

[REDACTED]

From:

Sent:

18 June 2020 08:51

To:

[REDACTED]

Subject:

Re: 20200616-RAF Little Rissington ACP

[REDACTED]

Can you just confirm, you are at Stage 4b, since the only documentation on the ACP portal is for Step 1a.

Having gone through CAP 1616 to Stage 4b, all of our documents are on the ACP and although very time consuming and laborious as a process (certainly much more than CAP 725), it does allow a number of things; transparency, CAA acceptance through each gateway and a full consideration and application of the process.

I cannot comment on your ACP, without sight of this. It is not an ACP DAATM commented on during their response to our consultation.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

BSc, PGDip, MA, CEng, FIMechE, psc(j)

Director of Airport Operations



KEMBLE AIR SERVICES LTD

The Control Tower
Cotswold Airport

Cirencester
Glos
GL7 6BA
Tel: 01285 771177
Fax: 01285 771318

www.cotswoldairport.com

Our consultation 'Cotswold Airport (Kemble) - Airspace Change for PBN (GPS) Approaches to Runway 08 and Runway 26' is now open.

You can view this consultation at

https://consultations.airspacechange.co.uk/cotswold-airport/cotswold-airport-kemble/consult_view

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 17 June 2020 17:53

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: 20200616-RAF Little Rissington ACP

I strongly agree with Andrew Roch here.

There are many UK airfields, gliding and parachuting sites that have significantly more movements than Little Rissington and don't benefit from an ATZ.

Regards,

On 16 Jun 2020, at 19:01, [REDACTED] wrote:

Many thanks for the heads up.

I have some very significant reservations about your proposal as I consider that it would force pilots of non-radio aircraft to divert around the proposed ATZ. The suggestion of a safe passage to the South is of course wrong. The proximity to airspace in taking such an action would be against CAA advice and the pinch point effect would render the region to the south an area of massive risk of mid-air collision to the user.

An additional concern is that if all gliding sites were to adopt the same or similar position then the overall restriction to class G aviation would become unreasonable.

My personal view is that this proposal would provide protection for the operation at LR at the expense of the other class G airspace users. ie safety for the very few at the expense of the safety of the majority.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] >

Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 5:47:28 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: 20200616-RAF Little Rissington ACP

Dear all,

Apologies for the cold email, but I wanted to contact each of the Oxford RAUWG members directly as key stakeholders in the area.

For those of you that don't know me, please allow me to introduce myself as the Aerodrome Operator for RAF Little Rissington (LR). As you will probably remember from previous RAUWGs, we (at 2 FTS) have had an intention to improve safety at LR for some time. One area that concerns our Duty Holder is the type of airspace surrounding LR; therefore, last year we opened a discussion with the CAA with a view to allocating a more formal airspace structure. These discussions have led to an Airspace Change Proposal (ACP), which is now live and open for consultation/engagement. The attached document has been uploaded to the CAA ACP portal (under ACP-2019-045), but I wanted to send a personal (unredacted) copy to each RAUWG member.

We are therefore scoping stakeholder feedback for the establishment of an ATZ at LR, and I would be grateful for any comments via the ACP Portal.

Regards



<image001.jpg>

Wing Commander [REDACTED] 2 FTS OC Ops Wg (Senior Operator, Aerodrome Operator & Regulation)
2 Flying Training School, RAF Syerston, Newark NG23 5NN

