

Design Options Stakeholder Focus Groups – Record of Discussion

Project Title	London Biggin Hill Airport Airspace Change Proposal
Client	London Biggin Hill Airport
Purpose of Meeting	Stage 2 Design Options Focus Group - AM
Date of Meeting	26 th October 2022
Held at	Online (Teams)
Present	<p>Keston Representative</p> <p>Trax International</p> <p>Trax International/Gatwick Airport</p> <p>Gatwick Airport</p> <p>Heathrow Airport</p> <p>Heathrow Airport</p> <p>Trax International/Gatwick Airport</p> <p>Farnborough Park</p> <p>Heathrow Airport</p> <p>London Biggin Hill Airport</p> <p>London Biggin Hill Airport</p> <p>Osprey CSL</p>

Meeting Summary

Item
<p>Opening Introductions</p> <p>LBHA welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance. He then provided an introduction which described the purpose of the Focus Group and then described the comprehensive list of options that had previously been shared with stakeholders.</p>
<p>Open Forum Discussion</p> <p>Question – why are changes to the initial departure routes not in scope? Would exploring changes to the initial parts of the departure routes, such as offset departures, offer other opportunities to meet DP5 (Harmonised routes) and some of the other DPs?</p>

Item

Our Response: The current departure procedures have not been changed primarily because of safety, based on feedback from aircraft operators. The slight jink on Runway 21 is to avoid Biggin Hill village. We do not want to change procedures close in and in fact will be unable to due to PANS-OPS limitations.

Question – why was there only one option presented for the Runaway 03 departures to the north when all the other options to the east, south and west have a number of options. This option goes through a densely populated area to the north of the airport and we would like to see other options for this departure.

Our Response: Bear in mind that this is a swathe and there could be multiple route options within this area. The options were developed to following the design principles and look to minimise the impact of noise on the ground. Options to go north then west were ruled out due to Heathrow but there may be options to go east first to minimise the impact.

Currently all departures go east which creates issues. It would be good to have options that can take aircraft in different directions, especially west. We need to consider every option but these will be assessed against the design principles and some options will get ruled out.

Comment – comment regarding climb rates and how realistic they are. Residents conclusion is that a higher climb rate will create more noise on the ground.

Our Response: Currently aircraft have to level at 2,400 ft before getting clearance to climb further. The aim of these options is for unconstrained climbs to 7,000 ft. The noise impacts will be modelled in more detail as we get closer to consultation. Generally speaking, a faster climb rate would logically bring the noise impact closer to the airport boundary.

Our ambition is to have unconstrained climbs to 7,000 ft but busy airspace and associated constraints may not make this achievable. The type of aircraft that operate from Biggin Hill are lighter than airliners operating from the airports around us so any restrictions may have to be applied to our aircraft rather than the heavy airliners.

Comment – the perception is that these options could result in more noise.

Our Response: The lines are just an indication of where aircraft could reach 7,000 ft. It would be wrong to conclude that they will result in more noise when it could actually result in less noise. A business jet is typically inaudible above 4,000 ft. Once we start looking at the detailed routes, we will be able to do the modelling that would answer the question.

Question – at what point in the process will the swathes get cut down into tracks?

Our Response: During the Stage 3 consultation phase. We still do not know where access points to the network are. We have been holding combinations of bilateral meetings with adjacent airports to look at their own plans and NATS will need to look at the higher level network to identify where aircraft can be accepted. This will include links to and from Europe, hence joining points are still to be determined.

Comment – the stakeholder stated that they support the comments previously made that aircraft taking off to reach height quickly are far noisier than slower aircraft. They did not agree that modern aircraft are inaudible at 3,000 or 4,000 ft. Aircraft are audible where they live early in the morning, specifically aircraft circling over their location at 5,000 ft before

