a flight plan. [redacted]<EDAL> replied that they didn't. Commercial Air Transport (CAT), such as airlines, had to file flight plans to be allowed to join the airways structure, but General Aviation (GA) traffic doesn't have to submit a flight plan. Not only can they fly where they want, they don't even have to talk to Air Traffic Control (ATC) to do so.	
Appropriateness of Level [redacted]<OSP> described the requirement to scale the process by assigning a level to the Airspace Change Proposal (ACP). She stated that the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) considered that this ACP would be Level 1. [redacted] <OSP> gave the attendees the chance to express their opinion on the appropriateness of the level chosen. [redacted]<NT> stated that as they were not experts in this area and that if the CAA had suggested that this will be a Level 1 change, they would not say anything to the contrary. There were no further comments or disagreements to the consideration that this ACP would be a Level 1.	
Open Forum Discussion [redacted]<ECC> asked who the recipients of the questionnaires at each Local Authority were. He commented that, for example, a City Council could receive 3 questionnaires to different parts of the Council, and this would result in 3 different opinions depending on who received the questionnaire. [redacted]<EDDC> stated that the Planning and Environmental Health departments should be the recipients.	

Item	Action
[redacted]<OSP> clarified that this is an early engagement with the Authorities and is not a consultation. Questionnaires were sent to Council Chief Executives for dissemination to the appropriate Council departments for action. [redacted] <ACC> commented that although many of those present were there due to their involvement in the Airport Consultative Committee (ACC), they also represented a number of local Councils. With their involvement in the local communities, there were only 2 main issues that the airport faces, that of noise and night flying. The ACC would prefer Exeter Airport to use standard departure and arrival routes, but any issues that arise can be mitigated by the ACC through discussion with the affected parties. Even if the airport were to expand by 50%, the only issue is likely to be night flying, and even this could be mitigated through quotas. [redacted]<OSP> emphasised that this ACP was about the airspace structure around the airport rather than the routes the aircraft follow. [redacted]<EDDC> asked whether the smaller planes that operate out of Exeter could fly anywhere and if the process was not about the routes, these aircraft could continue to fly anywhere. [redacted]<OSP> stated that there were no options at this stage but if the option was to have Controlled Airspace (CAS) all around the airport with a requirement to talk to ATC, other small aircraft may change their procedures which could have an indirect effect on the routes these aircraft follow. [redacted]<EDDC> stated that these small aircraft cause problems in areas of new development , rather than in large conurbations. [redacted]<OSP> asked whether Exeter Airport should also consider introducing new routes, which was not part of the original plan. [redacted]<EDDC> commented that these new routes would primarily be for the larger passenger carrying aircraft, and that the smaller aircraft would not be bound by these procedures. [redacted]<NT> asked whether at the minute, aircraft outside 2.5 miles from the airport can do whatever they want. [redacted]<EDAL> replied that only aircraft that want to operate inside the 2.5 miles have to follow ATC instructions. Passenger aircraft approaching the airport come up airways and ATC give them instructions and directions that will position them correctly to land and these aircraft have to adhere to these instructions. The idea is to have a larger area around the airport where other aircraft have to talk to ATC so instructions can be given to avoid confliction. [redacted]<NT> commented that there will be an impact on aviation traffic and their movements. If the airspace is increased, Exeter will be able to prioritise the CAT against the GA traffic and as they will be able to control the smaller aircraft, it will be easier to make them move.	

