

Meeting Record

Project Title	Biggin Hill 21 RNAV ACP (ACP-2019-86)
Client	Biggin Hill Airport (the Sponsor)
Purpose of Meeting	Stage 2 Design Options Public Focus Group
Date of Meeting	15 th April 2021
Held at	Virtual Conference (Zoom)
Present	██████████, Biggin Hill Airport – Chair ██████████ ██████████ Biggin Hill Airport ██████████ ██████████, Osprey Consulting Services Ltd ██████████ ██████████, Osprey Consulting Services Ltd ██████████ ██████████ Tatsfield Residents Association ██████████ ██████████, Westerham Town Council ██████████ ██████████, Westerham Town Council ██████████
Copies to	Listed above
Classification	None
Osprey Reference	71372/010
Issue	Final

This document is of UK origin and has been prepared by Osprey Consulting Services Limited (Osprey) and, subject to any existing rights of third parties, Osprey is the owner of the copyright therein. The document is furnished in confidence under existing laws, regulations and agreements covering the release of data. This document contains proprietary information of Osprey and the contents or any part thereof shall not be copied or disclosed to any third party without Osprey's prior written consent.

© Osprey Consulting Services Limited 2021



Meeting Summary

Item	Action
<p>1.1 – Opening</p> <p>As the meeting was held online via Zoom, ■ welcomed all and began with general housekeeping information.</p>	
<p>1.2 – Presentation and Overview of Design Options</p> <p>■ began talking through the presentation, providing an overview of the CAP 1616 process and current progress to date including Design Principles and constraints.</p> <p>As part of the presentation, the rationale behind the options numbering and development was described. This was followed by slides that showed all of the design options graphically featuring key points to note about each option.</p> <p>■ noted that the IAF North was not used much prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, however, due to the decreased traffic at LCY, over the last 12 months the use of the IAF North area has increased significantly.</p> <p>After talking through the Instrument Approach options, ■ proceed to describe the MAP options noting that Options 10 (Left turn out back to ALKIN) and 11 (Right turn out back to ALKIN) would most likely have the largest impact on the LGW CTA and/or Kenley airfield. It must be stressed that all MAP options will need to be at 2,000 ft or lower. ■ also briefed attendees on an additional MAP option (Option 12) that had been suggested at the earlier Aviation Focus Group.</p>	
<p>1.3 – Question & Answer Session</p> <p>■ asked what the current direction of the MAP was. ■ explained that the current procedure was for aircraft to turn right and route back to ALKIN via the airfield overhead. He also explained that a GNSS MAP was more constrained in the way they are designed with the use of waypoints and that it would not be possible to replicate the current ground track exactly using GNSS procedures.</p> <p>■ also stated that there were no major issues with the proposed options but asked what height the aircraft would be in the vicinity of Westerham. ■ explained that aircraft would climb to a maximum height of 2,000 ft during the MAP due to constraints of other procedures.</p> <p>■ stated that there were no problems with the routes chosen and asked what height aircraft would be in at OSVEV. ■ explained that aircraft would be at 3,000 ft at the start of the procedure as this is the height that aircraft are currently fed into the approach procedure by Air Traffic Control.</p> <p>■ also asked what aircraft were doing that were landing from a southerly direction. ■ explained that aircraft would fly the ILS procedure to Runway 21 and if weather conditions permitted, aircraft would fly a low level circling approach at 1,200 ft to land on Runway 03. Aircraft had to fly this procedure as there is currently no instrument procedure for Runway 03, although there is a separate ACP to introduce this procedure.</p> <p>■ asked for confirmation that this application was not about airport expansion.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>■ confirmed that this was not the case and reiterated the information from the presentation that the introduction of this procedure as an alternative to the ILS procedure.</p>	
<p>1.4 – Closing</p> <p>■ asked those attending the meeting if they could also provide written responses to the Design Options prior to the published deadline of 7th May. ■ thanked all for their attendance and closed the meeting.</p>	