

Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport Engagement Strategy

Level 3 Airspace Change Proposal

Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green

ACP-2024-037

Runway 16/34 – LNAV VNAV RNP

21 August 2026

CL-6137-DOC-012 DB Version 2.0

Document Information

Document title	Engagement Strategy - Runway 16/34 – LNAV VNAV RNP
Change sponsor	Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green
ACP reference	ACP-2024-037
Document reference and version	CL-6137-DOC-012 V 2.0
Date of release	21 August 2026

Change History Record

Issue	Change reference	Date	Details
Version 1	V 1.0	27/07/2026	Initial Issue
Version 1.1	V 1.1	28/07/2026	Additional Stakeholders included
Version 2.0	V 2.0	21/08/2026	CAA comments incorporated

Executive Summary

Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport is progressing Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) ACP-2024-037 for the introduction of Required Navigation Performance (RNP) Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs), with Lateral Navigation (LNAV) and Lateral Navigation/Vertical Navigation (LNAV/VNAV) minima to Runways 16 and 34.

The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) has classified the proposal as a Level 3 airspace change. This Engagement Strategy supports Stage 3 of the CAP 1616 airspace change process and sets out how Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport will engage with relevant aviation and non-aviation stakeholders in a proportionate, transparent and accessible manner.

The purpose of the engagement is to provide stakeholders with sufficient information to understand the proposal, the options considered and the potential impacts, and to enable them to provide informed feedback before the final ACP submission is made to the CAA. The strategy identifies the stakeholders to be invited to participate, the engagement methods and materials to be used, the proposed engagement period, and the arrangements for recording, monitoring and analysing responses.

Following the close of the engagement period, Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport will review all feedback received and consider whether any changes are required to the preferred design options, supporting assessments, mitigation measures or engagement material. The outcomes of the engagement, including how feedback has influenced the proposal, will be documented as part of the Stage 4 submission to the CAA.

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
ACC	Airport Consultative Committee
ACP	Airspace Change Proposal
AIP	Aeronautical Information Publication
AIRAC	Aeronautical Information Regulation and Control
AMS	Airspace Modernisation Strategy
ANSP	Air Navigation Service Provider
APDO	Approved Procedure Design Organisation
ATC	Air Traffic Control
ATZ	Aerodrome Traffic Zone
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority
CAP	Civil Aviation Publication
CAS	Controlled Airspace
DDP	Discretionary Design Principle
DP	Design Principle
DPE	Design Principle Evaluation
EGBO	ICAO designator for Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport
FAQ	Frequently Asked Questions
GA	General Aviation
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
IAP	Instrument Approach Procedure
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IFR	Instrument Flight Rules
IFP	Instrument Flight Procedure
IMC	Instrument Meteorological Conditions
LNAV	Lateral Navigation
LoA	Letter of Agreement
MDP	Mandatory Design Principle
NAP	Noise Abatement Procedure
NATMAC	National Air Traffic Management Advisory Committee
NDB	Non-Directional Beacon
NM	Nautical Mile
PANS-OPS	Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Aircraft Operations
PBN	Performance-Based Navigation
PIR	Post-Implementation Review
PPR	Prior Permission Required
RNP	Required Navigation Performance
SoN	Statement of Need
VFR	Visual Flight Rules
VMC	Visual Meteorological Conditions
VNAV	Vertical Navigation
VRP	Visual Reference Point

Contents

Document Information.....	2
Change History Record	2
Executive Summary	3
Abbreviations	4
Contents.....	5
List of Tables.....	6
1. Introduction	7
1.1 Overview of the Engagement Strategy.....	7
1.2 Overview of the Airspace Change.....	7
1.3 Objectives of the ACP	8
1.4 Level 3 Airspace Change Proposal Process	8
2. Objectives	10
2.1 Engagement Strategy Objectives.....	10
2.2 Consultation and Engagement Principles	10
3. Summary of Engagement Activity Undertaken to Date.....	13
4. Audience	13
4.1 Stakeholder Identification Method	13
4.2 Aviation Stakeholders.....	14
4.3 Non-Aviation Stakeholders.....	14
4.4 Seldom-Heard Audiences and Accessibility	15
4.5 Stakeholders	15
4.5.1 National Air Traffic Management Advisory Committee (NATMAC)	16
5. Approach.....	17
5.1 Overview	17
5.2 Notification of Engagement	17
5.3 Access and Response Routes	17
5.4 Engagement Methods	18
5.5 Engagement Monitoring	18
5.6 Risk of Engagement Failure	19
5.7 Data Protection and Publication of Responses	20

6. Materials	21
6.1 Overview	21
6.2 Content Requirements for Engagement Material	21
6.3 Presentation Structure	21
7. Length and Timeline	24
8. Post-Engagement	25
8.1 Feedback Analysis	25
8.2 Reporting Back	25
8.3 Design Update and Stage 4 Submission	25
8.4 Further Engagement or Re-Engagement	25
8.5 Decision, Implementation and Post Implementation Review	25
9. Roles and Responsibilities	26
Appendix A - Stakeholder List	27
Appendix B – Example Engagement Feedback Log	31
Appendix C - Example Survey Questions	31
Appendix D – Initial Stakeholder Email	32
Appendix E - Stakeholder Notification Email	33
Appendix F – Email British Model Flying Association	34
Appendix G - Strategy Compliance Checklist	35
References	36

List of Tables

Table 1: Design Principles	8
Table 2: CAP 1616 Process	9
Table 3: Consultation and Engagement Principles	12
Table 4: Engagement Activity Undertaken to Date	13
Table 5: Stakeholder Groups	15
Table 6: Engagement Response Routes	17
Table 7: Engagement Methods	18
Table 8: Engagement Monitoring	18
Table 9: Risk Analysis	19
Table 10: Overview of Engagement Outputs	21
Table 11: Presentation Structure	23
Table 12: Engagement Timeline	24

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview of the Engagement Strategy

This Engagement Strategy supports Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport's (EGBO) Airspace Change Proposal ACP-2024-037 and describes the approach to stakeholder engagement for Stage 3 Consult/Engage of the CAP 1616 process. It explains the scope of the proposal, the Level 3 process context, the engagement objectives, the stakeholder audience, the engagement methods, the materials to be used, the proposed timescales and the process for considering and reporting stakeholder feedback.

The Statement of Need (SoN) was submitted to the CAA on the 14 of January 2025. At the Stage 1 assessment meeting held on 12 March 2025, the CAA confirmed that this ACP could be conducted as a Level 3 ACP under CAP 1616h on the basis that the proposal is expected to have a low impact on aviation and non-aviation stakeholders. This classification may be reviewed by the CAA if the anticipated impacts materially change.

