

Organisation or Stakeholder Group (Q1)	Organisation or Individual Name (Q2)	Respondant Postcode (Q4)	Support ? (Yes, No, No Opinion) (Q6)	Response Reasoning and Additional Comments (Q6 and Q8)	Option Preference and Reason (Q7)	Response Which May Impact the Final Proposal (New Information or Ideas)		Response Which Does Not Impact the Final Proposal (Known Information)	Change Sponsor Reasoning/Justification (You Said, We Did)
						Impacted	Not Impacted		
NATMAC - British Helicopter Association	British Helicopter Association	GU24 8HU	Yes	This has no effect on traffic in the local area and provides a means of letting down from IFR in the Kemble area	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 Option 2 will expedite arriving traffic from North or South onto onto final approach in the most expeditious manner and spread the overflights out over 2 approach paths			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA		B58 2BG	Yes	For the reasons given by the airport. Also because it will make the airport available for RNAV approach training for based and visiting aircraft. This will not be any material noise concern to locals as a) a small fraction of arrivals and b) it is not a close pattern like the visual circuit most of it will be at reasonable altitude and distance.	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 T-bar allows for positioning onto intermediate fix for straight in if coming from directly west or fo low the t-bar.			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA	G ASNW Group	SN11 8NG	Yes	Having a P8 GPS approach will add to safety and operational efficiency.	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 The T Bar approaches will make routing inbound more flexible.			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA		CV9 2QE	Yes	The opportunity that GNS procedures offer to smaller airfields is vast. Not only from an economic point of view but it allows users and operators to have a wider choice of locations and provide safer and more efficient flights.	No preference I support either option As I am not locally impacted upon with noise abatement procedures I do not feel it fair to support one or the other. Local consideration should be			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA Resident		SN54DQ SN22hq	Yes Yes	Necessary for commercial and very useful for local GA pilots with IR There is nothing different from the heavy traffic we see at Fairford. With this the local economy would receive a boost from increased business	Option 1 - Straight in approach to both runways Option 3 - Straight in approach to both runways Easier to manage with other air traffic doing the Sam and 08 is too close in my opinion to the a429			X	Supported. A429 runs close to the R26 undershoot rather than 08 which is open fields. This ACP does not propose to extend the runway or suggest amendments to the local transport planning and/or highways agency. On current operations including recent B747 arrivals there is no data to suggest this is a safety concern to air or road users. Therefore this comment is out of scope. This is already known information which has already been considered in the Bowtie thus the response has been categorised as not impacting the final proposal.
GA		SN16 0JE	Yes	A I weather PBN approach essential for the continued success of any airport. Perhaps the missed approach Altitude could be higher than 2300 feet considering the track miles of the circuit; only descending to 2300 feet on the return cross leg? The ACP makes no mention of the fact that Kemble provides an AFISO service in fact the term "AFISO" is not written at all in the entire document. The document mentions the fact that Kemble has circa 30 000 movements per annum. These numbers are not dissimilar to Cardiff Inverness Southend and Norwich - all of which provide a full ATC service with Radar along with published instrument approaches. There is no mention of how Kemble expects to safely integrate and separate aircraft under its existing AFISO service as an ATC service (Radar or Approach) would be able to do. While there appears to be a "one aircraft at a time" rule no thought appears to be given to the fact another aircraft could divert in and wish to fly the approach as well or if an outbound aircraft (in IFR conditions) departs and wishes to make an unplanned return to the aerodrome whilst another IFR aircraft is inbound flying the procedure. Furthermore it does not account for the fact that while two inbound aircraft may be "separated" by defined time slots issued by the aerodrome a late slot one could arrive early or an early one could arrive late...thus having two aircraft inbound at the same time for the procedure. There appears to be no plan for this or availability of a published holding pattern - which would require an Approach Procedural ATC service as a minimum. The document makes reference to aircraft up to Boeing 747 size using the airport and the proposed approaches. There is no mention of how Kemble expects to mitigate the effects of wake turbulence to other aircraft under an AFISO service. AIRPROX report 2016093 refers to the AFISOs workload being a potential issue at Kemble and whether additional restrictions should be placed on the number of aircraft in the circuit including home-based aircraft. The ACP document makes no reference to this Airprox or any of the traffic limiting suggestions contained within it. I consider that if Kemble are serious about this proposal they and the CAA as the regulator consider whether AFISO is an appropriate level of service to provide given the amount and type of movements that they currently and are forecast to have.	No preference I support either option. Both suitable	X		Designs are now being amended (with the APD0) to raise the IAF and MA altitude to 2500ft.	
