

Stage 2a Engaged Stakeholder (by email and/or phone)	Engaged at Stage 2 (Y/N)	Responded (Y/N)	Sub Groups Resonded	Options Response (condensed into key statements - Full responses within response document)	Options prioritised for Further Development			Additional Comments or Observations	Airport Change Sponsor's Response
					Option 1	Option 2	Option 3		
NATMAC - British Gliding Association	Y	Y	Chair, BGA Airspace Sub Committee	Given that this will impact General Aviation as a whole it is likely that we will delegate our future responses to a local Gliding lead who will inject into a General Aviation Alliance joint response and they will respond accordingly but I strongly suggest that you engage with the local gliding clubs, if you aren't already, to get that local knowledge to assist you at this stage. From our perspective we want any identified solution as being safe, proportionate and one that takes other user's requirements properly into consideration and is as flexible as is practicable so that airspace available to gliding isn't compromised. Collision risks should be adequately assessed in the ACP process and we expect no additional CAS to be required initially or into the future as a result of GNSS approaches. We are encouraged that your early contact indicates an openness to looking at mitigation to help interoperability with all Aviation, including gliding. GNSS approaches are becoming popular across the U.K. and at this stage it may be best for us not to comment on each option other than say our preferences would favour the option that is likely to provide the lowest overall collision risk. Option 3 appears to fulfil that but only further work will confirm this.			✓	As CAP1616 was only introduced in January 2018 we are still putting in the structural elements in responding at each 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 so provide the following to assist you. We may in future provide a dedicated email address for ourselves but for the time being please retain this email on your mailing list.	The CS acknowledges the BGA's comments on support for an option which provides the lowest overall collision risk. Locally, we have already specifically engaged both local glider clubs as stakeholders from Stage1. This has driven a separate challenge meeting with the two local glider clubs based at Aston Down and Nympsfield to better understand their engagement feedback, and this from the BGA to better understand their use of airspace, see Ser 16 and 17 to this table, and objections to Option 3.
NATMAC - UK Flight Safety Committee	Y	Y		Thank you for sight of your Stage 2a ACP document. I will not offer a formal view on priorities but would observe that at this stage Option 2 appears to have the most utility.		✓		I also think it would be sensible to make it clear from the outset that your ACP does not involve any changes to CAS and will not drive an eventual requirement for CAS.	This supports the local glider view, which avoids conflict with the most frequently used glider airspace to the west of Kemble.
NATMAC - Ministry of Defence	Y	N		I understand and appreciate that you already have an excellent working level relationship with SATCO at RAF Brize Norton and I would encourage this to continue. *Radar services would continue to be offered by RAF Brize Norton based on their irreducible capacity. Therefore, if a service was unavailable, it would be important that altitudes should be capped at 3500' to remain outside of the RAF Brize Norton zone as proposed in ACP-2017-16. *Due to the potential increase in traffic at RAF Fairford, the MOD would object to Option 1 as it would fly directly through, or just above the ATZ. Option 2 or 3 would be acceptable, although, for RAF Fairford, Option 2 is preferred. *Predictable flight paths are a preferred option as offer potential increased situational awareness for other airspace users.		✓	✓	Radar services would continue to be offered by RAF Brize Norton based on their irreducible capacity. Therefore, if a service was unavailable, it would be important that altitudes should be capped at 3500' to remain outside of the RAF Brize Norton zone as proposed in ACP-2017-16.	The comments received from the MoD, prompted a telephone conversation with the SATCO from Brize Norton to better understand the response. Although ACPs are not linked, we must take into account the potential airspace changes to Brize Norton's controlled airspace. As discussed with SATCO Brize Norton, the current LOA between the two aerodromes allow for a closer relationship and provision of a radar service at the tactical level. To date, most of our jet arrivals have been provided a radar service from RAF Brize Norton. New draft procedural LOAs, will need to be developed in Stage 3 for both the current Brize Norton airspace and the potential airspace changes under their ACP. In this instance, it's worth highlighting that RAF Brize Norton also controls RAF Fairford's current (and future) traffic, along with their own and Kemble's inbound traffic.
