

Below are a sample of responses from the Change Sponsor's engagement at Stage 2a – to evidence 2-way engagement. Most of the engagement was via phone calls and several of the stakeholders responded/confirmed via email (latest emails at the top). The replies below are in response to the email at the bottom of this doc.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 September 2018 13:16
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20180830-HOLBEACH Airspace Change - Stage 2

[REDACTED]

Having reviewed your proposal, I have some initial feedback.

Just to set the scene and give some context, flights depart Norwich Airport and join CAS at NALAX for L602 to Scotland and at OTBED for Y70 in to Manchester.

On their return, they leave CAS at SUPEL inbound to Norwich.

I am sure you are aware of the MoD Combat Air Training Airspace which proposes changes to EGD323.

This proposal moves L602 to the west, which means the track of aircraft routing to and from Norwich to the north would also move to the west.

Should the dimensions of Holbeach Range also increase to the north east, I believe this could create a choke point between the 2 pieces of airspace and Y70.

This choke point would be used by military aircraft routing between the ranges and their home base, be it RAF Marham, RAF Coningsby or RAF Lakenheath.

My concern would be for the crossing Norwich aircraft under a Deconfliction Service in Class G airspace.

This risk is currently mitigated by a service very kindly provided by Swanwick(Mil); however, due to varying military operational and personnel issues, this service has had limited availability in recent months.

Thus, I ask that any proposed change to the dimensions of D207 also take account of any proposed change to the dimensions of D323.

Happy to discuss further.

Regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 06 September 2018 16:15

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: 20180830-HOLBEACH Airspace Change - Stage 2

Importance: High

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. NATS would like to be involved in the continued development of this proposal.

The email address [REDACTED] is the best general contact email for CAP1616 requests.

If you have already established lines of comms with NATS staff, please continue to use them but ensure any CAP1616-relevant formality copies in [REDACTED]

At this stage we have no particular opinion on the specific options to be progressed, but please bear in mind the following points during the options development:

1. Any impact on commercial air traffic should be mitigated to the greatest extent via all available means, as agreed with NATS, such as via managed activations/FUA/split areas laterally and/or vertically etc. This is in line with Design Principle (e) Minimise Network Impact which NATS considers high priority, with DP (b) FUA Principles also high priority acting in support of DP (e). The impact of the progressed design(s) will need to be analysed with respect to commercial air traffic.
2. The upper limit of any revised arrangement should use Flight Level and not Altitude. This should apply not only to D207 Holbeach but to all MoD plans for changes to danger area arrangements where the upper limit is above the transition altitude. Doing this immediately improves safety by avoiding a vertical reference mismatch between aircraft flying on ATS routes and those using D207 etc.
3. The design of revised lateral limits should be extremely cognisant of the application of the CAA Buffer Policy 2014 (link) with adjacent controlled airspace, taking into account potential future changes of activity type (where the application of that policy may change if the activity type changes in future). We appreciate that you have already considered this with respect to the Donna Nook option 7 but we want to reinforce that consideration.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 September 2018 14:39
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20180830-HOLBEACH Airspace Change - Stage 2

[REDACTED]

I have taken a good look and If I were to rank these options at this time this would lead to a ranking of –

1. Option 5
2. Option 6
3. Option 3
4. Option 4

I would put most of the weight behind options 5 and 6, with the suite of equipment available on F-35B – Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR), Electro-optical Targeting System (EOTS), GMTI (Ground moving target Indicator) and Distributed Aperture System (DAS), depending on the mission and training objectives, training will be achieved from an even further distance than in legacy aircraft. There will also be easy access from the new D323 construct. Options 3 and 4 do not really buy much for F-35.

I have discounted Options 1 (no change) and 2 (overly complex).

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 05 September 2018 08:06

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: 20180830-HOLBEACH Airspace Change - Stage 2 - Consultation Response

Dear [REDACTED]

Our ref: 257092

HOLBEACH AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL – STAGE 2

Natural England has no comments to make on stage 2 – develop & assess to enhance the airspace at Holbeach.

