



LAND'S END AIRPORT

CAP 1616 – AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL

FOR THE

LAND'S END TRANSIT CORRIDOR

-

STAGE 2 : DEVELOP & ASSESS

Addendum:

Stakeholder Feedback – Sponsor Responses

ID : ACP-2019-75

Organisation	Date Received	Medium Used	Feedback Received	Sponsor Comments
RNAS Culdrose via DAATM	11/09/2020	Email	Cautioned against an extension to the boundary too close to EG D001 as it is often used for live firing	The sponsor notes the feedback and will ensure this is considered when proposing any new dimensions/boundaries for the LETC
Perranporth Flying Club	11/09/2020	Email	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Perranporth Flying Club noted that MLAT had not been evaluated 2. Raised that creation of an RMZ risked moving the deconfliction problem to the boundary resulting in a risk of collision when orbiting 3. Suggested modifications and mitigations re the proposal to alter the dimensions of the boundary 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MLAT requires some form of transmission from the aircraft in response to an interrogation. Therefore, it will not solve the current issues with the traffic that is not transmitting. The sponsors suggested change would resolve this issue. 2. 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 3. The Sponsor is very grateful for the boundary proposals received from the Stakeholder and has in-fact further engaged with them directly to develop these further.
The Honourable Company of Air Pilots	11/09/20	Email	Concerned re-creation of new choke points and concerned about an increased density of aircraft skirting the edge of a designated RMZ or combined RMZ/TMZ	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

				<p>ensure the flight could continue</p> <p>Regarding aircraft skirting the edge of any new RMZ or RMZ/TMZ, three sides of the airspace are very infrequently transited as they are out over the sea. The Eastern boundary is more often transited but again, entry would be available for all those with the appropriate radio and/or transponder. Good airmanship by pilots would also dictate not to skirt the edge of such airspace.</p>
Natural England	08/09/2020	Email	Raised potential impact of an extension as affecting more designated sites and potentially different sensitive sites/reference to Habitats Regulations Assessment	The sponsor notes these concerns but would emphasise that the current routing of aircraft would not change. The airspace may be extended in size to protect already established routes (namely the RNP approach legs/tracks).