NATMAC - British Helicopter Association	Y	Y		Many thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Proposal. The BHA fully supports the proposal. Option 2 This one is selected as we suspect the prevailing wind is from the West the majority of the time and so Rnwy 26 will be the active. Plus most of the airliner traffic is shown originating from the East. Option 1 will concern the least amount of people and therefore likely encounter the least adverse comments. Option 3 This appears a first glance to be twice as big as option 2 and therefore anyone to the West in the T handles will think they are suddenly going to be subjected to increase noise/overflight.		✓		As an overall comment we suggest not putting the flight path segments in red – put them in a neutral colour like light blue. A statement of what percentage of time each runway is the duty one. There are additional options in that one could just have one part of the T designated at each end of the runway. Suggestion would be to select the bar of the T which flies over the least population and/or orientates to the area where the flying training schools do their IF general handling What this proposal does not cover in the overshoot and pattern for an aircraft flying consecutive GNSS approaches – I imagine training aircraft will do sorties where multiple consecutive approaches are flown – is there any intent to have a GNSS based 'hold' for these aircraft?	Although, this is formatting of the ACP, it does raise a great point, which will be changed to a neutral color for the public upload and taking into account for Stage 3. This point highlights a potential sub option for development in stage 2, if supported by other engagement feedback and considered against the criteria. This is out of scope with our statement of intent, we have no current plans to allow GPS approach training, which is out of scope. The subject of a hold does need further investigation. Advice from the CAA has been contradictory between the 1122 safety case and the airspace design areas. The bow tie safety case will address the requirement, but the statement of need and intent does not foresee multiple aircraft flying the approach.

Local Parish Councils	Y	Y	Chair, Local Villages Liaison Committee	<p>In general, the Design Principles are agreed. Suggest the addition of "to a practical minimum." to item (f).</p> <p>From the resident perspective items (f) and (l) would rank most highly in the Design Principles statement</p> <p>Noted that the final 4 - 6 NM of the final approach for large jets is unchanged.</p> <p>Economic case for large jets v light aircraft noted.</p>	✓	✓	✓	<p>Given the level of disturbance created by helicopters there is no enthusiasm for increasing the volume of commercial helicopter flights either based at or using the airport.</p> <p>Observation would suggest that helicopters are more likely to overfly residential areas suggesting that specific further controls are necessary.</p> <p>Should there be a practical option to vary approach and departure routes for appropriate sizes of aircraft this would "share" the disturbance and minimise the impact on particular locations.</p>	<p>The comments raised on the Design Principles were incorporated into Stage 1.</p> <p>A telephone discussion with our liaison officer amplified that the current approach tracks over Kemble Village (Runway 26 (and Culkeerton, runway 08)) are unlikely to be different under this proposal, both villages are within 2 miles of the threshold. What may change, subject to further work in stage 3, is the altitude they overfly the villages. Current tracks indicate this varies from 450 to 650 feet (QFE).</p> <p>The comments regarding helicopters are out of scope of this ACP. However, a separate note was sent in response, as part of our normal liaison engagement.</p> <p>The comments regarding variance refer to all traffic; this proposal will affect 1.3% of our annual movements, therefore considered out of scope of this ACP, but is noted for future GPS approach and departure route work.</p>
Cotswold AONB	Y	N	Reminded by email w/c 16 Jan and by telephone 21 Jan 19	Expected Fri					<p>Aviation is not considered in their new management plan and changes to aviation environmental affect are not considered by the AONB. No formal response has been received, but discussions on the telephone suggested no view and no considered objections, recommendation or comments. Cut off time for responses has been extended to attain a formal response.</p>
Cotswold District Council	Y	Y	District Councillor	<p>Not being an expert in such things, but as a resident right under the flight path of the larger planes which fly into Cotswold Airport, I would hesitate to comment on your proposals other than to say that option 3 at least gives more approach choices to pilots and therefore it is likely to reduce the overall impact on those living on the outside of the approaches.</p> <p>As a District Councillor, we at CDC are keen to encourage the ongoing operations together with any growth that doesn't have a severe impact on residents – these proposals don't appear to challenge these objectives and although there will be an increase in larger planes coming and going, I don't get the impression that we're going to be inundated</p>			✓	<p>With both hats on I would however suggest that as a part of this exercise, you use it to ensure a more disciplined use of the approaches by the private users of the airport, who continue to overfly the village and are, in some respects, more of a nuisance because of the time they take and the noise they create.</p>	<p>Comments on Option 3 suggest this option creates the most reduction of variance, hence the comments of people overflown.</p> <p>Support for this proposal and operational expansion is noted, as is the implied limitation of traffic density, which is supported by our own Statement of Intent.</p> <p>Comments on private users (GA) refer to GA pilots not abiding by our NAP. This is out of scope of this ACP. However, this is a separate ongoing project.</p>
Wiltshire Council	Y	N							
Bristol Airport	Y	N		No response					
RAF Brize Norton	Y	N	Reminded by email w/c 16 Jan and by telephone 21 Jan 19	Comments submitted via DAATM on 9 Jan 19.					