1.2 Overview of the Airspace Change

EGBO is located approximately 8 NM southwest of Wolverhampton and is situated within Class G airspace, close to Birmingham Airport and RAF Cosford. It has three hard-surfaced runways, but with only runway 16/34 being equipped with the necessary ground infrastructure to support the development of instrument flight procedures.

Current operations are limited primarily to Visual Flight Rules (VFR) with no published instrument procedures available following the withdrawal of the airport's NDB/DME approach aid. As a result, aircraft are unable to operate to or from EGBO in Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) and must either remain on the ground or divert to another airport, typically Birmingham.

The proposed airspace change seeks to introduce satellite-based Required Navigation Performance (RNP) instrument approach procedures, with LNAV and LNAV/VNAV minima, to Runways 16 and 34. The proposed procedures would enable continued operations in a wider range of weather conditions and provide more consistent approach guidance. They are intended to:

- Increase operational resilience. These procedures will facilitate safe approaches in poor weather when a standard visual approach cannot be flown. This will provide greater operational flexibility and potentially reduce diversions to Birmingham International Airport.
- Enable aircraft to follow a more accurate descent path, reducing reliance on manual altitude management.
- Improve safety by ensuring a consistent approach path with smoother and more fuel-efficient descents. This is also expected to improve efficiency and environmental performance.
- Deliver enhanced operational performance by introducing LNAV and VNAV guidance, in line with modern navigation standards and the UK Airspace Modernisation Strategy (CAP 1711).

The development of the Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP) design options for EGBO was primarily created in accordance with the guidance contained within CAP 2304 and ICAO PANS-OPS DOC 8168 VOL II. It has also taken account of the local airspace constraints, particularly those created by the proximity to Birmingham International Airport, RAF Cosford, VFR transit routes in the vicinity of the aerodrome and hotspots and by local Noise Abatement Procedures (NAP).

1.3 Objectives of the ACP

The objectives of this ACP were developed using the Design Principles (DP) shown in the table below. These DPs also informed the creation and down selection of the options that are being taken forward within this engagement.

The Mandatory Design Principles (MDPs) reflect requirements that must be considered for all applicable ACPs, while the Discretionary Design Principles (DDPs) address project-specific priorities; a full explanation of each principle and how it was developed is provided in the Stage 2 submission.

Design Principles	
MDP 1	Safety - The airspace change proposal must maintain a high standard of safety and should seek to enhance current levels of safety.
MDP 2	Policy - The airspace change proposal should not be inconsistent with relevant legislation, the CAA's AMS or Secretary of State and CAA's policy and guidance. The design options will be assessed against the relevant elements of the AMS: Safety, Integration, Simplification and Environmental Sustainability, including tranquillity/AONB where relevant. Analysis includes the impacts of the proposed design on other airspace users, and operations at adjacent aerodromes.
MDP 3	Overflight: The ACP should avoid overflight of densely populated areas where possible.
DDP 4	Technical (Accessibility for all airspace users): The airspace change proposal should satisfy the requirements of operators and owners of all classes of aircraft, including general aviation and other civilian airspace users.
DDP 5	Environment (Noise) - The airspace change proposal should take account of existing noise abatement procedures to avoid increasing noise exposure.
DDP 6	Economic (Performance) - The airspace change proposal should contribute to economic growth, development and/or improved productivity amongst businesses, individuals, government or third sector organisations.

Table 1: Design Principles

1.4 Level 3 Airspace Change Proposal Process

Level 3 ACPs are intended for permanent airspace changes that have the potential for low impact. CAP 1616h provides the Level 3 and pre-scaled process requirements. The process remains evidence-based and transparent, but the requirements are proportionate to the likely scale of impact.

A Level 3 ACP does not represent a reduction in safety assurance or stakeholder scrutiny, but enables a targeted approach with those stakeholders most likely to be affected. In addition, it ensures that the level of analysis, evidence and engagement is proportionate with the identified risks and impacts.

The proposed airspace change at Wolverhampton Airport is considered proportionate to a Level 3 ACP because the aerodrome is predominantly GA-focused, with no significant commercial traffic generation or strategic airspace role. The operational requirement is based on enhancing safety and increased operational resilience for the small number of IFR flights that operate into the airport, and the anticipated impacts are localised. Consideration has been given in the designs to local transiting traffic and other aerodromes, and it was concluded that the change at the aerodrome is unlikely to materially affect major airports, airline routes, military operations, or other airspace users.

In summary, the change addresses a local operational need rather than a wider airspace redesign, and the Level 3 process provides a balance between regulatory assurance, stakeholder engagement and the scale of the anticipated impact.

CAP 1616 stage	Purpose	Project status / evidence
Sponsor prepares and submits Statement of Need	Describe the issue or opportunity driving the proposal.	CAA Portal Reference ACP-2024-037 SoN submitted on 14 Jan 2025 Portal link Assessment meeting date: 12 March 2025
Stage 1 - Define	Confirm current-day scenario and design principles where required.	Initial timeline sent to CAA: 19 March 2025 Assessment meeting minutes added to CAA Portal: 26 March 2025 Portal link
Stage 2 - Develop and Assess	Develop realistic options and undertake proportionate assessment.	The Stage 2 submission was provided to the CAA on 26 May 2026. The CAA review took place in June 2026, and comments were addressed in the revised submission on 6 July 2026. A total of five design options created for runway 34, and seven options for runway 16. DPE undertaken which has taken forward two options as Viable from each runway direction (Total of four carried forward for this engagement)
Stage 3 - Consult/Engage	Engage stakeholders on the proposal and collect informed feedback.	This document sets out the Stage 3 engagement strategy.
Stage 4 - Update and Submit	Review feedback, update proposal and submit final material to CAA.	Formal ACP Submission: 29 January 2027
Stage 5 - Decide	CAA assessment and decision.	CAA Decision: 28 May 2027
Stage 6 - Implement	Implement the approved change.	Target AIRAC 09/27 Implementation 2 September 2027
Stage 7 - Post Implementation Review	Review whether the change has achieved the intended objectives.	September 2028

Table 2: CAP 1616 Process

2. Objectives

2.1 Engagement Strategy Objectives

The objectives of this Engagement Strategy are to ensure that the Stage 3 engagement is proportionate, transparent, accessible and capable of producing feedback that can be meaningfully considered before the final ACP is submitted to the CAA.

