

**London Southend Airport RNAV Approaches
Framework Briefing Minutes
CAA House, 01/11/16 1300-1500**

Attendees

CAA

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

NATS

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

LSA

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Meeting Notes

Introductions

[REDACTED] provided an update on the progress of the project. To summarise, LSA have been working with the NATS procedure design team and held a design workshop in September with based operators and since then have gone through an iterative design process to try and find a design that works from both an environmental point of view and an Air Traffic / Airspace point of view. A safety workshop was held in October.

[REDACTED] provided key dates of when the CAA could expect submissions (earliest possible date)

Dec 16 – Submission of procedures to [REDACTED] for approval, including safety case parts 1&2

Dec 16 – Submission of impact assessment to MW

Feb 17 – Consultation (full procedures)

Jun 17 – Validation of procedures & submission to [REDACTED]

Jun 17 – Updated safety case parts 3 & 4

Oct 17 – ACP submission

Dec 17 - Implementation of straight in procedures

Jun 18 – Implementation of full procedures

[REDACTED] confirmed he retired in 4 months time, so [REDACTED] will take over the IFP approval process.

■ had circulated the draft impact assessment document prior to the meeting. ■ commented that it was a 'little thin'. ■ explained it was a first draft and requested feedback from CAA to ensure all the correct information / details are included. ■ to provide feedback. ■ confirmed that it could be submitted at the same time as the procedures or within a couple of weeks of their submission and would be reviewed within the same timescale as the procedures. It should detail a comparison between the 'now' and the 'future', post-change and explain why it is felt that there will be no noticeable change.

■ confirmed that the straight in procedures required validation before they could be implemented but confirmed that it was acceptable to validate the full procedures, which would cover the straight in sections. ■ advised that it is likely the full procedure wouldn't be validated until consultation was complete. LSA may decide to do separate validations or validate the full procedure at risk before consultation has finished to have the ability to introduce the straight in procedure at the earliest opportunity. ■ will advise CAA when a decision has been made on which way to progress.

■ confirmed safety case could be submitted as one document detailing the phased implementation. ■ had also approved this approach.

■ presented and discussed the straight in designs and how aircraft currently approach the aerodrome.

■ and the team agreed that no consultation was required for the straight in sections and that there was only a requirement to submit an Impact Assessment.

Consider how to break down the issue of frequency of use of the procedures. Straight-in – rough calculation of overall volumes of traffic likely to use it. Put forward figures, methodology and justification.

■ then moved on to discuss the full procedure designs and talked the CAA team through the iterative design process that had taken place over the last couple of months. ■ presented the designs and discussed where changes had been made and why. ■ explained that the ATC team had provided comments to ensure that the procedures worked from an ATC perspective and fitted in the surrounding airspace and that ■ was looking at the procedures from an environmental point of view, trying to keep the procedures over water and avoiding built up / urban areas where possible by tweaking the designs.

As much as possible there was an attempt to replicate the current vectored routes, though Pans Ops considerations make it impossible for complete replication.

Should explain that some areas will get increased numbers of RNAV flights whilst other areas will not.

Include the safety argument in the explanation.

Explain that there will be a slow gravitation towards the RNAV routes over a period of time.

█ advised LSA to consider the language used and ensure any consultation material explains fully options that have been considered then discounted and why. Explain that nothing could be done any better within the given constraints.

GEGMU – make a clear definition of how the route came about and explain justification in the consultation document.

Forecasts should be provided, though doesn't need to be 'hard and fast' numbers but a description of what LSA expect. A qualitative statement is sufficient. Comparison of use today and expected use.

LSA should get a view from carriers on their likely usage to stay current.

LSA need to explain why it's difficult to predict numbers, cover training drawing people in and discuss why it could change.

LSA to mention how little the route from the north will be used in reality and how it is unlikely to change unless a new operator / destination appears.

█ discussed consultation and wanted to understand the requirements. █ advised that ACC and NATMAC only would not be acceptable and that LSA would be required to consult down to parish council level following the same methodology as their CAS and SIDs consultation. Consultation should be directed to areas underneath the footprint the aircraft fly. 1nm either side of the nominal track was considered to be too wide though LSA are to decide on the appropriate consultation area, which will likely tie into parish boundary lines. Only areas underneath the tracks from the IAF's to IF's to be consulted and the 05 GEGMU transition from the 23 IF to the where it joins the 05 northerly wingbar IAF.

No need to pre plan any meetings during the consultation period but be prepared to attend / arrange meetings as required.

█ confirmed there would only be one lot of procedure submission charges for assessment of both the straight in segments and full procedures.

█ confirmed that LEQ noise contour assessments were not required because any proposed changes would be beyond the 57dB contour and the changes only affect a number of aircraft not all LSA's traffic.

Guidance is that noise below 7000ft needs to be considered so an explanation of what noise can be expected should be explained in the consultation material.

█ confirmed that the new CAP 725 process would not be implemented until at least Aug / Sep 17, if LSA were out to consultation before the new process comes in then they would be assessed under current CAP725 process. The proposed new process requires its own period of consultation which is likely to take place in Spring 17.

█ also advised that the Air Navigation Guidance may change in the near future and when implemented becomes effective immediately and ACPs would then be assessed using the new

criteria. It was advised that the new guidance was likely to be out to consultation in the next 3 months which would be before LSA planned to be out to consultation.

█ advised that where possible the new guidance should be followed even if it hasn't been implemented.

█ mentioned that further guidance had also been promulgated around the CAP 725 process.

█ advised that LSA wasn't planning to use Focus Groups but was planning to carry out a 'pre consultation' with local councils (County / District / Borough level) to explain what we are doing, why we are doing it and explain the principles behind the design and how we have ended up with the designs we have. █ agreed with this approach and confirmed Focus Groups were not mandatory in the process.

█ confirmed that for simple RNAV changes the CAA were moving to a single AIRAC cycle.

█ advised LSA to look at the CAA website to understand how other sponsors have done assessments on future traffic levels that will use RNAV procedures.

LSA to look to include percentage figures for unscheduled traffic that carry out training.

█ advised that the draft Impact Assessment did not contain any reference to Environmental Impact and although █ wouldn't be assessing it, it should contain a statement on environmental impact (or lack of).

█ suggested for LSA to consider that it may be useful to write the document for the public to be able to understand and then possibly have an annex which contains the technical information.

█ confirmed Press Release or advert would be required to advise when the consultation goes live.

It was discussed that there are no holds associated with the change.

Missed approaches discussed briefly though LSA still need to make a decision on how to proceed. LSA to advise CAA when decision is made.

Post meeting decision LSA to implement conventional missed approaches for straight in approaches (phase 1) and RNAV missed approaches with the full procedures (phase 2).