Unknown	Anonymous Aviator	GL7 6BA	No	The document mentions the fact that Kemble has circa 30 000 movements per annum. These numbers are not dissimilar to Cardiff Inverness Southend and Norwich - all of which provide a full ATC service with Radar along with published instrument approaches. There is no mention of how Kemble expects to safely integrate and separate aircraft under its existing AFISO service as an ATC service (Radar or Approach) would be able to do. While there appears to be a "one aircraft at a time" rule no thought appears to be given to the fact another aircraft could divert in and wish to fly the approach as well or if an outbound aircraft (in IFR conditions) departs and wishes to make an unplanned return to the aerodrome whilst another IFR aircraft is inbound flying the procedure. Furthermore it does not account for the fact that while two inbound aircraft may be "separated" by defined time slots issued by the aerodrome a late slot one could arrive early or an early one could arrive late...thus having two aircraft inbound at the same time for the procedure. There appears to be no plan for this or availability of a published holding pattern - which would require an Approach Procedural ATC service as a minimum. The document makes reference to aircraft up to Boeing 747 size using the airport and the proposed approaches. There is no mention of how Kemble expects to mitigate the effects of wake turbulence to other aircraft under an AFISO service. AIRPROX report 2016093 refers to the AFISOs workload being a potential issue at Kemble and whether additional restrictions should be placed on the number of aircraft in the circuit including home-based aircraft. The ACP document makes no reference to this Airprox or any of the traffic limiting suggestions contained within it. I consider that if Kemble are serious about this proposal they and the CAA as the regulator consider whether AFISO is an appropriate level of service to provide given the amount and type of movements that they currently and are forecast to have.	Neither option/not supported			X	The responder has raised some very useful ATC centric points for consideration in the supporting safety case many of which have already been addressed in the Bowtie which was not part of the CAP 1616 consultation. The points raised suggest the responder was not familiar with CAP 1122 which is the underlying safety mitigation requirements for an AFISO airport noting that other AFISO airports have provided CAP 1122 mitigations to their PBN (GNS) instrument approaches and had similar proposals approved. A PBN approach is not an ATC controlled Instrument Approach which would require Controlled Airspace like an ILS; Performance Based Navigation (PBN) is in many ways similar to an NDB in that it's a cockpit based approach rather than Tower/Radar controlled. The activity articulated in the consultation document happens now; aircraft arrive on self-defined routing. This proposal will increase safety not reduce it. The un-named responder also referred to similar movement numbers at other airports. All these airports are commercial airports serving scheduled international passenger air services which require Controlled Airspace amongst other requirements not applicable in our case. These flights account for most of their declared movements. Cotswold Airport is a GA Airport not serving any commercial services; it serves GA business jets and aircraft on ferry flights for maintenance or recycling. Furthermore these aircraft account for 1% of our movements. It is not a useful comparison. The consultation was not on the CAP 1122 process although consideration has been given to the comments for inclusion into the safety case the comments raised are out of scope for this consultation and therefore categorised as a response which does not impact the final CAP 1616
In Scope Business Jet Operator		Hp108aq	Yes	As a commercial Pilot I believe that adding GPS approaches can only make flying into Kemble not only safer for arriving aircraft but for the local population. Embracing technology can only help rather than hinder operations at the airfield.	No preference I support either option No advantage to either from my perspective.			X	Supported No Suggestions
Individual		Ox18 1lu	Yes	It is important to make it safer for aircraft to land at Kemble. It will also allow other traffic around to know of the flight path the aircraft will use so flight planning is easier. It would be good if the PBN approaches could be used for training purposes as well as Kemble is a great facility for training.	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 A T bar at runway 26 will allow for traffic to avoid RAF Fairford and Brize Norton traffic approaches but it will allow easy access to Kemble.			X	Supported. Opening up the approach to all is out of scope of this ACP. The future may have a low increase after the post-implementation review has been successfully completed with the CAA. This is a UK wide problem which needs to be addressed by the CAA as GNS Approaches become a syllabus training area in IR and CPL training. This is already known information which has already been considered in the Bowtie thus the response has been categorised as not impacting the final proposal.
