

KEMBLE CAP1616 ACP STEP 2a OPTIONS
STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING

Tuesday 22nd January 2019

Cotswold Airport Control Tower Board Room

Present:

██████████	Airport ██████████	██████████	Merlin Aerospace Consulting
██████████	BGGC Nympsfield	██████████	BGGC Nympsfield
██████████	BGA	██████████	Cotswold Gliding Club

1 Apologies:

1.1 None

2 Minutes from previous meeting:

2.1 None

3 Outstanding Actions from previous meetings:

3.1 None

4 Airport ██████████ introduction:

4.1 Agenda (see attachment at page 3)

4.2 ██████ welcomed the attendees to Kemble and thanked them for their engagement and feedback so far. He briefly described the agenda including the objectives of the meeting and anticipated outputs.

4.3 ██████ reflected on the Open House held at Kemble [date] which had received a lot of support from the gliding community. Having studied the feedback and amended the Design Principles he was looking to test understanding of the meeting regarding Step 2b.

4.4 The focus going forward will be to assess options, prioritise and discount them as appropriate and he hoped that this group could help with that process.

4.5 A wide ranging discussion followed and the following comments were recorded.

5 Discussion notes:

5.1 Anticipated traffic on the procedure may be an average of 1 per day

- 5.2 Comment – Gloucester Airport example indicates approaches being made by a/c in conditions not requiring an RNAV(GNSS) IAP.
Answer – Kemble will operate a slot system to regulate approaches
- 5.3 Discussed Kemble current procedures and noise abatement procedures/circuit and CAT C/D restriction for permission to use the IAP.
- 5.4 Slots issues questioned.
Answer – ██████████ example used to illustrate the way to obtain CAA approval for reducing MAC risks in the circuit.
- 5.5 Comment – Gliding sites would prefer an option where the final approach was longer 10-12nm but without T or Y legs.
Answer – Kemble’s aim is to avoid gliding sites
- 5.6 █████ cautioned against confusing approaches with landings
- 5.7 Delegates agreed their preference will be Option 1 but questioned the issue of missed approaches/go arounds?
- 5.8 ‘Purple Airspace’ CAS(T) is a problem time and extent wise to glider sites, Anything that reduces the size and impact of the notification of airspace restrictions would be welcome.
Answer- Noted that an opportunity to reduced the size of temporary airspace may be afforded through the provision of defined approaches.
- 5.9 Question about South Cerney parachuting symbol on charts, BZN control? Redlands future?
Answer – Noted and added to list of issues to take to SATCO Brize Norton. Kemble shares the group’s concerns about the choke point created in the vicinity of South Cerney.
- 5.10 Subsidiary point raised concerning charting winch height and tow patterns.
- 6 AOB:**
- 6.1 Letters of Agreement between Kemble and local aerodromes require updating. ██████████ offered to help update the one for Aston Down as a separate action. An LoA for Nympsfield would also be considered

Next Meeting:

Date tbc

Venue Airport Control Tower

Time 11.00hrs (Local Time)

Agenda - Stage 2a Options Discussion with Local Gliding Community/Sites

Date: 22 Jan 19

Invited Members

Change Sponsor
Merlin Aerospace
Nympsfield Gliding Club
Aston Down Gliding Club
Local BGA Rep

Objectives

1. To discuss and challenge the Stage 2a initial options.
2. To better understand both Kemble's Cat C and D arrivals traffic and tracks and the use of local airspace by gliders.

Agenda

1. Apologies for absence
2. CAP 1616 progress and contextual stage in the process
3. Key feedback so far (GA and BGA)
4. Review of current airspace use by aircraft intended to be addressed by the proposal
5. Where we would like to place these aircraft in the future
6. Frequency of utilisation and operational controls
7. Constraints and context (other GA movements)
8. Stage 2a identified options and options discussion.
9. Safety case
10. Discussion on way ahead
11. AOB

Inputs	Outputs	Ground Rules
1. Kemble's CAP 1616 Stage 2a engagement document	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prioritisation/discounting options Changes to operating policies where appropriate and agreed. 2. Potential new LOAs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Open forum for discussion 2. Aim is to increase safety and reduce the potential collision risk 3. Aim is to reduce airspace impact ALARP.