Item
<p>finding getting a slot to approach Heathrow Airport. The general perception is that aircraft that take off quickly are noisier</p> <p>Our Response: The noise profile from a business jet and an airliner are vastly different. However, it was agreed that if an aircraft left the throttle open on departure, it would be noisier. Aircraft should be reducing power in the climb but would still be able to maintain the climb and should therefore be quieter.</p> <p>Comment – the stakeholder reiterated that early in the morning, aircraft circling before approaching Heathrow Airport come down to 4,500 ft and were not inaudible.</p> <p>Our Response: We were considering business jets, which were lighter and had smaller engines and are much quieter than airliners. It was reiterated that detailed analysis would be conducted at Stage 3.</p> <p>Comment – the current RNP Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP) is flown by relatively few aircraft. The Initial Approach Fixes (IAF) are further out than they need to be and would require a large amount of CAS. If the IAP was raised to a 3.5° glidepath, the procedure would be shorter and would therefore require less airspace and be better environmentally.</p> <p>Comment – when aircraft currently take off and circle to route over the centre of the airfield the impact is much less. Some departing aircraft end up further north than the airfield boundary and this has a bigger impact. They stated that it would be helpful if any route options that circle back to pass over the airfield use the middle of the runway as a reference point.</p> <p>Our Response: this will be considered as the options develop.</p>
<p>LBHA closed the meeting by thanking the participants for their attendance and contribution.</p>

Post-Meeting Note:

Following the meeting, alternative options for the Runway 03 departure to the north was discussed. Two alternate options were introduced that turned south initially (left turn and right turn after take-off) before circling back over the airport to route north. These were included as options 10a and 10b and were subsequently shared with stakeholders.

Project Title	London Biggin Hill Airport Airspace Change Proposal
Client	London Biggin Hill Airport
Purpose of Meeting	Stage 2 Design Options Focus Group - PM
Date of Meeting	26 th October 2022
Held at	Online (Teams)
Present	London Borough of Bromley, Airport Monitoring Officer RAF Kenley Individual Sevenoaks Strategic Planning Manager NATS NERL Woldingham Parish Council Surrey Hills Gliding Club (Kenley) London Biggin Hill Airport London Biggin Hill Airport Osprey CSL

Meeting Summary

Item
<p>Opening Introductions</p> <p>LBHA welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance. He then provided an introduction which described the purpose of the Focus Group and then described the comprehensive list of options that had previously been shared with stakeholders. This included the two additional options that had been developed following the previous Focus Group.</p>
<p>Open Forum Discussion</p> <p>Question – regarding options D6 through D9 and the climb ranges depicted. These options overfly the glider site at Kenley so wondered whether the climb profiles were continuous to 7,000 ft or levelled off. If they level off at 2,400 or 2,500 ft, they would impact the glider site operations.</p> <p>Our Response: The aim is for unrestricted climb to 7,000 ft and we would design routes so that they are deconflicted from Kenley. We understand very well Kenley's existence and it wouldn't be acceptable in the design process to impact Kenley. We very much need to work with Kenley to ensure routes are deconflicted from Kenley's operations. Although the restriction is 2,400 ft today, this may change as a result of the wider LTMA programme.</p> <p>Comment – as a resident of Woldingham, which is 900 ft above sea level, any aircraft departing Biggin Hill have to climb quite considerably to avoid noise impact on the village.</p>

Item

They added that there had been considerable work done on the new Runway 03 approach, which seems to have gone.

Our Response: Stated that the Runway 03 approach is separate to this programme and that the proposal for the new approach is with the CAA awaiting a decision.

It was added that part of the modernisation programme is to get better climb profiles for departing aircraft. Currently, aircraft take off and are close to Woldingham but can only climb initially to 2,400 ft. It is quite possible that with the new routes, aircraft will be passing this height only 1 mile from the runway, which should improve any impact. Current airspace geography prevents aircraft being able to climb faster.

Comment – arrivals is another issue and they have had a number of occasions where aircraft have been as low as 400 ft over Woldingham, which is too low considering it is 5 miles from the airport.

Our Response: These aircraft are not following the correct approach profile and that the new approach procedure should alleviate this issue.

Question – whether all of the options presented during the Focus Group, plus any others that are developed, would be subject to the full consultation?

Our Response: The actual route options, rather than the swathes will be looked at for the consultation but more discussions are required to develop these to ensure they match with the higher level network.

Comment – the general principal of the Council is that there should not be any greater overflight of the built-up population of Greater London than today. Local residents already suffer from a lot of air traffic. Some of the options presented go over densely populated areas.

Our Response: In reality, those currently overflowed are still likely to be overflowed in the future but we would look to minimise the impact. We will look at the swathes alongside the design principles to reduce the swathes to a few routes in conjunction with Heathrow and Gatwick Airports and NATS with consideration for other airspace users to arrive at the options that are put to consultation.

He added that feedback is important to remind us what to take into account when we narrow the options down to viable route options.

LBHA closed the meeting by thanking the participants for their attendance and contribution.