

Meeting between sponsors of RNP approaches to Sherburn-in-Elmet Aerodrome and Civil Aviation Authority, Airspace Regulation

23/04/2021 – 1430 BST via Microsoft Teams

Present via MS Teams: [REDACTED], for Sherburn), [REDACTED], for Sherburn), [REDACTED], Airspace Regulator, Technical, ACP Case Officer), JeanFrancois Soldano, Principal Airspace Regulator Instrument Flight Procedures), [REDACTED], Airspace Regulator, Engagement & Consultation), [REDACTED], Airspace Regulator, Facilitation Team)

Summary of meeting:

1. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the ongoing Airspace Change Proposal (ACP-2015-04) for the introduction of RNP instrument approaches to Runways 28 and 10 at Sherburn. Specifically, to confirm next steps with the CAA and what level of engagement with stakeholders would be required further to some changes to the proposed layout of the procedures.
2. At the original Airspace Framework Briefing in 2016 it was agreed between Sherburn and the CAA that given the low impact of the proposed procedures that local focused engagement with relevant stakeholders would be sufficient to meet the requirements of the CAP 725 process. Sherburn proceeded on this basis but in 2020 paused their application while making some revisions to the procedure design. A revised procedure proposal is now nearing completion.
3. [REDACTED] (CAA) stated that the CAA had received a submission in early 2019 and that the DfT call-in process had been carried out as a result of this submission. The ACP was currently paused in Stage 5, under CAP725 as a result of further work being done on the procedure designs. However, should the CAA receive another submission, as described previously by [REDACTED] (Sherburn) (likely to be a completely revised submission), then the Stage 5 period would possibly have to start again. [REDACTED] (CAA) also asked that as a result of this meeting, we agreed the way ahead for the proposal (a timeline) and that these meeting notes would be published on the Sherburn ACP 2015-04 webpage on the CAA website.
4. [REDACTED] (CAA) reviewed the original assumptions from 2016 (listed below) and queried whether they were still applicable to the project:
 - a. the procedures will be implemented solely for providing operational resilience and safety in IFR conditions.
 - b. the number of aircraft expected to use the procedures is very low (an expected average of one per day)
 - c. the short length of the runway (830m) limits the types of aircraft that can safely use Sherburn in Elmet to the light aircraft models which currently operate in to/out of the aerodrome.
 - d. the procedures are located entirely within Class G airspace
 - e. the change sponsor has engaged with local aviation stakeholders and is committed to mitigating any significant operational impact through the establishment of related LoAs

- f. there are few residential areas located under the procedures and those which are affected are already overflown by aircraft.
 - g. the procedures have been designed to minimise noise impact where appropriate without additional operational complexity.
5. ■ (Sherburn) confirmed that all assumptions were still applicable and that despite some minor changes to the procedures resulting in a planned revision to Sherburn's ACP submission, the scope and intent of the proposal was unchanged.
6. ■ (Sherburn) explained the changes to the IFP designs were minimal on RW 28 where the tracks remain much the same but with waypoint changes. The changes on RW10 MAP route up and around existing areas of in/out bound aircraft to SAC and LEA and are very low usage.
7. Given the intention to alter some elements of the proposal, it was agreed between Sherburn and the CAA that a further period of engagement with the relevant airspace and local stakeholders to raise awareness and discuss the impact of these changes should be conducted, but that the revised proposal did not precipitate the need for a formal consultation. ■ (CAA) explained Sherburn should record these engagement activities and any ongoing engagement that has taken place to date. This information, together with the evidence (emails, meeting minutes, etc) should be collated and submitted as a report as part of the revised ACP submission.
8. ■ (Sherburn) queried whether a formal timescale was necessary for the engagement period – it was confirmed this would be at Sherburn's discretion and that they should consider the impacts of the revised proposal.
9. ■ (Sherburn) described some of the issues encountered with local stakeholders and stated that there was a possibility that a Letter of Agreement (LoA) governing operational arrangements with Burn Glider Club would not materialise and that at some point Sherburn would have to draw a line under discussions, also stating Sherburn has a workable Risk Assessment for operating without an LoA if necessary. ■ (CAA) stated that the CAA (ATM Inspector) would need to consider the risks of operating without a signed LoA. ■ (CAA) said that a stakeholder's decision not to engage in dialogue around developing a new LoA is not a reason why a proposal could not be presented to the CAA for its consideration. The CAA would expect the sponsor to make best endeavours to engage with the stakeholder during the development of the proposal and to keep the offer of developing an LoA always open.
10. Discussion turned to the status of the Localiser Performance with Vertical Guidance (LPV) element of the procedures. ■ (Sherburn) queried whether it would be possible to get an LPV procedure approved, even if it would subsequently be notified as not available.
11. ■ (CAA) explained that following the impact of the UK leaving the EU, ANSPs will no longer have an agreement with the European Satellite Service Provider (ESSP), meaning LPV approach procedures will be de-notified. It was confirmed that the CAA is not expecting to issue any approval for LPV after the 25th June and subsequently new procedures could not have LPV minima notified.

12. Considering the timelines, it was confirmed by the ESSP will not issue new EWAs after the 25th June and that Sherburn will not have access to the EGNOS system beyond this date. [REDACTED] (CAA) confirmed it was not known what alternative arrangements to provide an EGNOS equivalent in the UK might emerge in the future.
13. The meeting concluded with [REDACTED] (CAA) confirming that once the revised application was received, the normal 16+1week ACP decision process would likely apply and that a DfT call-in window would probably need to be opened again [REDACTED] (CAA) asked that Sherburn provide the CAA with a revised timeline and new target AIRAC. [REDACTED] (CAA) also reminded Sherburn of the requirement for a flight validation plan to be submitted to the [REDACTED] (IFP) for agreement and that although the CAA had provided guidance on the development of the procedures, they had not received regulatory approval. [REDACTED] (CAA) reminded Sherburn that they could seek further advice regarding this, if required.
14. Next steps – Sherburn to conduct engagement activities as agreed and once concluded, resubmit ACP application documentation.