

KEMBLE APPROACH AIRSPACE CHANGE PROPOSAL

CAP 1616 STAGE 2 ENGAGEMENT METHODOLOGY - REVIEW

1. This document forms part of the Airspace Change Proposal process as defined in CAP 1616 for the Proposed Kemble Arrival Procedures. The Statement of Need and Design Principles (DPs) developed as part of the Airport's submission of Step 1b of this CAP 1616 process were accepted by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) on the 26 October 2018 at the Define gateway. This triggered further work to create a comprehensive list of options, which were circulated to stakeholders for comment.
2. Following a big effort to create records of all the work done to submit to the CAA for the next gateway via their portal, a moment to summarise how feedback was sought and captured in support of the process has been used to create this review.
- 3) Re-reading Stage 2 Develop and Assess, it's clear that the level of engagement by the Change Sponsor grew and matured considerably from the initial discussions with local people and organisations typically contacted over a number of years. These were both formal, through consultative committees and informal, such as long-standing relationships with other airspace users in the vicinity. In a few cases Letters of Agreement had been signed as a result.
3. In gearing up for Stage 2, the need to use those lines of communications established at Step 1b for the development of the Design Principles the Change Sponsor decided these would have to be revisited.
4. Before re-contacting those early stakeholders to afford them the opportunity for further input to the next step in the process, questions emerged about how to do this. These were;
 - a) Were all previous stakeholders still relevant to this next step?
 - b) Had new stakeholders come forward to seek engagement?
 - c) Had Kemble discovered potential new stakeholders who might appreciate being apprised of the story so far and provide comment? and,
 - d) Was there one or more methods Kemble should employ to maximise stakeholders' access to the Design Principles evaluation and Design Options appraisal documents?
5. CAP1616 Appendix C Consult and Engage proved helpful in mapping out how Kemble should undertake this activity. Paragraph C9 spoke to the questions raised above and confirmed the process started on a firm footing. Paragraph C13 underlined that Kemble's preferred methods of engagement with identifiable groupings within the broader spectrum of stakeholders was sound. It was decided to repeat this for Step 2a with invitations to meetings first and foremost.
6. Fortunately, Kemble's proposals for change are straightforward, require no new controlled airspace and have not generated any adverse reactions from the wider community as a whole.

7. As 2018 drew to a close, the **Step 2a Kemble Design Options (and Engagement)** document was sent out to all Stage 1 listed stakeholders. To that list the Cotswold AONB was added. The document was sent out, with an explanatory email to all and verbal briefings, where required for those that did not respond in Stage 1 or for the new stakeholder of the Cotswold AONB planning team. For those that did not respond within the allocated time period, a follow up phone call and email was used to ensure all had the opportunity to respond and provide feedback on the proposed options. Furthermore, open invitations to meet the change sponsor at the Cotswold Airport (Kemble) Control Tower for those that provided constructive feedback, rather than a simple acknowledgement or supportive agreement, to allow for face-to-face discussions. Based on the feedback received to the Step 2a document, these invitations went out to the local Parish Councils, the gliding community, the MoD (RAF Brize Norton as the local airspace representative) and the AONB.

8. The one group, that had been fully engaged, and readily accepted their invitation was the gliding community based *inter alia* at Aston Down and Nympsfield aerodromes. Other stakeholders such as the local Parish Councils and AONB, whilst acknowledging their invitations, expressed satisfaction with the level of detail supplied and whilst some offered guidance, all were content to 'skip' further engagement until the Consultation phase.

9. None of the many other stakeholders contacted in December 2018 requested meetings and only a few chose to respond in writing (by email) to the Step 2a documents they had received. All feedback received was extracted in full, from email, and inputted into the document entitled **Step 2a Kemble Design Options Engagement Feedback**.

10. In deciding how to react, Kemble pressed ahead with the gliding community meeting, conducted a tele conference with SATCO Brize Norton and used best endeavours to create the OA document whilst holding true to the feedback gathered through its chosen methods of engagement. Further developed feedback from these engagements is included in the list of Stage 2, Step 2a documents as specific meeting minutes.

11. The resultant deeper understanding contained in these minutes combined with the remainder of the Step 2a feedback, contained in the Step 2a Kemble Design Options Engagement Feedback table, was used to inform the **Step 2a Design Principles Options Evaluation**. This together with additional guidance suggested by stakeholder feedback, such as the Cotswold AONB Management Plan, was then used to inform further analysis and appraisal in Step 2b.