Yours sincerely

Age Group	Percentage
18-24	10%
25-34	20%
35-44	25%
45-54	20%
55-64	25%
65-74	10%
75-84	5%
85-94	5%
95-104	5%

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 September 2018 18:39
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 20180830-HOLBEACH Airspace Change - Stage 2

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for consulting the British Gliding Association on the subject of the Holbeach Airspace Change (EG D207) at this early stage. We are pleased by the early dialogue as it allows us to do any early screening on impacts specifically to Gliding that the General Aviation Alliance collectively maybe less concerned about.

As CAP1616 was only introduced in January 2018 we are still putting in the structural elements in responding at this stage. In addition, as I am relatively new to this role I want to make sure we do this as smoothly and robustly to avoid any future complications.

As you wish a decision by the 6 September 2018 about staying 'in the loop' I suggest we, the BGA, should stay in until we do some internal consultation with local gliding airspace representatives. Depending on that we may delegate the next stage to a local subject matter expert if, and only if, it is required.

We would then be in a clearer position to be removed from the process when an option is progressed

From our perspective we want any identified solution as being safe, proportionate and one that takes other user's requirements properly into consideration.

We are encouraged that your early contact indicates an openness to looking at mitigation where your needs require further airspace to operate D207.

We may in future provide a dedicated email address for ourselves but for the time being please retain this email on the mailing list.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 August 2018 10:12
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: 20180830-HOLBEACH Airspace Change - Stage 2

[REDACTED]

In principle, MRH are content with the designs, they have no adverse impact on MRM IFP. From an aircrew perspective Options 5 and 6 with 3 and 4 as a back-up are preferable.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 August 2018 09:40
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 20180830-HOLBEACH Airspace Change - Stage 2

[REDACTED]

From a Swk Mil ATC point of view, we have no comments on any of the plans for Holbeach. Like other airspace changes we will promulgate to our controllers and update radar maps. There are no adverse operational impacts on Swk.

Also, I am POC but can you replace [REDACTED] with my new Deputy - [REDACTED].

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

HOLBEACH AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL – STAGE 2

Sirs, ma'am, ladies and gentlemen,

1. The ACP to enhance the airspace at HOLBEACH is progressing and we are now at stage 2 – Develop & Assess. Please see the attached letter and I look forward to any initial feedback from the stakeholders (listed below) by **6 Sep**. As always, please let me know if any of the stakeholders below change, or, if you are at cc and would like to opt-out, please let me know. Thank you kindly.

2. **Local Stakeholders.**

RAF Coningsby: [REDACTED]

RAF Cranwell: [REDACTED]

RAF Marham: [REDACTED]

RAF Wittering: [REDACTED]

Swanwick (Mil): [REDACTED]

Low Flying: [REDACTED]

Provost Marshall: [REDACTED]

Norwich Airport: [REDACTED]

NATS: [REDACTED]

Natural England (East Midlands): [REDACTED]

RSPB

Environment Agency: [REDACTED]

MMO: [REDACTED]

HM Coastguards: [REDACTED]

EIFCA: [REDACTED]

WNNMP: [REDACTED]

Harbour Masters, Boston: [REDACTED]

Harbour Master, Wisbech: [REDACTED]

Trinity House: [REDACTED]

DIO Ecologist, Environmental Support & Compliance: [REDACTED]

MAUWG Members *(via DAATM)*

3. Platform Stakeholders. .

Typhoon: [REDACTED]

Lightning: [REDACTED]

Tornado: [REDACTED]

DAATM: [REDACTED]

RPA: [REDACTED]

P8: [REDACTED]

USAFE: [REDACTED]

41(R) Sqn: [REDACTED]

Hawk: [REDACTED]

JHC: [REDACTED]

JALO: [REDACTED]

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]