

**MINUTES OF DOLGELLAU (ID: ACP-2022-025) ASSESSMENT MEETING HELD ONLINE ON  
31<sup>st</sup> AUGUST 2022**

2<sup>nd</sup> September 2022

**Distribution List**

[xxxx.xxxx@caa.co.uk](mailto:xxxx.xxxx@caa.co.uk)  
[xxxx.xxxx@caa.co.uk](mailto:xxxx.xxxx@caa.co.uk)  
[xxxx.xxxx@uave.co.uk](mailto:xxxx.xxxx@uave.co.uk)

<b>Present</b>	<b>Appointment</b>	<b>Representing</b>
xxxx xxxx (CG)	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
xxxx xxxx (CB)	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
xxxx xxxx (KS)	Airspace Regulator (Engagement and Consultation)	CAA
xxxx xxxx (JC)	Airspace Regulator (Environment)	CAA
xxxx xxxx (AP)	Principal RPAS Technical Inspector	CAA
xxxx xxxx (PS)	Managing Director	UAVE
xxxx xxxx (GG)	Business Development	UAVE

**CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement**

*“The CAA has received the Statement of Need and Assessment Meeting Agenda in advance of this Assessment Meeting and can confirm that the documents are required to be published together with the minutes of this meeting on the airspace change portal.*

*The purpose of the Assessment Meeting as set out in CAP1616 is for the Change Sponsor to present and discuss their Statement of Need, provide information on how it intends to fulfil the requirements of the airspace change process and present its provisional timescales. Lastly, the sponsor is required to provide information on how it intends to meet the engagement requirements of the process.”*

	<b>ACTION</b>
<p><b>Item 1 – Introduction</b></p> <p>Introductions were made by all present at the meeting. CG read the opening statement as quoted above. CG noted that it was not required to have an Airspace Regulator (Economic) present for this meeting due to the scope of the proposed change. CG stated that UAVE should prepare draft minutes of the meeting and send to the CAA for a review prior to redacting and publishing on the ACP portal.</p>	<p>CB to send GG text of opening statement for inclusion in minutes</p>
<p><b>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</b></p>	

<p>GG presented an overview of the Statement of Need and highlighted the proximity of the proposed TDA to the “Mach Loop” Military Low Flying Area.</p> <p>CG asked if UAVE had undertaken any numerical analysis on the number of historical flights within the proposed TDA area and the likely impact. GG responded that as the area in question was Class G airspace no formal analysis of flight numbers had been undertaken however the UAVE broad assessment of the TDA area was that the vast majority of flights would be recreational and be undertaken on evenings and at weekends. To mitigate the effect on other airspace users UAVE’s proposal is to activate the TDA on weekdays only and only between 8am and 6pm (or ATC hours if shorter ).</p> <p>CB requested that UAVE make it clear in the stakeholder engagement material that whilst the TDA is requested for 90 days, the UAV operations are only expected to take 2 weeks and that the TDA would only be activated by NOTAM on active UAV flying days.</p> <p>CB commented that Peniarth Estate (Airfield) was within the proposed TDA and had we started engagement with them. PS responded that the airfield was operated by the same operator as Talybont Airfield and therefore they were aware of the proposal.</p>	
<p><b>Item 3 – Issues or opportunities arising from proposed change</b></p> <p>JC requested further information from UAVE regarding UAS flights over inhabited areas. GG responded that the UAVE UAS Operating Safety Case (OSC) states that flights can only be conducted in rural areas away from any towns and villages. JC advised that if the flights do not overfly inhabited areas then assessment of UAS noise could be scoped out. Additionally as the Danger Area is unlikely to result in rerouting of other airspace users then the assessment of the consequential noise impacts on other airspace users can also be scope out.</p>	
<p><b>Item 4 – Process requirements</b></p> <p><b>i. Stakeholder engagement</b></p> <p>KS reminded the change sponsor of the main process requirements from engagement perspective and offered to email those to UAVE to aid the TDA process. KS stated that the proposed 6-week stakeholder engagement timeline was a the standard length for TDA applications.KS advised that the CAA’s Flight Ops can review the UAVE targeted stakeholder engagement list to provide regional knowledge of operators and to check for any omissions. GG offered to email the list prior to the start of the engagement for CAA review. CB requested that UAVE make it clear in the stakeholder engagement material that the proposed TDA area was “not set in stone” and was open to be amended as part</p>	<p>KS to email the steps of the engagement process to GG.</p> <p>GG to email KS targeted stakeholder engagement list</p>

<p>of the process and that UAVE should present TDA options based on which airfield was used for operations.</p> <p><b>ii. Safety Assessment</b>  AP requested that UAVE liaise with the emergency services to provide assurances of prioritisation across the TDA if required. GG responded that for previous operations within TDA's UAVE put in place a document (Temporary Operating Instruction) with the emergency services (MCA/ARCC) detailing how this prioritisation would operate. AP requested updates to the UAVE OSC referencing the Dolgellau TDA were made early in the process. AP added from personal experience the military also routinely used the river valley / estuary from Dolgellau to Barmouth for low flying operations. AP requested clarification on whether buffer zones to allow for suitable deconfliction were included within the proposed TDA. PS responded that both lateral and vertical buffer zones were included in the TDA design</p>	<p><b>PS to update UAVE OSC and submit to AP.</b></p>
<p><b>Item 5 – Provisional Timescales</b></p> <p>Provisional timescales were outlined by UAVE (GG) with a proposed operations start date in May 2023.</p>	<p><b>GG to email Timeline to CG &amp; CB</b></p>
<p><b>Item 6 – Next steps</b></p> <p>CAA to review and CG / CB to advise UAVE on the suitability of the TDA process.</p>	<p><b>CAA to review and CG / CB to advise UAVE</b></p>
<p><b>Item 7 – AOB</b></p> <p>GG requested assistance in the correct way to describe a circle within a TDA. CG advised that the description should comprise a central point, a radius length and the start and end point of any arc if a full 360 circle was not described and offered to provide assistance on how to describe the proposed area such that it is consistent with other published DAs in the UK AIP  CB also requested that all coordinates were given as degrees, minutes and seconds, not decimal degrees as in UAVE's initial submission, as that is the required format of the AIC.</p>	

**ACTIONS ARISING FROM [INSERT NAME OF CHANGE PROPOSAL] ASSESSMENT MEETING**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Opening Statement	CB	Email opening statement to GG. COMPLETED	07 Sep 22
Minutes	GG	Email draft minutes to CG & CB. COMPLETED	07 Sep 22
Engagement Process	KS	Email steps of the engagement process to GG. COMPLETED	07 Sep 22
Engagement Process	GG	Email KS targeted stakeholder engagement list prior to start of the engagement	14 Sep 22
Safety Assessment	PS	Email AP updates to the UAVE OSC referencing the Dolgellau TDA	“ Early in the process”
Timeline	GG	Email Timeline to CG & CB. COMPLETED	07 Sep 22

UAVE Limited  
ACP Sponsor