

**MINUTES OF ACP-2022-077 LONDON BIGGIN HILL AIRPORT DVOR DEPENDENCY REMOVAL
ASSESSMENT MEETING
HELD ONLINE ON 6 OCTOBER 2025**

10 October 2025

All Attendees

Present	Appointment	Representing
	Airspace Change Account Manager	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Technical)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (IFP)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (E&C)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Environmental)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Environmental)	CAA
	Airspace Regulator (Economic)	CAA
	Inspector ATS	CAA
	Airspace Inspector (Navigation)	CAA
	Head of Safety & Compliance	London Biggin Hill
	Airspace Consultant	London Biggin Hill
	IFP Designer	London Biggin Hill
	Airspace Consultant	London Biggin Hill

CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement

CAA noted that the following documents: assessment meeting agenda and presentation were received in advance of the Assessment Meeting and confirmed that the documents must be published by the sponsor, together with minutes of the meeting, on the Airspace Change Portal page. CAA explained the purpose of the meeting and confirmed that the meeting was an Assessment Meeting and not a Gateway. The CAA reinforced that the sponsor was required to provide a broad description of their proposed approach to meeting the CAA’s CAP 1616 requirements, but the CAA was not deciding whether the proposed approach met the detailed requirements of the CAA’s process at this stage. The purpose of the Assessment Meeting (set out in detail in CAP 1616) was broadly:

- for the Sponsor to present and discuss their Statement of Need,
- to enable the CAA to consider whether the proposal concerned falls within the scope of the formal airspace change process, including determining whether the proposal falls within the scope of a pre-scaled ACP process/Level 3,
- to enable the CAA to consider the appropriate provisional Level to assign to the change proposal.

Additionally, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to proceed to fulfil the requirements of the airspace change process and to provide information on timescales. Lastly, the sponsor was required to provide information on how it intended to meet the engagement requirements of the various stages of the airspace change process.

	ACTION
<p>Item 1 – Introduction</p> <p>Introductions from the CAA and the London Biggin Hill Airport (LBHA) attendees and the CAA Account Manager read out the CAA Assessment Meeting Opening Statement.</p>	
<p>Item 2 – Statement of Need (discussion and review)</p> <p>LBHA read out the Statement of Need (slide 2).</p>	

<p>Item 3 – Background Information</p> <p>LBHA provided background information on the airport, the number of aircraft movements and surrounding airspace (slide 3).</p> <p>LBHA provided information on why, as per CAP1781, RNAV Substitution is not applicable the LBHA procedures (slide 4).</p>	
<p>Item 4 – Proposal</p> <p>LBHA stated the intention of the proposal (slide 5). LBHA highlighted they have assumed withdrawal of the BIG DME, even though this hasn't been formally consulted on by NERL yet.</p> <p>LBHA confirmed that the aspiration of the proposal is to amend the textual descriptions, without altering the flight behaviours. LBHA has provided the CAA with the initial proposed draft text.</p>	
<p>Item 5 – Stakeholder Engagement</p> <p>LHBA confirmed the stakeholder engagement intentions, to provide the initial proposed draft text amendments with LBHA operators, Jeppesen, and NATS Terminal Control to ensure they are operationally acceptable. As there is coding involved, need to understand if different coding is required and if so, if that would alter tracks over the ground (slide 6).</p>	
<p>Item 6 – Provisional indication of the scale level and process requirements*</p> <p>LHBA stated that they are currently unable to provide an indication of the level, as it is dependent on the outcome of engagement with LHBA's operators and Jeppesen. If there is no change to flight behaviours, LHBA believe the textual amendments can be progressed as an Applicability and Policy Alignment Check (APAC) (slide 7).</p> <p>However, if there is a change to flight behaviours, LHBA would expect to progress this change as a scaled Level 3 ACP.</p> <p><i>* When the sponsor submits their gateway materials for each Gateway at the agreed submission deadline, the period between this and the gateway decision will be an analysis by the CAA Airspace Regulatory team (Airspace Regulation) of the documentation submitted, for the purposes of making a recommendation to the CAA Gateway decision maker(s). In conducting the gateway assessment, the CAA is assessing the process employed and its compliance with the guidance stipulated within CAP 1616. It is not an assessment of the merits of the submission itself, which is reviewed at Stage 5 - Decision. We may request documentation from the sponsor that is referred to in the gateway submission but has not been provided as part of the Gateway submission materials. We may also request the sponsor to provide information by way of clarification relating to statements or assumptions made in the submission. Any further information sought by Airspace Regulation at this stage is for clarificatory purposes and is only for determining compliance with the CAP 1616 process.</i></p> <p><i>In any instance where a sponsor has not met the requirements of the process, we will inform them after the gateway decision and advise of next steps.</i></p> <p><i>Please note that <u>this text does not apply to airspace change proposals involving the sole implementation of RNP Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) without an Approach Control</u>, as Gateway Assessments are not required. Therefore, this text can be removed from the Assessment Meeting minutes.</i></p>	
<p>Item 7 – Provisional process timescales*</p> <p>LHBA proposed timescales, if the proposal can be progressed as an APAC, on slide 8. The intention is to begin engagement immediately after the assessment meeting with LBHA operators and Jeppesen.</p> <p><i>* The timeline agreed may become subject to change by the CAA. As outlined in CAP 2541 it is not the CAA's intent to conduct a re-prioritisation of all ACPs currently in progress, but only to prioritise when we believe this is required. Such prioritisation will be conducted on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with the principles</i></p>	