GA		8516 1WX	Yes	High time this is implemented. I have flown and instructed from here for 10 years and the ability to operate to/from the airfield in poor weather would be invaluable for locally based operators' businesses.	No preference I support either option No advantage to either from my perspective.			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA		SN15 4RP	Yes	Excellent opportunity for Cotswold Airport to benefit from a published approach in less than desirable conditions. Reduces chances of aircraft diverting due to deteriorating weather conditions. Provides an avenue for IR training and currency. As a training orientated aerodrome this sits neatly in with the current environment. Attracts visitors to the Cotswolds which has clear benefits for tourism. Local residents are supportive of the aerodrome and the proposed tracks/altitudes for the procedure do not cross any noise avoidance areas instead displaced further out than the visual circuit. I wholly support this proposal and having completed many years of training and flying at Kemble believe this to be a natural progression for a growing aerodrome and one which benefits the aerodromes training environment and pays credence to the local residents in the area.	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 To the East with busy airspace to negotiate a T-Bar arrival gives pilots a clear routing from the North or South. With clear tracks perpendicular to the F-A.T there is no vague routing to the IAF from whichever point an aircraft presents itself for the approach. From experience a T-Bar shaped procedure serves to enhance situational awareness in a busy airspace environment. The tendency to go direct to an IAF can lead to poor SA and perhaps complacency.			X	Supported. Information on the safety benefits of Option 2 have been noted.
Resident		SN4 9JG	Yes	Long overdue for an Airport that handles many corporate jets and airliners.	Option 1 - Straight in approach to both runways Same approach pattern for each runway. Surrounding airspace and aerodromes allow this.			X	Supported No Suggestions

ANSP/Resident		OX18 3PJ	Yes	Visiting foreign p lts off the airways w I often request radar vectors for an approach into Cotswold Airport and frequently request a Deconfliction Service in accordance with UK Air Traffic Services Outside Controlled Airspace. The Class G airspace in the vicinity of Cotswold airport can be congested particularly during fine weather with multiple aircraft not displaying SRR information. This combination of conditions leads to fast moving potentially unfamiliar pilots in congested class G with no predefined route to final approach. It also increases the likelihood of reactive deconfliction advice prolonging the pilot's flight in busy airspace. I believe GPS based PBN approaches into Cotswold Airport will give pilots a more complete understanding of their journey from the airway to the runway allowing capacity to respond to ATC and traffic information and enabling the pilot to gain visual references without having to route via a congested overhead. I also believe it will provide radar controllers with reduced easily understood and anticipated instructions for the aircrew as well as increasing the awareness and expectations of other airspace users.	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 Option 2 allows pilots to establish on a less threatening predefined track at an earlier point than option 1 and from two separate directions. The choice of multiple entry points for the procedure also allows for flexibility to avoid traffic congestion whilst still allowing p lts to establish at the earliest opportunity.			X	Supported. Really useful information logged from the repondee who intimately understands both RAF Brize Norton and Cotswold Airport ATC/ATM procedures.
GA		SN4 9PR	Yes	The provision of a PBN approach will allow the safe arrival of aircraft in IMC little or no effect on VFR traffic	No preference I support either option Any option is workable as long as provision is for both runways.			X	Supported No Suggestions
In Scope Business Jet Operator	NetJets Europe	SN16 9DD	Yes	Our clients occasionally request to fly to Kemble. The proposal will improve accessibility for us and improve safety for all local aircraft by better ensuring separation.	Option 1 - Straight in approach to both runways Simplicity.			X	Supported Noting simplicity of Option 1 from a Business Jet operator (in-scope) and validation of the operational/economic benefits of having a defined approach.
GA		GL8 8DD	Yes	It would be very good to be able to land at Kemble in poor visibility as the cloud base is often very low. At the moment we end up getting diverted to Gloucester.	No preference I support either option I don't fly IMC so I don't know enough to have an opinion.			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA/Other Airfield		GI4 5EB	Yes	400hr Pilot based Oaksey. I have got a lot of hours experience from learning at big commercial airports sharing airspace with big jets. We also have had plenty of close cooperation with military operations from Lyneham (low level). Brize are much higher. Having known routings for big jets makes it safer. I'm just surprised that they don't already exist. It would be a bonus to know about planned big jet movements at the flight planning stage although this shouldn't preclude radio contact. One challenge is that radio contact from the ground at Oaksey to the Tower at Kemble is not reliable.	No preference I support either option A GA approach to Kemble or Oaksey is typically starting from 3000 descending to 2000 within 5 m of the field. The proposed routes have little or no effect to current operations. Safer operations are always best. If there are proposals for preferred routings and altitudes to/from Oaksey that may be a benefit.			X	Supported. Useful information which will be actioned to allow more robust telephone/email contact with Oaksey Park Airfield. We have adopted a similar approach with Aston Down glider site already. This is already known information which has already been considered in the Bowtie thus the response has been categorised as not impacting the final proposal.