RAF Fairford	Y	Y	Via MoD, UK A3 (Aispace and ATC)	Any comments that we have will be included with the MOD response.					
Oaksey Park Airfield	Y	N		No further response, no additional comments post Stage 1					We have a very close relationship with Oaksey Park, which is just to the south overlapping into our ATZ. Previous engagement in Stage 1 and ongoing discussion suggested no conflict or concern and thus no formal response.
Aston Down Glider Site	Y	N		Feedback captured					

Both Glider Sites (Aston Down and Nympsfield)	Y	Y	██████████	<p>My preference involves an amended Option 1, the solution relies on liaison and agreements with Brize reference their/our GAA Class D proposal. Such a solution would create a known traffic environment and allow IFR feed ins from proposed Brize airspace via a straight in to Rwy 26, from an initial pick up Siren or Malby from Q63. Rwy 08 would again encompass a feed in from Brize airspace through the Kemble overhead, for a teardrop/procedure turn arrival to the Southwest. These solutions deconflict with NYM, AST and Gloucestershire arrivals and would better organise GAA air traffic in the West Cotswold area. Straight in GNSS/LPV/RNAV/PBN arrivals do not have to include a "Y" or "T" and a straight in solution cuts down on airspace and contrary to one of your DP G (which I disagree with) allows a safer scatter of traffic arriving from different points of the compass, yet in IMC, Brize would be available for an appropriate feed in. This is my preferred solution and I would encourage Kemble, BGA and GAA to adopt it, in order to facilitate a collaborative position to present to CAA, who are often keen to add red tape to IFP design.</p>	✓	✓			<p>A separate challenge meeting organised for the 22 Jan 19 to work through the issue and implications with the local glider community - in addition to the BGA's response. The output of the meeting was a really useful consensus and understanding on the proportional use of airspace, both east and west of Kemble, by gliders. The summary of this output was a recommendation from both glider sites to avoid any approach proposal option which places traffic north of the extended centreline west from Kemble towards the Bristol channel. North of this area has the highest concentration of glider traffic, particularly in competitions. In particular the airspace between the two glider sites is frequently used by student glider pilots. The minutes are at Annex D. This suggests a suboption between option 2 and 3, but removal of the northern join onto a 08 approach. It was also suggested to extend any approach to 10-12 out (are of the Bristol Channel). This will feed the analysis of option against DPs and this sub-option investigated in Stage 2b.</p> <p>The issue surrounding the use of South Cerney has been raised with RAF Brize Norton's SATCO. This choke point is likely to be exacerbated by the Brize ACP, if a controlled airspace altitude limit is placed over this area of class G airspace. Whilst the requirement to maintain Couth Cerney marked on charts as a paraport ATZ has been passed to the SATCO for MoD Clarification, this needs to be considered in Stage 2b. Any option must avoid creating a collision risk (linear and vertically) with this area of traffic concentration.</p>
Nympsfield Glider Site	Y	Y	Chair, and ██████████	<p>As you will guess Option 1 has the least impact. Option 2 places quite a large part of the approach across the path of gliders coming from the Swindon area try and route North or South of the Kemble ATZ but is probably feasible with some form or LOA on radio contact, and/or use of ADSB.</p> <p>Option 3 I would say is very risky indeed and I would strongly recommend not pursuing this design. Gliders from Aston Down and Nympsfield commonly extend their local flying area between the two clubs - staying in gliding distance of one or the other. Having the Northern part of the westernmost "T" crossing over the Nailsworth / Minchinhampton area would bring jet traffic into potential conflict with high levels of (sometimes inexperienced) pilots local soaring or training, as well as gliders on tow-out and returning from cross country from multiple directions. If you feel you need a "T" for the approach from the west I would place it much further out, maybe over the M5?</p> <p>So overall I would favour Option 1, probably say Option is workable with some mutual agreements and depending on Brize, but say Option 3 is likely to bring strong objections from both Nympsfield and BGGC.</p>	✓	✓		<p>It is probably worth saying that any option is going to impact the small gap that exists between Kemble ATZ and the parachute dropping zone at South Cerney. We have some hope that this might be changed in status, as it is rarely used but any advantage could be nullified by the expected move of USAF aircraft which will no doubt result in activation of the Fairford ATZ and MATZ. Gliders today commonly route through this gap on cross country tasks to/from the Didcot / Lasham area so will be crossing the extended approach (as they do today). It may be we need a local LOA on radio contact - as we do with Gloucester where their ILS crosses Cheltenham</p> <p>I note that the latest CAA Airspace strategy is considering mandatory Electronic Conspicuity within the next 5 years, and I believe that Gloucester are trialling use of ADSB by their ATC staff next year. As low-power ADSB devices are becoming available then I suggest maybe this might be a way of reducing risk when these approaches are established.</p>	