- **Provide clear information:** Explain the proposal, baseline/current-day scenario, design options, anticipated impacts and process in language suitable for both technical and non-technical stakeholders.
- **Enable informed feedback:** Provide sufficient information, maps, diagrams and response routes so stakeholders can understand how they may be affected and provide considered feedback.
- **Support two-way dialogue:** Offer appropriate opportunities for stakeholders to ask questions, request clarification and provide written feedback.
- **Demonstrate proportionality:** Tailor the scale and method of engagement to the expected low impact of a Level 3 ACP, while maintaining transparency and regulatory compliance.
- **Record and analyse feedback systematically:** Ensure all responses are logged, categorised and reviewed consistently, with a clear audit trail.
- **Explain how feedback has been used:** Prepare post-engagement material explaining what was heard, how it influenced the proposal and, where feedback did not result in change, why not.
- **Identify and respond to issues early:** Monitor feedback during the engagement period so that misunderstandings, low participation or emerging risks can be addressed promptly.

2.2 Consultation and Engagement Principles

This strategy is informed by the Gunning Principles and the Government Consultation Principles. The table below explains how these principles have been applied to this proportionate Level 3 engagement

Principle	Description	How this ACP will address it
Proposals are at a formative stage	A final decision has not been made or predetermined.	A range of design options were developed and evaluated during Stage 2. The engagement material identifies the viable options and the Sponsor's preferred options. Rejected options are included for transparency only, and feedback is not being sought on them. The preferred options have not been finally adopted. Feedback received during the engagement will be considered before the proposal is finalised and submitted at Stage 4. It may influence the designs, supporting assessments, mitigation measures or associated documentation.

Sufficient information for intelligent consideration	Stakeholders must be given enough accessible information to understand the proposal and respond.	Section 6 of this document outlines the engagement materials that will be used. Central to these materials is the Engagement Presentation, which provides stakeholders with the necessary background information on the reasons for the proposed change, the objectives of the airspace change, the factors that have influenced the development of the design options, and the design options themselves. Where appropriate, maps, and diagrams have been included to provide context and enhance understanding of the written explanations. Whilst the subject matter is technical, care has been taken to explain key concepts, design principles and regulatory requirements in a clear and accessible manner to support participation from both aviation and non-aviation stakeholders and to assist them in providing informed feedback. Sections of particular importance in the Engagement presentation are: Section 2 – The Design Process: This section explains how the proposed approach procedures were developed, including the regulatory framework, airspace constraints, PBN concept, and Design Principles that shaped the design options and determined which were considered viable. Sections 3 and 4 – Viable RNP Approach Options: These sections present the options for runway 34 and runway 16 that were assessed as viable during the DPE and taken forward for further consideration. Each option is described in detail, supported by maps to illustrate the proposed flight paths, and a summary of how the option performed against the Design Principles. Section 5 – Rejected (Unviable) Options: This section outlines the options considered during the DPE but not progressed because they failed to meet one or more Design Principles. They are included for transparency and to provide stakeholders with a complete understanding of the option-development process however, feedback is not being sought on these rejected options. In summary, all efforts will be made to ensure that stakeholders understand the issues and the potential impacts of the proposal on them to ensure that they are able to give informed responses.
Adequate time for consideration and response	The engagement period must be long enough for stakeholders to consider the material.	The engagement will run for 40 days, from 7 September to 16 October 2026. This will provide stakeholders with sufficient time to review the material, attend an information session, request clarification and submit a response. A technical session and a non-technical session will be held on 15 September 2026. A mid-point reminder and final reminder will also be issued. Additional sessions or an extension to the response period will be considered if required. If further information sessions are required, this will be accommodated
Feedback conscientiously taken into account	Responses must be considered before the final decision is taken.	Feedback on the engagement will be sought through a survey hosted on Microsoft Forms. This will enable responses to be captured consistently, categorised and analysed against key themes arising from the engagement. The feedback received will be reviewed alongside the project objectives, Design Principles and stakeholder concerns to

		identify whether any changes to the proposed designs are needed. Where feedback results in amendments to the proposal, these changes and the rationale behind them will be documented. A summary of feedback received, together with an explanation of how it has been considered and incorporated into the proposal will form part of the Stage 4 submission to the CAA.
--	--	---

Table 3: Consultation and Engagement Principles

3. Summary of Engagement Activity Undertaken to Date

This section aims to provide a clear chronology of engagement already undertaken before Stage 3. This includes CAA meetings, SoN, HRA/environmental scoping, technical coordination and any stakeholder updates which have been issued.

Date	Stage / activity	Stakeholders involved	Purpose	Outcome / evidence
14/01/2025	Stage 1	CAA	Statement of Need	Portal link
12/03/2025	Stage 1 / meeting	CAA	Assessment meeting	Confirmed as a Level 3 scaled ACP with Stage 3 engagement required.
17/12/2025	Stage 2	CAA	HRA Scoping	The CAA advised that they will conclude on whether the HRA can be definitely screened out after Stage 4 submission.
27/07/2026	Stage 3 / email	Stakeholders	Advise stakeholders of upcoming engagement and update contact records	Appendix D Evidence will be provided in final stakeholder report
27/07/2026	Stage 3 / email	British Model Flying Association (BMFA)	To identify relevant clubs	Appendix F Evidence will be provided in final stakeholder report

Table 4: Engagement Activity Undertaken to Date

4. Audience

4.1 Stakeholder Identification Method

Stakeholders should be identified by considering who may be affected by, or have an interest in, the proposed change. For a Level 3 ACP this should normally include aviation stakeholders and may include non-aviation stakeholders where appropriate for transparency, local awareness or environmental/community relevance.

- **Geographical relevance:** Communities, local authorities, parish councils, constituencies and other bodies located near the airport, under existing or proposed flight paths, or within the relevant operational area.
- **Operational and aviation interest:** Airspace users, based operators, adjacent aerodromes, ANSPs, military units, emergency services, flying clubs, training organisations, NATMAC members and other organisations with an aviation safety, access or operational interest.
- **Community and environmental interest:** Airport consultative committees, local community bodies, environmental organisations, protected landscape bodies, Natural England or relevant equivalents, and organisations linked to nearby sensitive receptors.
- **Seldom-heard audiences:** Groups or individuals who may face barriers to engaging, such as limited digital access, language barriers, disability, age, isolation or limited awareness of the ACP process.

4.2 Aviation Stakeholders

Aviation stakeholders have been identified on the basis of their proximity to the proposed procedures, their use of the surrounding Class G airspace, their role in providing or coordinating air traffic services, and the potential for the proposal to affect existing flying activity.

The stakeholder group will include based operators and flying training organisations, frequent users of EGBO, local general aviation pilots and representative groups, neighbouring aerodromes and air traffic service units, and military stakeholders whose operations may interact with the proposed procedures. Birmingham ATC, RAF Cosford and RAF Shawbury will be included because of their operational relationship with the airport and the potential need for coordination with the proposed RNP approaches. The CAA Assessment Meeting also identified the need to consider local model-flying, hang-gliding and parachuting activity, including relevant national or local representative bodies where such activity takes place in the area.