GA	SAS INTERNATIONAL	CF729HH	Yes	There are too few airfields which accept GA traffic and have PBN. This will allow private individuals to fly in and out of Kemble on days that are not only suitable for VFR traffic. We need more PBN approaches in the UK full stop.	No preference I support either option I support either option but would prefer T-bar for both approaches so as to allow better spacing and coordination for GA traffic.			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA		Ng12 3ed	Yes	Pilot requiring more destinations with pub ished approach procedures	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 Conforms to standard			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA	Morgan Martell Ltd	GL8 8NE	Yes	In the age of technology we live in it makes sense to afford Cotswold Airport the opportunity to move into the 21st Century. GPS will encourage a new section of air traffic and clientele that accompanies it. This will benefit the local community in many ways.	No preference I support either option As long as aircraft can approach safely I'm happy with either option.			X	Supported No Suggestions
NATMAC - The Air Charter Association Ltd		EC3A 8BH	Yes	GPS PBN should be supported wherever possible as it opens up safe and flexible operations at airfields which are subject to restrictions due to local weather conditions. Cotswold Airport has gone from strength to strength in its commercial activities and alongside the successful recycling of aircraft is a popular destination for business aircraft accessing companies in the region. Our Association represents the interests of professionals who work in the air charter industry and therefore anything which permits operators to use the airfield without weather restrictions is in the interests of our members and their passengers. It is important to remember that the passengers of business aircraft generate nine times the GDP of commercial air line passengers and that inward investment generally occurs within the catchment area of the airfield being visited. We are pleased to see this investment in the local economy by the airfield.	No preference I support either option We support the concept of all weather operations at the airfield our operational members are being encouraged to respond with practical input on the safest and most productive approach path.			X	Supported. A very useful in-scope aircraft perspective which has been noted.
Resident		RG45 6EB	Yes	Enhanced flight safety.	No preference I support either option I agree with the analysis provided in the consultation document.			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA	Blackbushe Aviation	GU17 9LB	Yes	A pub ished instrument approach is an enhancement to safety at any airfield. On a personal level another airport for practice instrument approaches will be handy in the South East. Given that the technology is now in the majority of light aircraft I see no sense in not enhancing safety an every suitable airfield by having an instrument approach.	No preference I support either option A correct approach talking everything into consideration is vital. Offering no current preference ensured the correct decision will be made further down the line			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA		RH123QF	Yes	Improved safety for GA aircraft	No preference I support either option Any increase in the number of RNAV approaches is a positive benefit for GA. Safety would be improved.			X	Supported No Suggestions
Resident		SN15 3RE	Yes	Why wouldn't you assist arriving aircraft as much as you can? Safety. Convenience. Plus some marginal economic benefits.	No preference I support either option The differences are in the margins.			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA		RG19 4GP	Yes	As a GA pilot who occasional flies into Kemble this will increase safety by co-ordinating such in-scope arrivals as well as aiding the airport to grow its business and thus be sustainable into the future.	No preference I support either option Happy with either but possibly slight preference for option 1			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA		GU17 9AL	Yes	The provision of a GPS PBN approach will enhance flight safety and enable pilots to train on the future of approaches as this is very limited in the UK.	No preference I support either option			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA		B56 5AU	Yes	I feel the potential increase in instrument air traffic will be beneficial for the airport and the surrounding economy and for operators this GPS approach can only be seen as a positive in terms of safety in operations.	No preference I support either option Any option would work though possibly a slight preference for a straight in approach on both RWY's as it will avoid disruption with circuit traffic.			X	Supported Point noted on Option 2, although the T is 8NM to the east of circuit traffic for both Cotswold Airport and Oaksey Park. Special operational procedures will be in place during Instrument Approaches including an allocated slot arrival system and sterilisation of the visual circuit. This is already known information which has already been considered in the Bowtie thus the response has been categorised as not impacting the final proposal.
GA		SP5 5BJ	Yes	This will enhance safety and reduce noise by keeping aircraft higher and giving pilots options rather than having to fly lower in poor weather.	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 More flexible T approach reduce fuel consumption and distributes traffic volume. More IAFs audio show more options to hold ease traffic control sequencing.			X	Supported Benefits of Option 2 have been noted for consideration in the Final Appraisal.
