

# Meeting Record

---

<b>Project Title</b>	Biggin Hill 21 RNAV ACP (ACP-2019-86)
<b>Client</b>	Biggin Hill Airport (the Sponsor)
<b>Purpose of Meeting</b>	Stage 2 Design Options Aviation Focus Group
<b>Date of Meeting</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> April 2021
<b>Held at</b>	Virtual Conference (Zoom)
<b>Present</b>	<p>██████████ Biggin Hill Airport – Chair ██████████</p> <p>██████████ Biggin Hill Airport ██████████</p> <p>██████████ Osprey Consulting Services Ltd ██████████</p> <p>██████████ Osprey Consulting Services Ltd ██████████</p> <p>██████████ Osprey Consulting Services Ltd – IFP Designer ██████████</p> <p>██████████ Osprey Consulting Services Ltd – Minute Taker ██████████</p> <p>██████████ NATS ██████████</p> <p>██████████ Aircraft Owners and Pilot Association ██████████</p> <p>██████████ Gatwick Airport ██████████</p> <p>██████████ RAF Kenley ██████████</p> <p>██████████ British Helicopter Association ██████████</p>
<b>For Information</b>	██████████ Heathrow Airport Ltd
<b>Copies to</b>	Listed above
<b>Classification</b>	None
<b>Osprey Reference</b>	71372/008
<b>Issue</b>	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><b>1.1 – Opening</b></p> <p>As the meeting was held online via Zoom, [REDACTED] welcomed all and began with general housekeeping information.</p>	
<p><b>1.2 – Presentation and Overview of Design Options</b></p> <p>[REDACTED] 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>[REDACTED] 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, [REDACTED] 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.</p>	
<p><b>1.3 – Question &amp; Answer Session</b></p> <p>[REDACTED] queried why the ILS would be required to be adjusted as a result of the new RNAV approach option. [REDACTED] responded stating that this was mainly due to the safety margins relating to the PAPIs. For safety, a 3° ILS would be permitted with a 3.2° RNAV approach (as trailed at LHR). On the other hand, a 3° glideslope with a 3.5° RNAV approach would be unacceptable, resulting in an adjustment of the ILS and PAPIs. It was noted that this would only be the case if the presented options involving a 3.5° approach were taken forward.</p> <p>[REDACTED] then enquired whether the options presented were the only ones being considered [REDACTED] confirmed that at this stage, this was the case. [REDACTED] added that the options presented was the full list of options derived from the Design Principles as per the CAP 1616 process but would be filtered down further following all focus groups and prior to the full consultation at Stage 3.</p> <p>An addition question was raised by [REDACTED] asking whether the new procedure would start at OSVEV. [REDACTED] confirmed this was correct. This prompted [REDACTED] to raise concerns regarding radar separation from LCY traffic, especially applicable on options 5, 6 and 7. [REDACTED] acknowledged this fact, reiterating that this full list of options would be scrutinised based on stakeholder feedback and some may be discounted all together as a result.</p> <p>[REDACTED] asked whether the ILS was to be removed to which [REDACTED] responded confirming that the ILS would remain.</p> <p>[REDACTED] expressed some concerns regarding the effect that the proposed MAP would</p>	

Item	Action
<p>have on Kenley airfield and associated gliding operations, stating that the MAP options presented appeared to be within 2km of Kenley. As a result, [REDACTED] queried whether the options presented actually already existed. [REDACTED] confirmed that the existing MAP cannot be replicated exactly due to IFP Design constraints, so the options presented were applicable.</p> <p>Following on from this, [REDACTED] suggested that a wider MAP track would be preferred to deconflict with traffic operating out of Kenley, referencing the planned approaches for RWY 03 as a baseline. [REDACTED] responded stating that as per the CAP 1616 process, this alternative MAP option would be explored in greater detail to determine its feasibility.</p> <p>[REDACTED] confirmed from an LGW perspective, there were no issues with the proposed inbound tracks. On the other hand [REDACTED] noted that deconfliction of the presented MAP options and LGW departures may be required, especially for those aircraft departing LGW routing north of the centre line. Furthermore, [REDACTED] suggested that during the formal consultation activities in Stage 3, that 'Current vs Future' graphics were presented to aid stakeholder understanding. This point was acknowledged by [REDACTED] who agreed to look into this further.</p>	<p>1.3.1</p> <p>1.3.2</p>
<p><b>1.4 - Closing</b></p> <p>[REDACTED] thanked all for their attendance and closed the meeting.</p>	

### Summary of Actions

Action	Description	Status	Owner(s)	Due Date
1.3.1	Explore the viability of an alternative MAP option with a wider track to deconflict with Kenley traffic.	Actioned	LBHA	30 Apr 21
1.3.2	Explore the possibility of adding 'Current vs Future' graphics into the Stage 3 Consultation material to aid stakeholder understanding.	Open	LBHA	Stage 3 Consultation