The engagement will also seek views on the interaction between the proposed procedures and existing VFR traffic, circuit activity, and flight training within Class G airspace. This reflects the issues identified at the CAA Assessment Meeting, including the potential for concern within the GA community and the need to understand whether the proposal could affect the behaviour or access of other airspace users.

A targeted selection of NATMAC members will be contacted rather than the full NATMAC distribution list. The selected organisations will be those representing airspace users with a credible operational interest in the area or whose activities could reasonably interact with the proposed procedures. This approach is considered proportionate to the scale and anticipated impacts of the Level 3 ACP. The stakeholder identification exercise will not rely solely on published AIP information, as the CAA noted that not all local model-flying activity is recorded within the AIP.

4.3 Non-Aviation Stakeholders

The proposal is a low-impact Level 3 ACP and is intended primarily to provide instrument approach capability for existing airport users. It is not currently expected to result in a substantial change in overall aircraft movements or a material change in the scale or nature of airport operations. Nevertheless, proportionate engagement with relevant non-aviation stakeholders is considered appropriate to support transparency, provide local awareness and address potential concerns regarding perceived airport expansion, increased traffic or the introduction of larger aircraft. The possibility of such perceptions was specifically identified during the Assessment Meeting.

Non-aviation stakeholders will therefore include relevant local authorities, parish or town councils, community representatives and any environmental bodies whose interests may reasonably be affected by the proposed procedures. Their inclusion will be informed by the location of the proposed flight paths, the altitude of aircraft operations, the findings of the environmental assessment and HRA screening, and any identified potential for changes in traffic patterns below 3,000 feet.

Where Natural England or another environmental body is identified as having a relevant interest, engagement will be undertaken to ensure that any potential effects on designated sites or other environmental receptors are properly considered. The Assessment Meeting confirmed that environmental stakeholder engagement may be required where changes to traffic patterns or movement numbers below 3,000 feet are expected.

Engagement material issued to non-aviation stakeholders will be written in plain English and supported by clear mapping so that recipients can understand the nature of the proposal, its anticipated use and its potential effects. The scope of non-aviation engagement will remain proportionate to the likely impact of the proposal and will not imply that significant environmental or community effects are expected.

4.4 Seldom-Heard Audiences and Accessibility

At the time of preparing this strategy, EGBO is not aware of specific seldom-heard audiences that require tailored engagement. The engagement approach will remain responsive. If a need is identified, EGBO will provide suitable support, which may include printed material, alternative formats, direct contact through local councils or community representatives, or additional explanation by telephone or email.

4.5 Stakeholders

Table 5 identifies the types of stakeholders scoped into the engagement and explains the basis for their inclusion. The full list of individual organisations and contacts is provided in Appendix A - Stakeholder List, with any exclusions and the reasons for them set out below.

Stakeholder group	Organisation / role	Reason for inclusion	Engagement method	Contact status
Local authorities / councils	Local Council / Parish Council	Represents communities near the airport or affected flight paths	Email notification / non-technical session / survey	Initial email 27/07/2026
Airport Consultative Committee	ACC Chair / members	Established airport community forum	Email notification / Meeting / email / survey	Initial email 27/07/2026
Technical stakeholders	Adjacent ANSP / airport / military unit	Operational interface or airspace management interest	Email notification / Technical session	Initial email 27/07/2026
Local aviation stakeholders	Operator / flying school / club	Based or regular airspace user	Technical session / survey	Initial email 27/07/2026
NATMAC	Member organisation	Representative aviation stakeholder	Email notification / choice of session / survey	Initial email 27/07/2026
Environmental bodies	Natural England / protected landscape body / RSPB etc.	Potential interest in protected sites or environmental receptors	Email notification / non-technical session / survey	Initial email 27/07/2026
Model Flying Clubs	British Model Flying Association (BMFA)	Flying sites could interact with proposed approaches, holds or missed approaches. May not be published in AIP.	Email notification / choice of session / survey	Initial email 27/07/2026 Separate email to BMFA to establish relevant local groups (see appendix F).

Table 5: Stakeholder Groups

4.5.1 National Air Traffic Management Advisory Committee (NATMAC)

As this is a targeted Level 3 ACP, a number of NATMAC organisations are not expected to be directly affected by the proposal or to have a relevant operational interest in the local area. The following members have therefore been excluded from the engagement on the basis that their remit is not sufficiently relevant to the scope or anticipated impacts of the change: Airlines UK, British Airways, BAE Systems, BALPA, the Isle of Man CAA and Low Fare Airlines.

5. Approach

5.1 Overview

The engagement approach for this ACP will be proportionate to the expected low impact of the proposed change and tailored to the needs of different stakeholder groups. The approach will include direct notification to identified stakeholders, publication of engagement material, opportunities for clarification, and a structured feedback route.

5.2 Notification of Engagement

Identified stakeholders will be notified directly by email at the start of the engagement period. The notification will explain the proposal, where the engagement materials can be accessed, how stakeholders can ask questions and respond, and the deadline for responses.

The engagement will also be publicised through the [airport website](#) and the [CAA Airspace Change Portal](#). In addition, the Airport Consultative Committee (ACC) Chair or secretariat will be provided with the engagement notice, a link to the materials, the response deadline and contact details. They will be asked to circulate the information to ACC members through the Committee's established mailing list and, where practicable, raise awareness through an ACC meeting or other established communication channels.

ACC members will be directed to the same formal response routes as other stakeholders. Use of the ACC will supplement, rather than replace, direct notification to identified stakeholders.

5.3 Access and Response Routes

Engagement materials will be made available via email. Stakeholders will be invited to respond using an online survey. Where stakeholders cannot access digital material, printed copies or alternative formats will be made available on request.

Response route	Use	Process for logging
Online survey	Primary route for structured responses	Responses exported and logged in engagement feedback log.
Email	Questions, clarifications and written responses	Relevant responses entered into the feedback log.
Postal response	Alternative for stakeholders without digital access if required	Scanned/entered into feedback log.
Meetings / sessions	Clarifications and discussion	Key questions and actions recorded; stakeholders encouraged to submit formal response.