GA		SP8 4FT	Yes	It is making the airport accessible in bad visibility by adequate qualified pilots. It is increasing safety.	No preference I support either option I don't see any problem on either options.			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA		B57 8QH	Yes	I am a private pilot based at Cotswold Airport and as such I want to support this proposal as I believe that it will facilitate Cotswold Airport to prosper. I also believe that the addition of a PBN approach will increase safety for not only for the aircraft and crews using this on approach but also for local GA traffic as they will know exactly where the PBN approach traffic will be routed.	No preference I support either option Either option will work well for aircraft on approach to Cotswold Airport.			X	Supported. Situational Awareness Benefits noted for Final Appraisal and Safety Case
GA		Ox14 2hu	Yes	Instrument approaches improve safety and the implementation of PBN/GNSS approaches in the UK has been far too slow compared to other countries. They offer a simple solution to improving safety for pilots as well as improving the utilisation of the airfield in bad weather and consequently supporting the local economy.	No preference I support either option do not have a view on the alternatives - the important thing is to establish the approach procedures.			X	Supported No Suggestions
GA		S15 8qf	Yes	The introduction of the PBN GPS approach would enhance the viability of the airport. As a frequent business visitor to Cirencester and the surrounding area being assured of being able to land at Kemble in all but extreme conditions would mean I would be able to avoid a long drive and instead fly in and then use local companies for incidental transport. This has benefits all round - Less road congestion smaller carbon footprint using local companies and overall a growth in personal activity in the area. The surrounding area around a Kemble is not the easiest to get to hence why the airport with instrument approaches becomes an even better asset for the community and local economy.	No preference I support either option Both options are feasible. I slightly prefer the option 2 as I like the T-bar although having said that there is no reason why the approach could not be operated as a straight in approach.			X	Supported. Thank you for highlighting the wider benefits.

Kemble and ewen Parish Council		GL7 6AP	Yes	A low defined flight path into the airport and for better use in poor weather saves going around again. I have seen where large	No preference. I support either option I think this depends on the type/size of the aircraft using the airport.		X	Supported. No Suggestions
In Scope Business Jet Operator		GU12 3DS	Yes	As a Pilot previously based at Kemble and flying a business jet there. I believe that the proposed GNSG approaches will greatly increase the safety for all users of the airport. In my own experience during marginal weather I had to divert to either Gloucester or Bournemouth when the weather was not acceptable to attempt a visual approach. This led to extra costs, emissions and delays for passengers. In my opinion these approaches should be made available as soon as possible to enhance safety, reduce emissions and increase dependability of Kemble as an airport. The approval of GNSG approaches is woefully slow in the UK compared to the US or France - they are simple and cheap to operate and provide a huge increase in safety for pilots operating into airports served by them. Apart from the approach itself being a positive, the defining of minima helps all instrument pilots contemplating an approach a set of 'hard' limits to fly to rather than possibly being sucked into attempting an approach in marginal weather. This provides an enormous increase in safety for all parties. I can see no negatives. Please approve the approach ASAP. Regards Fraser O'Sullivan	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 More flexibility to use the predominant runway from different arrival directions. Increased traffic awareness for other pilots using the circuit.		X	Supported. Some very useful information raised from an in-scope pilot's perspective which will be considered when drafting the Final Appraisal work. This is already known information which has already been considered in the Bowtie, thus the response has been categorised as not impacting the final proposal.
In Scope Business Jet Operator		SN16 9SD	Yes	Important economic benefits of the airport I don't believe there will be any disruption to noise, traffic or any part of my life or we being - can think of no reason to object. The airport is an important source of local employment and economic benefit and should be supported as much as possible.	No preference. I support either option I'm happy with them all		X	Supported. No Suggestions
Resident		SN11 8NG	Yes	Flight safety	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 Not all approaches from the same direction. Easier joins from north and south.		X	Supported. No Suggestions
GA		TA14 6TE	Yes	This development would enhance safety margins	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 Clearer navigation and separation from Fairford and Brize Traffic.		X	Supported. No Suggestions
NATMAC - British Microlight Aircraft Association	British Microlight Aircraft Association	OX15 0TT	No opinion/don't know	Please refer to our comment below regarding design principles an engagement. British Microlight Aircraft Association Policy for Design Principles during ACP engagement Introduction The following text describes the underlying principles that the British Microlight Aircraft Association (BMAA) believes must be followed by applicants for airspace change proposals. Consultation 1. The BMAA welcomes the opportunity to engage in consultation at an early stage within the ACP CAP 1616 process. 2. Sponsors are encouraged to engage with the BMAA and its members as early as possible during the development of the ACP. Previous ACPs have missed the opportunity for early engagement and dialogue resulting in significant and costly delays. Airspace classification 1. The BMAA considers that the UK airspace's default classification is G and that sponsors must establish a safety case for proposing to change this class or add any further restrictions or requirements by their ACP. 2. All sponsors must demonstrate that alternatives have been considered such as RMZ and TMZ before considering controlled airspace. 3. Where Class E is proposed, without a TMZ or RMZ should be considered as the default option. Access by GA 1. Sponsors must accept the assumption that GA including sporting and recreational aviation is entitled to continued safe use of airspace and that commercial aviation does not have a right to limit airspace access. 2. Sponsors should ensure that there will be measures to allow flexible use of airspace and prepare for the wider use of electronic conspicuity devices and interoperability with existing e-conspicuity e.g. FLARM and Pilot Aware etc. .	Neither option/not supported Please refer to our comment below regarding design principles an engagement.		X	This and the following duplicate response was raised in error by the BMAA: "My mistake. I read the CAA site incorrectly and assumed this was at Stage 1 not 3. There are so many of these at the moment it gets confusing. I'll look again and please delete the earlier response. Geoff Geoff Weighart CE BMAA Despite engagement during Stage 1 and 2 to a NATMAC member, this was the first response from the BMAA. This is a standard response from BMAA to all ACPs with Design Principles (DPs) for consideration in Stage 1. Noting the BMAA's Design Principles, I am pleased to see that our DPs, along with the small scope of this ACP, are in unison with the sentiments of the BMAA's own DPs. This is already known information derived from a misjudged response (a standard response for Stage 1 ACPs) which has already been considered in the Bowtie, thus the response has been categorised as not impacting the final proposal.
