

**MINUTES OF THE KEEVIL PERMANENT AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL – VIRTUAL MEETING WITH WILTSHIRE AND NORTH DORESET GLIDING CLUB 28 JAN 2022**

28 Jan 2022

47Regt RA  
WNDGC  
BGA

Present	Appointment	Representing
Mr [REDACTED]	Stakeholder 1	Local Gliding Clubs
Mr [REDACTED]	Stakeholder 2 - CEO BGA	BGA
Capt [REDACTED]	Operations Officer (Sponsor)	47 Regt RA
WO2 [REDACTED]	Operations Warrant Officer	47 Regt RA

**Meeting Overview**

As part of Stage 2A of the ACP, the Sponsor has met with this Stakeholders virtually in order to discuss any concerns that they may have.

Content discussed	ACTION
<p><b>Item 1 – Introduction</b></p> <p>1. Stakeholder 1 opened the meeting and the participants introduced themselves. Stakeholder 1 specifically represented the following clubs: Mendip GC, Bristol and Gloucester, Lasham, Aston Down, Upavon, Bannerdown and Shalbourne.</p> <p>2. The Sponsor explained the rough agenda in order to keep the meeting structured and asked the Stakeholders to propose any additional questions they would like to address throughout.</p>	
<p>3. The Sponsor confirmed the Statement of Need and Stage 1A and 1B which were accepted by the CAA at the December gateway.</p> <p>4. The Sponsor explained to participants now in Stage 2A, being the design option stage and explained the 3 options presented – 1) do nothing, 2) Use extant airspace already present and 3) Use of a danger area</p> <p>5. The Sponsor stated that as part of Stage 2A they are looking for feedback from the Stakeholders to confirm that the Design Principles align with the Design Options.</p> <p>6. Stakeholder 1 confirmed he understands the structure the Sponsor is having to operate within.</p> <p>7. The Sponsor explained about the compressed timelines of Stage 2A and methodology being used to engage with as many stakeholders and that the specific questions posed in the Form is designed to focus Stakeholder feedback without the requirement for in-depth analysis on topics that will be covered later in the ACP stages.</p> <p>8. Stakeholder 1 expressed his concern about the process adopted but also about the use of the forms and restraints it brings as a form is very restrictive in providing feedback.</p> <p>9. Stakeholder 2 agreed with this and admitted he didn't understand the need of the compressed timescale.</p>	

10. The Sponsor explained the timeline for this Stage is similar compared to other ACP's of a similar nature, and that for the information required at this level, this isn't a particularly short timeline. It seems a short timeline as Stakeholders may not be aware of the 3 month consultation stage that is coming next. The questions that require answering at this stage focus specifically on whether the Design Principles aligns with the Design Options. There is opportunity for Stakeholders to raise other points, but that is not the primary focus at this stage.

11. Stakeholder 1 expressed concerns over the response time of 2 weeks and asked for more clarification on timescales. The Stakeholder stated that prior notification of documents being sent may assist them in assigning resources.

12. The Sponsor explained the next consultation phase is longer and can't be compressed. They continued how the meeting today would hopefully help to answer any concerns and explained how they would more than happily engage outside of the consultation period to make sure everyone's interests are being represented. They continued that meetings like this with Stakeholder who wished to request more information was part of the engagement strategy in continuing discussion with Stakeholders. In addition, the Sponsor has agreed to bring on board (once they are back from their travels abroad) one of the BGA members who deals with Airspace Changes in order to keep him better informed of the process and thereby improve relations.

13. The Sponsor explain that's the reason they have created the questionnaire/form in such a way was to present Stakeholders with the specific information required to allow them to answer the question at hand and not require significant time investment from Stakeholders in filling it out.

14. Stakeholder 1 explained that this is a process that nobody is familiar with and its easy to go off on tangents - having a form helps to focus the answers but his concern about the form is that it's constraining, and Stakeholders may end up giving up territory that they don't want to give up.

15. The Sponsor explained to the stakeholder that this procedure (confirming that Design Principles align with Design Options) was based on CAP1616 and similar to how other people have approached these issues and explained that in Stage 2, the constructs are not fully designed yet, and that they feedback is required to develop it further. There will be a time to discuss more specific topics in the Consultation stage. The intent in the Form is not to silent Stakeholders but rather get targeted information from Stakeholders.

16. Stakeholder1 asked if the sponsor was looking for a degree of compliance with the design principles in the various options suggested and that option 1 was already discounted as it's impossible to not do anything and achieve the desired outcome, so why add Option 1?

17. The sponsor explained that it's stipulated in the CAP that they have to include a yardstick of "do nothing". The Sponsor is aware that Stakeholder may believe that they can achieve the SoN by flying at other locations, and that should they wish, the Sponsor wants to allow the Stakeholder to select that option, even though the Sponsor has conducted assessments that has discounted the use of other airfields for their purpose.

18. The Sponsor explained that they can in fact fly from Boscombe Down, but they cant achieve the requirements stated in the Statement of Need from Boscombe Down to other constraints at that location. The purpose of Keevil is to force generate that can not be achieved from Boscombe.