Table 6: Engagement Response Routes

5.4 Engagement Methods

The following engagement methods are proposed:

Method	Audience	Purpose	Timing	Owner
Pre engagement email	All identified stakeholders	To ensure stakeholder list is up to date and relevant and to advise stakeholders of upcoming engagement.	27/07/2026	Airspace Consultant / Airport Operations Manager
Initial notification email	All identified stakeholders	Launch engagement and direct stakeholders to materials	Day 1	Airport Operations Manager
Technical information session	Aviation/technical stakeholders	Explain procedure design, operational issues and technical constraints	Week 2	Airspace Consultant / Airport Operations Manager
Non-technical information session	Community/non-aviation stakeholders	Explain proposal, expected impacts and how to respond in accessible language	Week 2	Airspace Consultant / Airport Operations Manager
Drop-in session (if required)	Local community / stakeholders	Provide informal opportunity for questions	If required TBC	Andy Sampson / Jordan Timmins
FAQ updates	All stakeholders	Address common questions and reduce misunderstanding	Throughout	Airspace Consultant
Reminder email	All stakeholders	Encourage responses before deadline	Interim reminder and final reminder shortly before close	Airport Operations Manager

Table 7: Engagement Methods

5.5 Engagement Monitoring

During the engagement period, EGBO will monitor response levels, the themes emerging from feedback, stakeholder questions and any evidence of misunderstanding. Monitoring will allow the sponsor to consider whether additional clarification, targeted engagement, FAQ updates or an extension to the engagement period is required.

Monitoring item	Indicator	Potential mitigation	Escalation route
Low response rate	Few/no responses from key stakeholder groups	Reminder or targeted follow-up	ACP lead / CAA case officer if material
Common misunderstanding	Repeated questions on same point	Issue FAQ or clarify material	ACP lead
New impact concern	Stakeholder identifies impact not previously considered	Technical review and response	ACP lead / procedure designer / CAA case officer
Adverse publicity / social media	Incorrect or misleading public narrative	Correct factual information via website/FAQ	Airport comms / ACP lead
Accessibility issue	Stakeholder cannot access material	Provide alternative format or direct support	ACP lead

Table 8: Engagement Monitoring

5.6 Risk of Engagement Failure

EGBO has identified credible risks that could prevent the engagement from generating useful, representative or informed feedback and have set out proportionate mitigation measures, taking account of the anticipated impact of the proposed change. These are set out in Table 9.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation	Owner
Stakeholders do not understand the technical proposal	L	M	The engagement document explains the fundamentals of PBN, the design process and known constraints and considerations for the design with diagrams throughout. Each option is described in detail with maps and an explanation of where the option has met, partially or not met any design principle.	Airspace Consultant
Key stakeholders do not respond	M	M	Reminders will be sent from the project email address that clearly state the importance of their input and the risks of not responding. All reminders will be recorded as part of project governance.	Airspace Consultant / Airport Operations Manager
Engagement period coincides with holiday/election/local event	L	M	Engagement is planned outside the peak holiday period and there are no scheduled national or local elections in England between September and November 2026 that would affect West Midlands MPs or councillors.	Airspace Consultant
Feedback identifies a material design issue	L	H	Review the feedback to assess its safety and operational impact with procedure designer and the aerodrome team. Where necessary consider engagement with CAA case officer; If issue cannot be resolved, consider design amendment or further engagement	Airspace Consultant

Table 9: Risk Analysis

5.7 Data Protection and Publication of Responses

EGBO will handle stakeholder information in accordance with applicable data protection requirements. The engagement material should explain how responses will be stored, reviewed and, where applicable, published or summarised. Personal data should not be published unless there is a lawful basis and stakeholders have been clearly informed.

6. Materials

6.1 Overview

The engagement material aims to provide enough information for stakeholders to understand the proposal and respond meaningfully. Materials aim to be accessible, proportionate and tailored where necessary for technical and non-technical audiences.

Material	Purpose	Audience	Status
Engagement Strategy	Explains engagement approach for CAA review	CAA / public once published	This document
Engagement Presentation	Provides accessible summary for information sessions	Technical and non-technical stakeholders	Final
Stakeholder survey / response form	Collects structured feedback	All stakeholders	Draft
Maps and diagrams	Shows current-day scenario, options and relevant receptors	All stakeholders	Final – contained within Engagement Presentation.
Technical annex	Provides procedure/airspace detail where needed	Aviation stakeholders	Not required. Engagement presentation has been tailored to provide detail to both aviation and non-aviation stakeholders.
FAQ	Provides consistent answers to common questions	All stakeholders	Drafted and to be maintained.

Table 10: Overview of Engagement Outputs

6.2 Content Requirements for Engagement Material

- Purpose and need for the change, linked to the accepted Statement of Need.
- Current-day scenario and baseline used for comparison.
- Options considered, including any discounted options where relevant for transparency.
- The proposed option(s) and design rationale.
- Expected aviation impacts, including safety, access, operational resilience and interactions with adjacent airspace users.
- Expected non-aviation impacts, such as noise, overflight, emissions, tranquillity and environmental receptors, where relevant to the ACP.
- Maps and diagrams that are clear, legible and appropriately labelled.
- How stakeholders can respond, the deadline for responses and what happens next.
- Explanation of how feedback will be used and the limits of what can be influenced.

6.3 Presentation Structure

EGBO has prepared the engagement presentation with the requirements set out in Section 6.2 in mind. The structure and content of the presentation are summarised in Table 11.

Slide / section	Content	Notes
Introduction	ACP reference, proposal title, airport and stakeholder engagement	Introductions: presenter and participants
	Airport background, current operational context and engagement timescales	Provides the initial context for stakeholders.
CAP 1616 Process	Explanation of the Level 3 process, current project stage and purpose of Stage 3 engagement	Explain proportionality without implying reduced scrutiny.
Statement of Need	Current operations, need for change and proposed RNP approaches to Runways 16 and 34	Link clearly to the accepted Statement of Need.
Design Principles	Mandatory and discretionary Design Principles and how options were evaluated against them	Keep wording accessible and avoid unnecessary technical detail.
The Design Process	Overview of how the proposed instrument approach procedures were developed	Section introduction.
	Regulatory framework, including PANS-OPS, procedure-design criteria and relevant constraints	Explain the basis for the design process clearly.
	Explanation of Performance-Based Navigation and the main segments of an RNP approach	Useful for non-technical stakeholders.
	Local airspace, operational and environmental constraints, including Birmingham, RAF Cosford, RAF Shawbury, VRPs, hazards and Noise Abatement Procedures	Use a clearly labelled map and explain how each constraint influenced the design rather than simply listing features. Distinguish between regulatory constraints, operational considerations and environmental sensitivities.
	HRA screening, relevant protected sites and the screening conclusion	Provides environmental context.
Purpose of Engagement	Reason for engagement, stakeholders invited to participate and the questions on which feedback is sought	Separate questions for aviation and non-aviation stakeholders where appropriate.
Viable RNP Approach Options	Scope of the proposal, introduction of RNP approaches, no additional controlled airspace and anticipated benefits	Be clear about what will and will not change. Avoid overstating benefits.
	Expected users, PPR arrangements, timeslots, circuit suspension and proposed weather-use criteria	Clearly identify any arrangements that are still subject to development.
	Explanation of options development, DPE methodology and assessment criteria	Explain that the assessment is qualitative and proportionate.
Runway 34 Options	Design influences and constraints affecting the development of Runway 34 options	Includes Birmingham controlled airspace, GA activity, VRPs, environmental considerations and neighbouring aerodromes.
	Main dimensions and structure of the Runway 34 procedure options	Keep technical detail proportionate to the audience.
	Viable Options 3/34 and 5/34, including DPE results, maps and overflight information	Clearly identify Option 5/34 as preferred and explain why.