Item	Action
[redacted]<ECC> added that it will be less likely that a commercial aircraft would be diverted around due to an unknown aircraft and therefore there is likely to be less noise impact on Exeter city. [redacted]<EDDC> asked if there would be consequences for aircraft that did not comply with ATC instructions. [redacted]<NATS> stated that there are occasions when aircraft infringe airspace and if this is caused by negligence on the part of the pilot, the pilot will be interviewed by the CAA. Repeat offenders can have their flying licence suspended. With the use of Global Navigation Satellite Systems (GNSS), the boundaries of airspace are obvious and are shown on the displays being used, so there are fewer infringements. [redacted] <BCPC> asked that if the airport were to get CAS, will it be able to confine CAT to precise approaches. As a resident of a local village, noise from the smaller aircraft 'droning around' is very annoying. [redacted]<OSP> added that inside CAS, the aircraft have to talk to ATC. There are some pilots that don't want to talk to ATC so as a consequence, there may be more aircraft around the edge of the CAS trying to avoid it. [redacted]<EDDC> commented that the airport should consider using different maps, especially around areas of new development, like Cranbrook and in areas around the edge of Exeter as the town expands. [redacted] <OSP> explained that for the next phases, where design options are being made, a different array of maps will be used to give the best possible picture of the areas that may be affected. [redacted]<OSP> added that the airport struggles to get all the information of planned developments that may inform the design process. [redacted]<EDDC> stated that all the local areas have plans that have proposals for 20 years plus. [redacted]<NT> added that policies maps are also available from websites that detail plans out to approximately 2030. [redacted]<EDDC> commented on the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan (GESP), which is local Councils [East Devon, Exeter, Mid Devon, and Teignbridge] working in partnership with Devon County Council on a wider view for the local community and that this is an amalgamation of local strategic plans. [redacted]<NT> added that GESP is about to go to consultation, so the website may show the sites for proposed developments, which will assist Exeter Airport. [redacted] <ECC> commented that there are two different sorts of plans; Local Authorities have their development proposals for an area but the developer's will have their own development plans, which will outline how the developer intends to utilise the space they are developing on. It may be the case that the developer does not necessarily develop in the way the Local Authority	

Item	Action
originally intended. Exeter Airport will be a statutory consultee in any of these local developments so will have the opportunity to comment on plans. [redacted]<EDDC> added that local plans will be a part of GESP and that service leads within the authorities will have details of developments in their area. The level of the plans will need to be looked at to see if this could benefit Exeter Airport. [redacted]<NT> asked that, if Exeter currently have a 2.5-mile zone at the minute, what kind of CAS do other airports of a similar size have. [redacted] <EDAL> stated that Bournemouth Airport was a similar size to Exeter and that they have a lozenge-shaped area of CAS [demonstrated on a map]. [redacted] <EDAL> also showed the airspace construct at Bristol and Southend Airports, to demonstrate how the airspace can be stepped in height blocks to accommodate aircraft as they climb or descend. [redacted]<BCPC> added that the airspace around Southend Airport is more to do with the airport's expansion plans, rather than flight safety. He stated that Southend's plan is to get bigger and busier and create more noise. [redacted]<EDAL> added that Exeter Airport's growth plan is smaller than Southend's. [redacted]<ACC> commented that Southend Airport has large growth due to the proximity of London and that Bristol, Airport has a large catchment area to support its operations. He added that at Exeter Airport, there is a small local populace and that the number of flights is generally dictated by demand of local population. He also added that growth at an airport could be a result of capacity limitations at other airport's, such as Heathrow not being allowed a third runway. However, there was a remote possibility that this would effect Exeter Airport. [redacted]<BCPC> asked whether the military have any preferential treatment at Exeter. [redacted] <EDAL> replied that although the military currently use Exeter Airport, they do not receive any preferential treatment and they don't solely use Exeter Airport. [redacted]<EDDC> asked whether the military aircraft call Exeter ATC on the radio. [redacted]<EDAL> stated that they are generally very good at calling Exeter ATC. [redacted]<EDDC> asked whether creating the blocks of airspace demonstrated in the opening presentation and on the map, would tempt other aircraft to fly lower nearer the airspace. [redacted] <EDAL> replied that the aircraft would fly whatever height they wanted, regardless of the airspace around. [redacted] <OSP> added that the airspace designs would need to take into account where, and at what height, aircraft currently operate around Exeter Airport.	