British Microlight Aircraft Association		OX15 0TT		Duplicate Response				As Above Duplicate Response.
Heel Air Limited & British European Aviation Limited		GL51 6SR	Yes	I believe this can or will improve the options available to pilots requiring navigational and landing aids in the locality and can only be seen as an improvement of services and benefit to the aviation community. Cotswold Airport / Kemble is a substantial airport with a suitable runway(s) for this traffic.	No preference. I support either option Mainly for safety, any improvement to the service offered in the locality should be viewed as a benefit to the aviation community. I do not personally use Cotswold as our business is based at Gloucestershire Airport but nevertheless continuous improvements should be progressed for the benefit of the whole.		X	Supported. No Suggestions
In Scope Business Jet Operator	Jet2.com Ltd	LS19 7TU	Yes	Jet2.com support the introduction of RNP Approaches at Kemble. Jet2.com aircraft occasionally operate to Kemble for end-of-life purposes. The introduction of RNP Approaches will remove the requirement for crew to position visually with the associated increase in workload. This will have a safety benefit, especially as flights to Kemble operate outside controlled airspace.	Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26 T Bar on 26 so that is the runway most likely to be in use and will give flexibility to be able to join the approach from the northerly or southerly directions. A straight in for 08 would be sufficient		X	Supported. No Suggestions
Cotswold Gliding Club		GL6 6HR	Yes	We wish to support Cotswold Airport in its actions to maintain a safe airspace environment for the small number of in-scope arrivals which it proposes.	No preference. I support either option Both options provide a known environment for Cotswold Airport's operations and in the case of option 2 the additional route in from the north lies mainly within Brize Norton's existing class D airspace.		X	Supported. Its good to see the benefit of close cooperation between a GA/Business Jet Airport and Glider Sites for mutually beneficial use of the local airspace.

NATMAC - General Aviation Alliance and British Gliding Association		LE19 1RJ	Yes	<p>The GAA and BGA supports this necessary aviation infrastructure. GNSs approach facilities should be encouraged but must be planned to minimise impact on GA including sporting and recreational aviation as well as to ensure their continued right of access to the airspace. The approach should be promulgated by feathers on the VFR chart. The approach should be available to all airspace users. It is pragmatic and appropriate that these approaches are in Class G; the collision hazard associated with any controlled airspace outweighs that of any perceived IFR requirements. Hazard can be further mitigated by applying SOPs regarding crossing the proposed feathers....</p> <p>Recommendations: Associated with this ACP it is strongly recommended that South Cerney parachute zone is removed from the chart. Activity there is very limited the resident parachuting no longer takes place and gliders are no longer based there. Any activity that does take place at South Cerney (as with Little Rissington parachuting) is rare enough to be covered by the Notam facility.</p> <p>Temporary Class D is often associated with Kemble such airspace should not be designed around the IFR or MAP using CAA containment policy as it would effectively shut a huge swathe of the Cotswold AIAA at short notice; a straight in approach through the Brize overhead would ensure a smaller more efficient environmental and indeed equitable solution for arrivals on R26 at Kemble such R26 arrivals being on the majority of occasions.</p>	<p>Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26</p> <p>Option 2 is supported in part. The T Bar base leg is only appropriate from the South as good practice and TEM requires a deconfliction by design from position REKLO (GST PBN 27) and NAXAT (Brize SID R25). Additionally a chokepoint is identified between Kemble South Cerney and Brize Class D so a T bar leg to the North would add a MAC hazard to this already busy airspace. In the event that a recovery from the North is required a straight in approach could be flown if vectored through Brize airspace alternatively marshalling through the Kemble overhead on a CDA profile to take up the MAP UNAV to IFR from the South would also be possible but this would add to track miles.</p>			<p>Supported. Very welcome support from both the GAA and BGA; a product of much CAP 1616 engagement.</p> <p>Accessibility to all airspace users is currently out of scope for this ACP due to CAP 1122 imposed limitations which has been accounted for in the safety case work to allow success for the proposal. However it is noted and must be considered post validation (Stage 7).</p> <p>The two highlighted concerns regarding both South Cerney and the temporary Class D airspace to safeguard royal flights are noted but considered out of scope for this ACP and an action for further development by the CAA. That aside we previously highlighted the South Cerney/artificial choke point concern to the CAA in both direct interaction and within our Bowtie and safety arguments.</p> <p>Noting the tactical operational points raised which have been noted this is already known information which has already been considered in the Bowtie thus the response has been categorised as not impacting the final proposal.</p>