Runway 16 Options	Design influences and constraints affecting the development of Runway 16 options	Highlight the proximity of RAF Cosford ATZ, interaction with local GA and VFR activity, the location of the hold, nearby aerodromes, environmental sensitivities and the need to align the missed approach with existing Noise Abatement Procedures.
	Main dimensions and structure of the Runway 16 procedure options	Explain the offset intermediate segment and missed-approach differences clearly.
	Viable Options 6/16 and 7/16, including DPE results, maps and overflight information	Clearly identify Option 7/16 as preferred and explain the Course to Altitude feature.
Preferred Options	Summary of preferred options 5/34 and 7/16 and the reasons for their selection	Provide a concise comparison and avoid repeating earlier slides unnecessarily.
Rejected Options	Summary of rejected Runway 34 and Runway 16 options	State clearly that they are included for transparency and feedback is not being sought on them.
Expected Impacts	Proportionate summary of aviation, operational, environmental, community and economic impacts	Summarise anticipated benefits, adverse effects and areas requiring further assessment against the current-day baseline.
How to Respond	Questionnaire, email address, engagement deadline, information sessions, alternative formats and portal location	Make the response route and deadline prominent.
Next Steps	Engagement close, analysis of feedback, possible design updates, Stage 4 submission, CAA decision, implementation and PIR	Make the deadline clear.
Questions and Contact Details	Opportunity for questions and project contact details	Welcome any feedback via email

Table 11: Presentation Structure

7. Length and Timeline

A six-week engagement period is proposed, running from 7 September to 16 October 2026. This is considered appropriate and proportionate for a Level 3 ACP of limited scope and anticipated low impact. The engagement is targeted at aviation and non-aviation stakeholders with a direct or relevant interest in the proposal, rather than constituting the wider public.

The proposed period provides sufficient time for stakeholders to review the engagement material, attend either the technical or non-technical information session, seek clarification and submit a considered response. A mid-point reminder and final reminder will be issued to encourage participation, and responses will be accepted through the identified engagement routes.

The timeline also provides a three-week period following the close of engagement to categorise and assess feedback before the proposal and supporting material are updated for the Stage 4 submission.

Activity	Proposed date	Purpose	Dependencies
CAA review of strategy/materials	28/08/2026	CAA review prior to launch	Submission of draft material 27/07/2026
Engagement launch	07/09/2026	Notify stakeholders and publish material	CAA acceptance / sponsor approval
Technical session	15/09/2026 (AM)	Technical explanation and Q&A	Stakeholder availability
Non-technical session	15/09/2026 (PM)	Accessible explanation and Q&A	Stakeholder availability
Mid-point reminder	01/10/2026	Encourage responses	Engagement in progress
Final reminder	12/10/2026	Remind stakeholders of deadline	Four days before close
Engagement closes	16/10/2026	Deadline for responses	Minimum duration met
Feedback analysis	19/10/2026-06/11/2026	Categorise and assess feedback	Responses exported
Stage 4 submission	29/01/2027	Submit updated ACP to CAA	Feedback analysis complete

Table 12: Engagement Timeline

8. Post-Engagement

8.1 Feedback Analysis

After the engagement period closes, EGBO will collate, review and categorise all responses received. Each response will be assessed to determine whether it raises a relevant issue, whether it supports or objects to the proposal, whether it identifies a potential impact, and whether it requires a design, assessment or material change.

Feedback category	Description	Assessment question	Potential outcome	Evidence recorded
Support / no objection	Stakeholder supports or does not object to proposal	Does it identify conditions or assumptions?	Record and consider	Feedback log
Clarification	Stakeholder asks a question or shows misunderstanding	Is material clarification required?	FAQ/update response	Response record
Operational concern	Aviation stakeholder identifies operational/safety/interface issue	Does design or LoA require review?	Technical review/design update	Issue/action log
Environmental/community concern	Stakeholder identifies noise, overflight, tranquillity or receptor concern	Was this considered in assessment?	Assess and explain response	Impact review
Out of scope	Feedback relates to matters outside ACP scope	Can the concern be redirected/explained?	Explain scope limitation	Feedback log

8.2 Reporting Back

EGBO will prepare a post-engagement report or consultation response document summarising the engagement undertaken, the responses received, key themes, sponsor responses, and any changes made to the proposal or supporting material. A clear "we asked / you said / we did" approach may be used where helpful.

8.3 Design Update and Stage 4 Submission

Following feedback analysis, EGBO will confirm the option to be taken forward and identify whether any updates are required to the procedure design, options appraisal, safety assessment, environmental assessment, engagement record or other supporting documents. The final submission to the CAA will include the required Level 3 Stage 4 material and any supporting evidence requested by the CAA.

8.4 Further Engagement or Re-Engagement

If feedback or design development identifies a material change to the proposal or a new impact not previously presented to stakeholders, EGBO will discuss with the CAA whether further engagement is required before Stage 4 submission.

8.5 Decision, Implementation and Post Implementation Review

Following CAA assessment and decision, EGBO will plan implementation in accordance with the approved proposal, relevant AIRAC cycles and implementation dependencies. A Post Implementation Review will be undertaken in accordance with CAP 1616 requirements to determine whether the implemented change has achieved its intended objectives and whether any unexpected impacts have arisen.

9. Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Named lead	Responsibilities	Back-up / support
Change sponsor ACP lead	Airport Operations Manager	Overall delivery, CAA liaison, approval of material	Airspace Consultant
Airport operational lead	FISO Manager	Operational input, stakeholder queries, implementation dependencies	Airspace Consultant
Procedure designer / APDO	Instrument Flight Procedure Designer	Procedure design input, technical constraints, design updates	Senior Instrument Flight Procedure Designer
Engagement lead	Airspace Consultant	Stakeholder list, notifications, sessions, survey and feedback log	Charlotte Mummery

Appendix A - Stakeholder List

ACP-2024-037 | Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport

Stakeholder category	Organisation or stakeholder group	Engagement route
Sponsor and airport governance	Wolverhampton Airport Ltd	Internal project coordination and direct notification
Sponsor and airport governance	Airport Consultative Committee	Notification through the ACC Chair or secretariat for circulation to members
Airport aviation stakeholders	Airspace Flight Training School	Direct email using the controlled stakeholder register
Airport aviation stakeholders	AA Aviation	Direct email using the controlled stakeholder register
Airport aviation stakeholders	Aerohire Limited	Direct email using the controlled stakeholder register
Airport aviation stakeholders	Almat Flight School	Direct email using the controlled stakeholder register
Airport aviation stakeholders	Hadaircraft Ltd, Hadair Flight Training Ltd and Hadair Microlights	Direct email using the controlled stakeholder register
Airport aviation stakeholders	Jetstream Aircraft Maintenance and Hangar 8 Ltd	Direct email using the controlled stakeholder register
Airport aviation stakeholders	PDG Helicopters	Direct email using the controlled stakeholder register
Airport aviation stakeholders	The Flying School Ltd	Direct email using the controlled stakeholder register
Airport aviation stakeholders	Wolverhampton Flight Training Ltd	Direct email using the controlled stakeholder register
Airport aviation stakeholders	David Dunn North West Flight Training	Direct email using the controlled stakeholder register
Airport aviation stakeholders	Resident aircraft owners and private airport residents	Direct email using the airport's controlled distribution list
Airport aviation stakeholders	Based and regular airport users	Direct email using the airport's controlled distribution list
Other airport stakeholders	On-airport tenants and non-aviation businesses	Direct email using the airport tenant distribution list
External aviation stakeholders	Birmingham Airport and Birmingham ATC	Direct notification to the relevant airport and NATS contacts
External aviation stakeholders	RAF Cosford ATC	Direct notification to the relevant operational contacts

External aviation stakeholders	RAF Cosford Airshow	Direct notification to the relevant event and operational contacts
External aviation stakeholders	RAF Shawbury ATC	Direct notification to the relevant operational contacts
External aviation stakeholders	Wellesbourne Airport	Direct notification using the controlled stakeholder register
External aviation stakeholders	East Midlands Airport	Direct notification using the controlled stakeholder register
External aviation stakeholders	Manchester Airport	Direct notification using the controlled stakeholder register
External aviation stakeholders	Stratford Gliding Club	Direct notification using the controlled stakeholder register
External aviation stakeholders	Sherwood Flying Club	Direct notification using verified contact details
External aviation stakeholders	Airspace4All	Direct notification using the organisation's published contact route
Model-flying stakeholders	British Model Flying Association	Direct notification to the BMFA and request for circulation to relevant affiliated clubs
Model-flying stakeholders	Relevant local model-flying clubs	Direct notification where identified through the BMFA or local stakeholder mapping
Local authorities and community representatives	Black Country Chamber of Commerce	Direct notification using the controlled stakeholder register
Local authorities and community representatives	Bobbington Parish Council	Direct notification to the parish clerk
Local authorities and community representatives	Claverley Parish Council	Direct notification to the parish clerk
Local authorities and community representatives	Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council	Direct notification to the relevant council representatives and officers
Local authorities and community representatives	Enville Parish Council	Direct notification to the parish clerk
Local authorities and community representatives	Kinver Parish Council	Direct notification to the parish clerk
Local authorities and community representatives	Shropshire Council	Direct notification to the relevant council representatives and officers
Local authorities and community representatives	South Staffordshire District Council	Direct notification to the relevant council representatives and officers

Local authorities and community representatives	Staffordshire County Council	Direct notification to the relevant council representatives and officers
Local authorities and community representatives	Swindon Parish Council	Direct notification to the parish clerk
Local authorities and community representatives	Wombourne Parish Council	Direct notification to the parish clerk
Environmental stakeholders	Natural England	Direct notification using the organisation's published contact route
Environmental stakeholders	Environment Agency	Direct notification using the organisation's published contact route
Environmental stakeholders	Shropshire Hills National Landscape Team	Direct notification using the controlled stakeholder register
Environmental stakeholders	Relevant local authority planning, ecology and environmental health teams	Direct notification through the relevant authority
Local landowners and businesses	Highgate Farm	Direct notification using verified contact details
Local landowners and businesses	Whittimere Farm	Direct notification using verified contact details
Technical stakeholders	Met Office	Direct notification to the relevant aviation meteorology contacts
NATMAC – airport and airspace organisations	AirportsUK	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – airport and airspace organisations	Airfield Operators Group	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – airport and airspace organisations	Airspace Change Organising Group	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – airport and airspace organisations	NATS	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – aviation representatives	Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – aviation representatives	British Business and General Aviation Association	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – aviation representatives	General Aviation Alliance	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – aviation representatives	Guild of Air Traffic Control Officers	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list

NATMAC – aviation representatives	Honourable Company of Air Pilots	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – aviation representatives	Light Aircraft Association	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – aviation representatives	PPL/IR Europe	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – specialist airspace users	Association of Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems UK	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – specialist airspace users	British Balloon and Airship Club	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – specialist airspace users	British Gliding Association	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – specialist airspace users	British Helicopter Association	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – specialist airspace users	British Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – specialist airspace users	British Microlight Aircraft Association	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – specialist airspace users	British Skydiving	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – specialist airspace users	Helicopter Club of Great Britain	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – environmental and safety organisations	Aviation Environment Federation	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – environmental and safety organisations	UK Airprox Board	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – environmental and safety organisations	UK Flight Safety Committee	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – military stakeholders	Military Aviation Authority	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – military stakeholders	Ministry of Defence – Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – military stakeholders	Navy Command Headquarters	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list
NATMAC – military stakeholders	United States Visiting Forces	Direct notification using the current NATMAC contact list

Appendix B – Example Engagement Feedback Log

Ref	Date received	Stakeholder	Response route	Theme	Summary of feedback	Sponsor response	Action / status
[ref]	[date]	[stakeholder]	[survey/email/meeting]	[theme]	[summary]	[response]	[open/closed]
[ref]	[date]	[stakeholder]	[survey/email/meeting]	[theme]	[summary]	[response]	[open/closed]
[ref]	[date]	[stakeholder]	[survey/email/meeting]	[theme]	[summary]	[response]	[open/closed]
[ref]	[date]	[stakeholder]	[survey/email/meeting]	[theme]	[summary]	[response]	[open/closed]
[ref]	[date]	[stakeholder]	[survey/email/meeting]	[theme]	[summary]	[response]	[open/closed]
[ref]	[date]	[stakeholder]	[survey/email/meeting]	[theme]	[summary]	[response]	[open/closed]

Appendix C - Example Survey Questions

The following questions will be used to gather structured feedback from stakeholders on their understanding of the proposal, the options presented and the potential effects of the preferred designs. Respondents will also have the opportunity to identify additional issues, suggest changes or mitigation measures, and request follow-up contact from EGBO.