19. Stakeholder 1 asked if this was due to the requirement of a danger area and the exclusion of everything else whilst flying?

20. The Sponsor agreed and presented that it's the lack of integration available at Boscombe Down being the primary reason explaining how we are the only air platform in the defence that doesn't have its own airfield making force generation very difficult.

<p>21. Stakeholder 1 then asked about the recent ACP at Fairford and if that interacted with the proposal at all?</p> <p>22. The Sponsor stated that they were talking to DAATM (Defence Airspace Air Traffic Management) as they're running the ACP for the US Air Force and currently their timeline is a little behind this one but rapidly catching up.</p> <p>23. The Sponsor goes on to say how their Statement of Need is very similar to ours with a similar platform so there is definitely engagement at this stage with other ACPs that may impact each other.</p> <p>24. The Sponsor reassured the Stakeholder that it is something they are looking at with regards to it either complimenting each other or causing issues, but until they know their plan it's hard to assess the impact.</p> <p>25. Stakeholder 1 states that they see it as a threat to their liberties and ability to fly. If the 2 ACPs could use the same space it would be better.</p> <p>26. The Sponsor states that merging the two will not be possible, but he can't go into details as the APC in Fairford is with the US Air Force and no specific information are shared with the Sponsor.</p> <p>27. Stakeholder 1 agrees and states that this has put similar pressures on to the Stakeholders responding.</p> <p>28. Stakeholder 1 states that he is concerned that Option two of the Design Options it's not really an option at all as Watchkeeper requires Segregated air space and can't just use existing airspace structure like a Drop Zone.</p> <p>29. The Sponsor explains that part of CAP1616 they are required to explore other options, albeit unique. The Sponsor should not assume that the only means of achieving their goal is a Danger Area, and have therefore included the use of a Drop Zone. The sponsor explained that similar principles that exist with a Drop Zone, exist to a Danger Area, and that if there is enough support from the public that suggests a Drop Zone to be used, then this adds weight to the argument. The Sponsor will then be able to present that fact to the CAA and the Military Aviation Authority (MAA) in order to scope the use of a Drop Zone as a means of providing Segregated Airspace.</p> <p>30. The Sponsor continued that the use of a Drop Zone as a means of providing segregation may not be accepted in every location in the UK, but due to its proximity to SPTA, it may be allowed in this location.</p> <p>31. The Sponsor explain how a Danger Area is not the panacea and doesn't make everything risk free and explains that it's a way of segregating activity. If a similar mechanism can be used that achieves the same level of segregation, then why not use that in this case.</p> <p>32. The Stakeholder then asks how realistic is that in terms of what you're trying to do with this ACP right now with the rules that they are operating within?</p> <p>33. The Sponsor explains that should the CAA agree that a Drop Zone affords similar characteristics to that of what is afforded to Segregated Airspace, then the ACP may be able to stop and WK activity could commence without introducing additional airspace.</p> <p>34. The Sponsor continues that option 3 (DA) is the traditional means, and that Option 2 is a possible means of achieving Segregation, and the Sponsor would like Stakeholder feedback and generate discussion about that.</p> <p>35. Stakeholder 1 agrees generating discussion is fine, but it's got to be about the art of the possible. If the CAA agrees to use the drop zone surely, it'll take years to change these rules.</p> <p>36. The Sponsor confirmed that it does not require a change in the rules and that not</p>	
--	--

every DZ will be classed as segregated airspace, but rather, the use of the Keevil DZ will be allowed in place of Segregated airspace based on a Safety Case accepted by the CAA / MAA.

37. The Operations Warrant Officer goes on to explain that, for us, it would be a safety case with the belief that it would be equivalent of segregated air space so safe to do so. That would be presented to the CAA and MAA but ultimately the Stakeholders will have to decide if they accept this.

38. The Sponsor explained that one of the drawbacks of using the existing DZ as segregated airspace will negatively impact on some of the other Design Principles, like reducing the noise impact on the local community. With a DA, the sponsor may be able to create multiple transit routes in and out of SPTA, reducing overflight of the same local village. If they use the DZ, they may only be able to overfly the same area, causing more noise in a concentrated area.

39. Stakeholder 1 states that it's just about the extent to which you meet the design principles.

40. The Sponsor states that other notification mechanism exists where aviator are warned that a pilot may not be able to abide by the rules of the air due to a specific activity in a specific airspace, like using an ACN to conduct Gliding in class A airspace, or conducting radar calibration flights.

41. The Stakeholder states that he is no airspace expert but is trying to protect the interest of the locals but is grateful for the explanation about option 2, why it's there and what limitations it may have.

42. The Stakeholder goes on to discuss Option 3 which a number of airspace structures have been produced in the documents and expresses his concern about the process and if, in saying yes, to one or even a combination of them, that they have then given away some ground and there is no further discussion apart from these items.