<p><i>outlined in CAP 2541. Should it be considered necessary to reprioritise an ACP a member of the Airspace Regulation team will contact the sponsor directly.</i></p>	
<p>Item 9 – Next steps & AOB</p> <p>LBHA stated that Jeppesen do provide operators with charts for their Standard Departure Routes (SDRs), and asked the CAA if it is possible to produce AIS versions of those charts to have in the AIP? LHBA feel that with the restricted airspace around the airport, a chart would be beneficial from a safety perspective.</p> <p>The CAA stated that nothing can be promulgated in the AIP, as it is not an IFP. Also, multiple coding houses produce departure charts, and they have previously been mis-labelled as SIDs, giving a misconception of additional protection, such as for obstacle clearance.</p> <p>The CAA touched on CAP778 and what other options are available. Due to the Class G airspace, they cannot be SIDs, and operators must follow standard rules for flying in that airspace.</p> <p>LHBA requested clarification from the CAA that, a Jeppeson or other coding house chart cannot be promulgated, as they are separate sources, and may be coded slightly differently. To have a single source, an AIS version would be required, however this would give the false impression that this was a SID. The CAA confirmed this was the case.</p> <p>The IFP Regulator confirmed that SDRs and SIDs are different, and as SDRs are not subject to obstacle clearance they cannot be produced as a chart.</p> <p>The CAA asked for additional information regarding the changing of tracking to/from beacons to DME, as the project progresses. LHBA confirmed that BIG and DET will be remaining as en route waypoints, and they are not used outside of CAS.</p> <p>The CAA stated that it could be possible for the airport to have coding provider charts available which crews could reference, but they cannot be promulgated in the AIP due to potential confusion discussed above.</p> <p>The CAA highlighted that engagement with ANSPs should include adjacent service providers to ensure existing co-ordination will not change.</p> <p>The IFP regulator asked the intention regarding the reference DET VOR (note 5). LHBA confirmed the intention is to remove any requirements from the DET VOR and confirmed that the DET DME is remaining.</p> <p>LHBA will provide the minutes for this meeting to the CAA within the next week and initiate the engagement with stakeholders.</p> <p>The CAA confirmed an internal discussion would take place regarding the level of the proposal, APAC or Level 3 ACP and welcomed additional information from the LBHA engagement which would assist with the decision.</p>	<p>LHBA</p> <p>CAA</p>

ACTIONS ARISING FROM LONDON BIGGIN HILL ACP-2022-077 ASSESSMENT MEETING

Subject	Name	Action	Deadline
Minutes	LHBA	Draft meeting minutes to CAA	13 October 25
CAA Portal	LHBA	Publish meeting material on CAA Portal	20 October 25
APAC/ACP level	CAA	Confirm APAC/ACP Level	TBC

London Biggin Hill Airport
 ACP Sponsor