1. Do you understand the purpose of the proposed change? [Yes / No / Partly] Please explain your answer.
2. Do you have any comments on the current-day scenario or baseline used for the proposal?
3. Do you have any comments on the options considered, including any discounted options?
4. Do you have any comments on the proposed option(s) to be taken forward?
5. Do you consider that the engagement material provides enough information to understand the potential impact on you or your organisation?
6. Do you have any aviation safety, operational or airspace integration comments?
7. Do you have any comments on potential environmental, noise, overflight, tranquillity or community impacts?
8. Do you have any suggestions for changes or mitigations that EGBO should consider?
9. Would you like EGBO to contact you about your response? If yes, provide contact details.

Appendix D – Initial Stakeholder Email

Subject: ACP-2024-037 – Forthcoming stakeholder engagement

Dear [stakeholder],

Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport will be commencing Stage 3 stakeholder engagement over the next couple of months in relation to ACP-2024-037, which proposes the introduction of RNP instrument approach procedures to Runways 16 and 34.

This email is being sent in advance of the formal engagement to make you aware of the forthcoming activity and to confirm that we hold the correct contact details for you or your organisation.

Please could you confirm whether this is the appropriate email address for future correspondence and whether you remain the correct contact for this ACP. Where another person or team should be contacted, please provide their name, role, and email address.

The formal engagement material, response arrangements, and engagement dates will be issued separately once finalised.

Kind regards,

Airport Operations Manager

Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport

Appendix E - Stakeholder Notification Email

Subject: ACP-2024-037 - Stage 3 engagement on EGBO RNP Approach.

Dear [stakeholder],

Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport (EGBO) is progressing Airspace Change Proposal ACP-2024-037 to introduce Required Navigation Performance (RNP) Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs), with LNAV and LNAV/VNAV minima, to Runways 16 and 34. The CAA has classified the proposal as a Level 3 ACP, and EGBO is now undertaking Stage 3 stakeholder engagement.

You are invited to review the attached engagement material and provide feedback by 16 October 2026. The material explains the proposal, the options considered, the anticipated impacts and how stakeholder feedback will be taken into account before the final submission is made to the CAA.

You can submit your response using the [online engagement survey](#). Questions and requests for the material in an alternative format can be sent to acp_wolverhampton@cyrrus.co.uk.

Technical and non-technical information sessions will also be held on 15 September 2026. The technical session, intended primarily for aviation stakeholders, is planned for the morning, with the non-technical session, intended primarily for non-aviation stakeholders, planned for the afternoon.

Please register your interest by emailing acp_wolverhampton@cyrrus.co.uk and indicate which session you wish to attend. Further details, including confirmed times and joining instructions, will be provided to registered attendees.

Airport Operations Manager

Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport

Appendix F – Email British Model Flying Association

Subject: ACP-2024-037 - Request to Identify Relevant Model Flying Clubs and Sites

Dear Sir/Madam,

Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport is progressing Airspace Change Proposal ACP-2024-037 to introduce satellite-based Required Navigation Performance instrument approach procedures to Runways 16 and 34.

The proposed procedures would provide suitably equipped aircraft and appropriately qualified crews with lateral and, where applicable, vertical guidance when approaching the airport in weather conditions where a visual approach may not be possible. The proposal does not involve the introduction of controlled airspace, but the procedures would operate within the surrounding Class G airspace.

As part of the Stage 3 stakeholder engagement, we are identifying model-aircraft, model-helicopter and recreational drone flying activity that could interact with the proposed approach or missed-approach procedures. We understand that not all local flying sites are necessarily recorded in the Aeronautical Information Publication.

Please could you therefore confirm whether you are aware of any affiliated or unaffiliated clubs, flying sites or regular model-flying activity within or close to the Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport area that should be included in the engagement? We would also be grateful if you could provide the relevant contact details or forward this email to the appropriate clubs or representatives for inclusion to our stakeholder list and engagement.

The formal engagement material, including maps of the proposed procedures and details of how to respond, will be issued separately once finalised.

Please contact us at acp_wolverhampton@cyrrus.co.uk with any information or questions.

Airport Operations Manager

Wolverhampton Halfpenny Green Airport

Appendix G - Strategy Compliance Checklist

Question	Yes / No / N/A	Evidence / location
Does the strategy identify the ACP reference, sponsor and proposal clearly?	Yes	Cover page; Document Information; Executive Summary; Sections 1.1 and 1.2
Does it explain why the proposal is Level 3 and how proportionality has been applied?	Yes	Sections 1.1 and 1.4; Section 2.1; Section 5.
Does it identify aviation stakeholders and explain the basis for selection?	Yes	Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.5.1; Appendix A
Does it justify any non-aviation stakeholder engagement or explain why it is limited?	Yes	Sections 4.1 and 4.3
Does it address seldom-heard audiences and accessibility?	Yes	Section 4.4; Sections 5.2 and 5.3
Does it set out materials to be provided and how stakeholders can access them?	Yes	Sections 5.2 and 5.3; Sections 6.1–6.3
Does it provide an adequate response period and justify the timeline?	Yes	Section 2.2 – Adequate time for consideration and response; Section 7
Does it include reminders and monitoring arrangements?	Yes	Sections 5.4 and 5.5; Section 7
Does it explain how feedback will be logged, categorised and considered?	Yes	Section 2.1; Sections 5.3 and 5.5; Section 8.1; Appendix B
Does it explain post-engagement reporting and Stage 4 submission?	Yes	Sections 8.2–8.4
Does it align with the Gunning Principles?	Yes	Section 2.2 – Consultation and Engagement Principles

References

- UK Civil Aviation Authority (2025), CAP 1616: Airspace Change Process, Version 5.1, 11 September 2025. CAA publication page
- UK Civil Aviation Authority (2023), CAP 1616H: Guidance on Airspace Change Process for Level 3 and Pre-Scaled Airspace Change Proposals, Version 1, effective 2 January 2024. CAA publication page
- UK Civil Aviation Authority (2025), CAP 1616F: Guidance on Airspace Change Process for Permanent Airspace Change Proposals, Version 1.1, 11 September 2025. CAA publication page
- UK Civil Aviation Authority (2023), CAP 1616i: Environmental Assessment Requirements and Guidance for Airspace Change Proposals, Version 1, effective January 2024. CAA publication page
- Cabinet Office (2018), Consultation Principles, updated 19 March 2018. GOV.UK publication
- R v Brent London Borough Council, ex parte Gunning (1985) 84 LGR 168.