Air Salvage International	Y	Y	████	<p>I'm good with this ██████, many thanks for moving this forward.</p>	✓	✓	✓		
Based GA Flying Schools	Y	Y	Freedom Aviation	<p>Freedom Aviation fully supports the proposal. Since we are out of scope, it's difficult to select an option and I would support any that delivers the approach. I do have the following additional comments to make:</p> <p>The option that delivers the least risk of collision would get the best support, particularly since most of our aircraft are flown by student pilots undergoing training or on their first solo. The most defined approach, including north and south joins would place all approach aircraft into known airspace.</p> <p>We are keen to better understand the implications on VFR use of the approach and any impact on our training schedule; as you know we account for about 10k of your 32k movements annually, so the impact would be felt more acutely by us than other schools. I'm not convinced you would need to sanitise than ATZ when an aircraft is flying an approach under VFR, as we do now traffic integrates into the circuit as advised by your FISOs, including the jet aircraft pilots flying their self-defined approach.</p>				<p>I disagree that this should be confined to just a few corporate jets. We do a fair amount of IMC training and revalidation and currently have to transit to Gloucester/Oxford/Cardiff/Bournemouth. As the syllabus changes, we need to start IR(R) training on GPS approaches and would prefer to do this at our home airfield. If you were to open this approach to IR training (in both IMC and VMC), you would get many more aircraft using this service.</p>	<p>Very understandable comments and fully recognise the IR requirement for GPS approaches. However, GA use and trg this is out of scope of this ACP. It is however noted.</p> <p>VFR use of the approach and MAC risk is to be mitigated within the CAP 1122 BOWTIE.</p>

Based GA Flying Schools	Y	Y	Kemble Flying Club	<p>I totally understand that the financial return from light aircraft movements (including microlights) is tiny in comparison to larger aircraft movements but it seems there is no intention to cut these movements which are of course our lifeblood.</p> <p>Presumably there could be some restriction however on VFR movements at the airfield when an aircraft is flying a GNSS approach and no doubt detail on this will emerge as the process develops. Forgive me mentioning it now but potentially aircraft flying the GNSS Approach in VFR conditions for all the good safety reasons mentioned would effectively be arriving in the ATZ as they do now and I wonder whether in VFR Conditions we might just all carry on as normal? In IMC conditions we would not be flying microlights anyway and I would imagine in these conditions there will be a requirement relative to separation of traffic?</p> <p>Having suggested a concern about a possible problem of separation even if the traffic using the approaches does increase 100% this is hardly likely to have a major impact on the flying schools. I was surprised there is no intention to allow GNSS training approaches but then I hazard a guess that full ATC may be required for that.</p> <p>I am sure I speak on behalf of all my Club Members that we wholeheartedly support the AIP in this endeavour.</p>			✓		Response as above. Development in both Stage 3
Based GA Flying Schools	Y	Y	Lyneham Flying Club	<p>I much prefer your option 3 (north and south intercepts to both runways). One change to the runway 08 approach would be to avoid R102 (Highgrove House) rather than fly overhead, albeit above the restriction. Therefore I propose a south-westerly intercept and possibly similarly a north-westerly intercept to go between Nymphsfield and Aston Down gliding sites may be preferable</p>			✓	Good luck with the approach, it is sorely needed and will definitely be used by our club!	
Starspeed Training	Y	Y		Fully Supported, any option.	✓	✓	✓		
Gloustershire Airport	Y	N		Awaiting Response					
Based Jet Operators	Y	Y							
Frequent Jet Operators	Y	Y	Merlin Motorsport	<p>1. Option 3 should be given the highest priority.</p> <p>2. Option 1 acceptable for 08 but encroaches Brize ATZ for 26.</p> <p>Option 2 better for 26 and spreads arrival traffic over 3 points.</p> <p>Option 3 best option and in line with many existing RNAV approaches. Arriving aircraft have 6 options for initial arrival point.</p>	✓	✓	✓		prioritisation of options noted, particularly the standardisation of RNAV approaches and maximising options for joining the approach. For consideration in Stage 2b development, depending upon initial assessment of options.
Queens Helicopter Flight	Y	Y	Chief Pilot	Any of the three options would suit TQHF.	✓	✓	✓		Noted.
Royal Household Protection Group - Gloucestershire Constabulary	Y			I will take a look and get back to you if there are any problems, but from our discussion and the attached map it does not appear to have any impact on the Royal Households.					In addition to current R105 overflight restriction on Highgrove.

