

## Mullen, Justine

---

**From:** Smailes Baggy [Baggy.Smailes@caa.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 07 November 2012 11:04  
**To:** Department of Planning; Saul, Clive  
**Subject:** FW: 11/03705/FU/14 Day Reconsultation

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Orange

**Attachments:** ufm42.rtf



ufm42.rtf (19 KB)

Dear Mr Saul,

Thank you for the recent correspondence from the Council which sought Civil Aviation Authority comment relating to the Skelton Grange Energy Recovery Facility. I should add that your subsequence e-mail was extremely helpful and allowed me to provide the following comments, which I trust are useful.

I gather that the tallest associated structures are intended to be a twin flue that would have a height of 90 meters (m) measured above ground level. On that basis I believe the following issues are worth of consideration:

- **Aerodromes.** I note that Leeds Bradford International Airport (LBIA) has recorded that there are no associated issues other than that associated with bird activity. Noting that aerodrome safeguarding responsibility rests in all cases with the relevant aerodrome operator / licensee, not the CAA, it is important that the LBIA comment is taken into account during associated planning deliberations.

- **Aviation Warning Lighting.** Given the height of associated structures there is a potential need for aviation warning lighting.

- o In the UK, the need for aviation obstruction lighting on 'tall' structures depends in the first instance upon any particular structure's location in relationship to an aerodrome. If the structure constitutes an 'aerodrome obstruction' it is the aerodrome operator that with review the lighting requirement. For civil aerodromes, they will, in general terms, follow the requirements of CAP 168 - Licensing of Aerodromes. This document can be downloaded from the CAA website - Chapter 4 (12.8) refers to obstacle lighting.

- o Away from aerodromes Article 219 of the UK Air Navigation Order (ANO) applies. This Article requires that for en-route obstructions (ie away from aerodromes) lighting only becomes legally mandated for structures of a height of 150m or more. However, structures of lesser high might need aviation obstruction lighting if, by virtue of their location and nature, they are considered a significant navigational hazard.

- o In this case, it would appear that LBIA have not dictated any lighting requirement. However, given that the flue would most likely be the tallest structure in the immediate vicinity, I believe that low intensity steady red aviation warning light (positioned as close to the top of the flue as possible, displayed at night and visible from all directions (taking account of potential obscuration of the lighting by flue emissions)) would be a sensible consideration. Note that in the absence of any aerodrome issue at such a height this suggestion of lighting could not be mandated, merely recommended.

- **Gas Venting and/or Flaring.** It is assumed that the power station is not intended to vent or flare gas either routinely or as an emergency procedure such as to cause a danger to overlying aircraft. If that is not the case parties are invited to use myself as an appropriate point of contact for any further related discussion.

- **Aviation Promulgation.** There is a civil aviation requirement in the UK for all

structures over 300 feet (91.4m) to be charted on aviation maps. It follows that, at 90m high, there is no en-route (ie non-aerodrome specific) civil aviation charting requirement.

- Military Aviation. I understand that the MoD have provided aviation related comment.

- I should also add that that due to the unique nature of associated operations in respect of operating altitudes and potentially unusual landing sites, it would also be sensible to establish the related viewpoint of local emergency services air support units.

Whilst none of the above negates any aforementioned need to consult in line with Government requirements associated with the safeguarding of aerodromes and other technical sites (Government Circular 1/2003 refers), I hope this information matches your requirements. Please do not hesitate to get in touch if the Planning Inspectorate requires any further comment or needs clarification of any point.

I trust this is useful; please call if you need further comment or guidance.

Mark Smailes  
0207 453 6545

Off Route Airspace 5  
Directorate of Airspace Policy  
Civil Aviation Authority  
CAA House  
45-59 Kingsway  
London WC2B 6TE

-----Original Message-----

From: [planning@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:planning@leeds.gov.uk) [mailto:[planning@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:planning@leeds.gov.uk)]  
Sent: 02 November 2012 14:42  
To: Smailes Baggy  
Subject: 11/03705/FU/14 Day Reconsultation

Please See Attached

---

The information in this email (and any attachment) may be for the intended recipient only. If you know you are not the intended recipient, please do not use or disclose the information in any way and please delete this email (and any attachment) from your system.

The Council does not accept service of legal documents by e-mail.

---

\*\*\*\*\*  
Before Printing consider the environment.

This e-mail and any attachment(s) are for authorised use by the intended recipient(s) only. It may contain proprietary material, confidential information and/or be subject to legal privilege. If you are not an intended recipient then please promptly delete this e-mail, as well as any associated attachment(s) and inform the sender. It should not be copied, disclosed to, retained or used by, any other party.  
Thank you.

Please note that all e-mail messages sent to the Civil Aviation Authority are subject to monitoring / interception for lawful business  
\*\*\*\*\*