NATMAC -The Honourable Company of Air Pilots		SE1 1XN	Yes	<p>Improved air track predictability and safety for poor weather operation. GNSs-based approaches enhance operational safety. Once these are adopted the sponsor and CAA should also devise and promulgate measures for operational safety and resilience in the event of temporary or prolonged GNSs outage event in the vicinity of the airport.</p>	<p>No preference I support either option</p> <p>Either Option 1 or 2 delivers the improvements stated above.</p>			<p>Supported.</p> <p>The comment on revisionary mode is noted and will be included in the Final Appraisal and Safety Case. In this instance the failure of GNSs SIS would be one of the factors that would temporarily withdraw the use of the procedure until the SIS can be verified defaulting back to the current operations of pilots as defined routings.</p> <p>Our APDO providing a GNSs monitoring station which has been gathering SIS data for the past 6 months. Data has shown a consistent 98.8% performance for both APV-I and LPV-200. Although a revisionary mode is required I assess the risk of this as very low to minimal based on the data we have been gathering and analysing on GNSs performance.</p> <p>This is known information thus this response was assessed as not impacting the final design.</p>
Swindon Borough Council	(Head of Planning Regulatory Services and Heritage)	SN1 2JH	Yes	<p>More accurate GPS is superior for both pilot and civilian safety.</p> <p>PLEASE NOTE THIS IS AN OFFICER COMMENT WHICH HAS NO FORMAL COUNCIL APPROVAL THOUGH RELEVANT CABINET PORTFOLIO HOLDERS ARE SUPPORTIVE OF THE RESPONSE</p> <p>It is noted that the consultation is technical in nature and that the main impacts of the proposal will be on other airspace users. It is also noted that the consultation relates to a very small number of flights to and from the airport amounting to an average of 1 per day. This is not significant. The consolidated flight paths touch the north west of the Borough at a point of turn but don't cross any further. This improves on the current indicative position of more random paths some of which run directly above the Borough.</p> <p>The Borough Council has a responsibility to ensure that the quality of life for its residents workers and visitors is maintained and where possible enhanced. The two main concerns here would be around air quality and noise. The numbers are very small and only the go-around legs really impinge over a very small part of North West Swindon. Any change on either of these areas would not be measurable in air quality or noise terms and so would be indefinable relative to interests on the ground in Swindon.</p> <p>The report marginally favours option 1 and for Swindon this is also marginally the better option ensuring that all incoming aircraft would join the approach in line with the runway in either direction and to the North of Swindon.</p> <p>The report's reference to growth at Swindon is welcomed. The Airport has the potential to support Swindon's businesses and economy and the Council also welcomes the opportunity to begin a constructive dialogue around how future operations at the airport could link in with our Corporate vision and in supporting our businesses.</p>	<p>Option 1 - Straight in approach to both runways</p> <p>Express a preference for Option 1 which has marginally less impact on Swindon Borough.</p>			<p>Supported.</p> <p>The comments regarding mutual business development are very welcome although out of scope of this ACP but a considered a potential economic benefit of the proposal which has already been included within the Appraisal documents and further meetings (post COVID19) will allow this development.</p> <p>This is already known information which has already been considered in the Bowtie thus the response has been categorised as not impacting the final proposal.</p>
Gloucestershire County Council		GL1 2TH	Yes	<p>This seems a perfectly reasonable proposal.</p>	<p>No preference I support either option</p>			<p>Supported. No Suggestions</p>