43. The Sponsor reassures the Stakeholder that they wouldn't be giving up any ground and it was recommended by DAATM that they include varies options of how a danger area might look. With a few different options in place for the design principles referring to simplicity and different air space structures. The document also states that the shape and size is only for demonstration purposes. The Sponsor is not yet solutionising at this stage.

44. The Stakeholder explains that it is clear that the Sponsor requires the gap between the Keevil DZ and SPTA to be closed during operations, and that they can already see a few options for airspace, which they would like to discuss in the consultation phase. Whatever answer the Stakeholders give, must allow access to SPTA. The Stakeholder agreed that the options proposed so far works for the Gliders, but would like to protect the gap in between SPTA and the DZ in the future.

45. The Stakeholder then explains that this can be reflected in the response they put in but with regards to the gap between Salisbury Plain and Keevil, which is a bit they use a lot, this will be trying to protect.

46. The Stakeholder is satisfied with the answers given regarding the Design Options and Design Principles during the meeting.

47. The Sponsor explains that if a danger area is taken forward then the consultation stage in 3 months would be the time to discuss specific operating procedures with regards to NOTAMs, times of operations, crossing abilities.

48. The Sponsor also explains that they are looking at the development points from the TDA (Temporary Danger Area) to take forward for consultation and assures the Stakeholder that from consultation to the submission stage that they will create a solution that takes everyone views into consideration.

<p>49. The Stakeholder agrees with having good faith and as long as the Sponsor isn't digging into the files for past information as the Stakeholder will be supply it again if needed.</p> <p>50. The Stakeholder believes that option 3 is clearly what the whole thing is steering towards. The Stakeholder noted that although the Sponsor requires specific information to be answered regarding the alignment of the Design Principles with the Design Options, that the Form does open up the ability for Stakeholders to provide any other information at this stage as well. He enquires how much information the Sponsor is willing to receive in the open question.</p> <p>51. The Sponsor explains that it is down to the time the Stakeholder wishes to spend and if they would like to propose separate options. Every alternative option is considered. It is not too late adopt Stakeholder advice on different Options. The Sponsor does not want to sensor any Stakeholders' ability to provide any form of feedback during this stage.</p> <p>52. Stakeholder 1 then asks Stakeholder 2 if there are any considerations with regards to Bannerdown Gliding Club that needs to be flagged up.</p> <p>53. Stakeholder 2 states that the club had a very good relationship with all the operators at Keevil during the TDA and that the club mainly operated on the weekends, to date, it hasn't impacted them. He continued that he is very keen for the Sponsor to be engaging with Bannerdown in the future and understands they have separate engagement because it is localised on the airfield so Bannerdown aren't asking the Stakeholder to comment on their behalf, at the moment.</p> <p>54. Stakeholder 1 asks for confirmation from the Sponsor that local discussions with Bannerdown are happening.</p> <p>55. The Sponsor confirms this and explains that as they are a member of the RAF Gliding Association the process is slightly different in that they are a military Stakeholder who are engaged through the DAATM.</p> <p>56. The Sponsor confirms that their commanders have had open dialog with them, and they are relatively content at this stage.</p> <p>57. The Stakeholder (1) confirmed that he is from now on not representing Bannerdown gliding club, due to their unique position being a military club.</p> <p>58. Stakeholder 2 asks if the North West segment of Keevil is not going to be used by WATCHKEEPER as one of the options shows that segment to be reduced.</p> <p>59. The Sponsor explains that it's a concept and focus will be mainly on the main runway which will limit the extremities of the air space to the south in that picture. This is however just for illustrative purposes. This design has been considered in order to anticipate the requirement to free up airspace that will reduce the funnelling effect of transiting aircraft as much as possible.</p> <p>60. The Stakeholder expresses his concern regarding possible Cul-De-Sacs some novice glider pilots may find themselves in and find difficult to get out of, should the southern gap be closed off.</p> <p>61. The Sponsor agrees this is a valid point and is something they've spoken about from a general aviator's perspective. There may be benefits of having published visual reference points in order to aid pilots in navigating using known points in the area to avoid turning early into a cul-de-sac.</p> <p>62. Stakeholder 1 states that gilder pilot don't tend to use visual reference points but in terms of practicalities of how the danger areas are designed, there are places you can find yourself in a predicament because you lost attention for a few minutes. This will be good to discuss on later stages.</p> <p>63. The Sponsor thanks the participants and states again that as this is a rather emotive</p>	
---	--

<p>topic with a lot of stakeholders in the area, so regardless of the engagement period by the statutory process asks that if there is anything the stakeholders feel they should look at, anything they think may help to reduce the impact or in making designs as efficient as possible just let them know. The stakeholders shouldn't feel they have to wait for an engagement period and they are free to discuss concerns with the Sponsor at any point.</p> <p>64. Stakeholder 1 stated that the document that the Sponsor produced in the Stage 1 Engagement was very well produced and an example of how it should be done. The Stakeholder felt that their views were represented very fairly and thanks the Sponsor for that. They believe that there is a good bond of trust between the Sponsor and the Gliding Stakeholders.</p> <p>65. The parties thanked each other and concluded the meeting.</p>	
---	--