



LAND'S END AIRPORT

CAP 1616 – AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL

FOR THE

LAND'S END TRANSIT CORRIDOR

-

STAGE 2 : DEVELOP & ASSESS

Stage 2A Stakeholder Feedback

ID : ACP-2019-75



Organisation	Date Received	Medium Used	Feedback Received	Sponsor Comments
Cloud 9 and Kernow Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association	11/09/2020	Email	Doesn't think it would have any affect, please consider their activities	We have a very good working relationship with these associations and will continue to help them to complete their activities
Sloane Helicopters @ Penzance Heliport	11/09/2020	Email	<p>Agree that greater 'situational awareness' of aircraft inside or close to the LETC would be beneficial. ADSB in the future.</p> <p>Radar too expensive to install and radar feed unlikely to give good low level coverage.</p> <p>Class D and E airspace would create delays.</p> <p>RMZ/TMZ is fully supported.</p>	
RNAS Culdrose via DAATM	11/09/2020	Email	<p>MOD do not have a specific preference between Options 1 and 2 and either option does not pose any safety concerns to current MOD ops.</p> <p>Current working relationship with Land's End is strong and robust and keen for this to continue.</p>	
Perranporth Flying Club	11/09/2020	Email	<p>The Preferred option is a TMZ.</p> <p>1. Did this include a change to the shape of the LETC to protect the instrument approaches at Land's End and Penzance?</p> <p>2. Does the ACP include a proposal for the LETC to be controlled by a single authority?</p>	Since receiving the feedback, a telephone conversation was initiated, and the feedback discussed in greater detail. After discussions, concerns over the intentions of the ACP were allayed - any change would not be used to impede the flow of air traffic but rather to improve the safety for all aircraft.

			3. Concerns raised as to how a RMZ would operate and if aircraft would be 'left outside'?	The sponsor considers it highly unlikely that multiple aircraft would be left to 'hold' outside the LETC – whenever possible, an 'agreement' (under the Basic Service precept) with the pilot would be made to ensure the flight could continue (perhaps by a change of route or altitude)
Seahawk Gliding Club @ RNAS Culdrose	11/09/2020	Email	Generally happy with RMZ. 1. Concerns over TMZ as gliders are not fitted with EC. 2. Some pilots do not have RT licence 3. Would seek to enter into a Letter of Agreement regarding EC should TMZ be established	SATCO at Land's End would welcome talks regarding a Letter of Agreement with the club regarding any operations within the LETC SATCO would also seek to help any glider pilots at Seahawk obtain their RT licence at little or no cost to themselves so as not to exclude them from the LETC
Environment Agency	10/09/2020	Email	Acknowledgment of email received – no further comments from Stage 1 feedback	
Cobham Helicopter Training Academy	10/09/2020	Email	No feedback/comment	
St Just Town Council	10/09/2020	Email	Acknowledgment of email received, and all information shared with councillors – no comment	
St Mary's Airport, Isles of Scilly	08/09/2020	Email	Agree with the conclusions in the safety assessment and recommendations	
British Helicopter Association	08/09/2020	Email	Preferred options are: 1. ADSB 2. RMZ/TMZ 3. RMZ	
Natural England	08/09/2020	Email	Nothing to add from Stage 1 feedback – fully consider impact to sensitive sites – in particular birds and seals and Eastern Isles.	

Cornwall Airport Newquay	07/09/2020	Email	RMZ or combined RMZ/TMZ only viable options Questions regarding conspicuity code or allocated additional codes.	Valid questions that would have to be addressed early on if an option of TMZ was adopted
Airprox Board	07/09/2020	Email	Acknowledgment of email received – no comment	
CPR Cornwall	07/09/2020	Email	Acknowledgment of email received	
FlyNqy – Newquay Flying School	10/09/2020	Email	Supports RMZ as a minimum and the use of RTF (Radio) whenever possible	
Director of Aviation Affairs	11/09/2020	Email	Supports airspace with a known environment	
AOPA	11/09/2020	Email	Acknowledges some options not possible due to cost and does not support the ‘do nothing’ option Supports ADSB Suggests start with RMZ as TMZ may be opposed locally Costs should not be recovered through increased landing fees and other services (this referred to the ‘high cost’ options – ie radar)	Feedback to date suggests that a TMZ is not strongly opposed by local GA groups and Flying Clubs/Schools. In addition, Letters of Agreement’s could be considered.