Ministry of Defence	Defence Airspace and Air Traffic Management	RH7 0YR	No opinion/don't know	<p>The Ministry of Defence (MOD) recognises the rationale and requirement for PBN at Cotswold Airport (CA) and will continue to engage in order to realise an acceptable solution considering current and future activity at CA RAF Brize Norton (BZN) and RAF Fairford (FFD).</p> <p>There have been a number of meetings between BZN and CA over the last few years wrt the BZN ACP and how both operations would be handled under a Letter of Agreement (LoA). The introduction of the CA ACP has raised a number of issues that need to be discussed further with a more robust LoA drafted to assist both airports their individual ACPs and future aspirations.</p> <p>The following are points Brize would wish to see addressed and included within an LoA with CA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * BZN expect that CA would use the same runway direction as BZN and FFD for an RNAV approaches. * CA would not increase the planned usage above 5 per day in the future. * CA would not expect BZN LARS to pick up their traffic when clearing their cct for the RNAV approach. <p>* BZN does not provide an approach service to CA. BZN LARS or ZONE provide a transit facility to the IAF - no vectoring will be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Consideration of this CA proposal against the BZN ACP proposal to ensure that any issues are addressed at the earliest opportunity. * This list is not exhaustive and all other issues as identified should also be addressed between BZN FFD and CA. <p>The MOD feel that the CA ACP should fully consider the BZN ACP. MOD will continue to engage with CA recognising the importance of both the CA ACP and BZN ACP to each organisation in order to work towards an acceptable solution for all parties.</p>	<p>Option 2 - Straight in approach to Runway 08 and a T Bar approach to Runway 26</p> <p>Both seemed equally valid.</p> <p>Option 1 Comments</p> <p>The position of option 1 IAF/IAF (BP261) is extremely close to BZN current Class D airspace which doesn't allow any room for error on the pilots part (containment) this could potentially increase the number of infringements. The majority of a/s would be leaving CAS under BZN LARS control and it is not expected to be unmanageable. The problem would be when BZN LARS freq. is closed or the a/s are not from CAS and positioning direct to BP261. As it would only be up to 5 a/s a day CA could pass T1 to BZN as part of Letter of Agreement (LoA) Presumably CA will have a RNAV squawk organised as part of the ACP; grateful for clarification. This option does not allow any expected arrival path so could see a/s arriving from any direction.</p> <p>Option 2 Comments (BZN Preferred option)</p> <p>This option has the IAF N (IAFNE) and S (IAESE) which allows for some level of track control. The northerly one would be subject to BZN availability as it would require entry to BZN CTR the southerly one the preferred route as remains outside CAS (just).</p> <p>There is still the same potential issue of infringements.</p> <p>MOD feel that the CA ACP should be considered in relation to the BZN ACP which is currently ongoing under CAP725 (and of which CA is a stakeholder) as there is potential for issues that need to be addressed. When considering the aspirations for the Brize ACP the proposal for CA IAF BP261 would lie within Class D/Class E TMZ/RMZ airspace which would require BZN Zone to control or give procedural clearance to CA on all the easterly arrivals onto and down the approach (i.e. provide an approach service.) This requires further discussion between both parties in order to be fully understood. The westerly arrivals from</p>			<p>The response is supportive and none of the ATM issues highlighted are new and are the topic of ongoing engagement and collaboration thus the response has been categorised as not impacting the final proposal.</p> <p>The points raised for the LOA and welcome and already identified within the bowtie. Equally the current LOA would enable this proposal. The comments regarding same runway direction is noted and a very practical one for ATM.</p> <p>The point on consideration of the Brize Norton ACP is an interesting one. The final shape and size of this enlarged airspace in not yet approved. Whilst acknowledging the RAF Brize Norton ACP it is not unreasonable to suggest that integration of current (for Cotswold Airport) these Cat B-D aircraft already arrive and following similar general routings that this proposal aims to define and planned operations within uncontrolled airspace is an issue that the ACP will need to address if it wishes to enlarge its airspace into areas where this activity takes place.</p>
British Airline Pilots Association (BALPA)		UB7 0DQ	Yes	<p>Thank you for the reminder. BALPA does not wish to comment specifically on this airspace change consultation but has no objections.</p>				<p>Email Only</p>
Lynham Flying Club		GL7 6BA	YES	<p>I've had a quick scan of the document (I also did when you first sent it out) and cannot see any problems. I think it is a very good idea and it certainly encourages me (and hopefully others in the Club) to get an IIR(R) endorsement in the near future.</p>				<p>Email Only</p>

Malmesbury Area Board			No opinion/don't know	Many thanks for your email. The members of Malmesbury Area Board have considered your proposals and are content that this matter is being dealt with by the Cotswold Airport Liaison Group so at this stage they don't feel a need to bring this matter to an Area Board meeting.				X	Email Only
		SN16 DNZ		I have received the consultation emails directly thanks.					
Cotswold AONB Board		GL54 3JH	No opinion/don't know	Unfortunately it is unlikely that I will have capacity to respond to this consultation on this occasion.				X	Email Only