Item	Action
[redacted]<ECC> asked if there would be any disadvantages to local residents from the planned changes. [redacted]<OSP> replied that other aircraft would fly around the airspace, rather than through it, so there would be a possibility that traffic would become concentrated in a particular area, and therefore produce an increase in noise. However, as long as the planned changes took this into account and didn't create 'pinch-points' for GA traffic, it shouldn't be an issue. [redacted]<ECC> commented, that with the current 2.5 mile and 2,000 ft Air Traffic Zone (ATZ), aircraft 5 miles away could freely fly around the edge of Exeter city and causing noise in that area. If the planned airspace extended so that it covered the whole of Exeter city, small aircraft would be more likely to fly outside the area and would therefore be less likely to create a noise problem on the periphery of the city. [redacted] <EDDC> commented that aircraft would be more dispersed if the planned airspace was, for example, a 5-mile radius circle. [redacted]<ECC> commented that the process was thorough and exhausting and that the airport would not want to go through the process again in 5-years' time. He added that the airport should look at both current and future plans and for commercial reasons, the airport should go larger rather than small. [redacted]<BCPC> commented that, as a local resident, flights observed down the River Exe estuary occasionally turn early and asked whether this was avoiding action. [redacted]<EDAL> replied that generally no, and that it was just aircraft turning early. He added that it would depend on the height that the aircraft had achieved. A CAA document includes an instruction to turn 'as early as possible to avoid the City of Exeter' and this can be interpreted differently by the pilots. [redacted] <NT> commented that as part of the engagement, the airport could ask for any areas that should avoid an increase in air traffic. If there are any areas that are more vulnerable than others, the airspace could be designed to either include the area within the airspace, which could reduce the number of aircraft flying in that area, or not put the boundary of the airspace close to the sensitive area, to avoid pinch points and overflight by aircraft just avoiding the CAS. [redacted]<NT> added that, on behalf of the National Trust (NT), Killerton House would be an area they would like aircraft to avoid. However, due to its location away from the approach lanes to the runway, it may benefit from fewer low flying aircraft. In addition, there may be areas that people go to enjoy the tranquillity and that this needs to be an important consideration. These areas are valued by people trying to get away from urban noise. **Design Principle: Designs should consider areas of local tranquillity** [redacted]<OSP> stated that any designs will have to assess the impact on other areas not directly affected.	

Item	Action
[redacted]<EDDC> commented that the proposed change may have inherent positive benefits due to the increase in control that aircraft will be under. [redacted] <OSP> added that although it might make it better for some, it might make it worse for people around the periphery of the airspace. [redacted]<EDDC> stated that it should be made clear that the proposal shouldn't make the situation any worse due to the aircraft operating in and out of Exeter Airport as there are established approach routes at the minute, and these won't change. Most of the local problems are caused by the light aircraft operating in the local area. [redacted] <ECC> asked where the process goes from here and was consultation the next step. [redacted]<OSP> replied that the discussions from the Focus Group meetings, together with the questionnaire replies, would be used to create the Design Principles which will inform the airspace design process. The Design Principles would be sent back to the stakeholders who have been involved so far so that they can be prioritised. The prioritised Design Principles will then be sent to the CAA for the Gateway that will allow Exeter Airport to proceed to the next stage, where airspace designs will be produced. These will again be sent to the stakeholders for comment before being whittled down to a short list that will go through to full consultation. [redacted]<ECC> asked why airports have different shapes and sizes of CAS. [redacted]<EDAL> replied that it was based on the airport's runway, and was generally long and narrow to protect the aircraft during the final approach or departure. [redacted] <BCPC> opened a general discussion on the use of conspicuity codes. [redacted] <EDAL> explained what conspicuity codes were and how they were used by Air Traffic. He also explained, with reference to the opening presentation, that even if an aircraft has a conspicuity code, it can still cause problems for ATC in deconflicting with aircraft under their control. [redacted]<ECC> added that he could not believe that aircraft could fly around without a radio or a transponder and couldn't be seen by radar. The audience general consensus was that, from a safety point of view, why wouldn't you have aircraft talking on the radio and creating a known traffic environment. [redacted]<ACC> commented that the concept of a known environment is a must and that even with standard arrival and departure routes, the airport must have CAS for protection. [redacted] <OSP> added that the general public do not know the issue of GA, and in particular gliders, flying around without talking on the radio or using electronic conspicuity and that any support from the local councils in this matter, would be beneficial. [redacted]<BCPC> stated that he could not believe that the current protected area is only 2.5 miles.	

Item	Action
[redacted]<OSP> replied that the aim of this proposal was to have greater protection for the airport and its traffic. [redacted]<EDAL> added that the aim was to create a known traffic environment. **Design Principle: Create a known traffic environment** [redacted]<NT> stated that everyone was supportive of the plan and will send the airport map details of local NT estates and their visitor numbers, to be considered as part of the design process. [redacted] <ACC> commented that the ACC was totally supportive of Exeter Airport and its plans and was committed to working with the airport to mitigate the effect of noise and night flying, which remain the major issue for local communities. [redacted] <ECC> added that their guiding principal was to support the airport as it was an important asset bringing economic value and diversity to the region but reiterated the importance of noise and pollution. People want the economic benefits but without the downsides but the reality is that it is a balance. He is keen on the development of the airport and if it means there are less un-scheduled movements and less noise and pollution, he is supportive. [redacted] <EDAL> thanked everyone for attending and providing their input before closing the meeting.	

Summary of Design Principles

No	Design Principle
1	Designs should consider areas of local tranquillity
2	Create a known traffic environment