

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	
		Organisation / Stakeholder Type (Q4 - 7)	Support the ACP? (Q8)	Response to combined airspace design (Q9)	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Response to medium airspace design (refined Stage 2 Option 8) (Q11)	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q 12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	Response may impact final proposal		Response does not impact final proposal	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)	
											Impacted	Not Impacted			
1		CEO, British Helicopter Association (NATMAC Organisation)	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	The BHA supports this ACP and requires no alterations						X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
2		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Support the current proposals						X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
3		Local Authority Stakeholder	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	There needs to be safe space for viewing as the current week has shown the number of people stood on the verge close to the A15 is at times dangerous. Some space could be used near where the Vulcan typically is parked for parking and viewing which would keep the road free from pedestrians						X	Response of support for ACP noting respondent's comment on safety aspects of provision of viewing area.	
4		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
5		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
6		Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	I am not happy that the RAFAT are planned to be practicing their aerobatic manoeuvres over our local built up areas. At Scampton their location was rural and surrounded by far fewer dwellings. Even with that said, those of us who have lived locally for years remember the mid air collision over the village of Welton involving RAFAT. Another crashed on finals for Runway 21, fortunately onto farm land. With the Waddington area being far more built up, the risk to local residents is much higher. The RAFAT have a poor accident record in recent years and I would not feel safe with RAFAT's fifty year old aircraft operating over my and my families heads. RAF Barkston Heath or RAF Syerston would, in my opinion be much safer locations for EGR313.	Move EGR313 to RAF Syerston or Barkston Heath.	Public safety in the built up areas surrounding the aerodrome at RAF Waddington. I am not worried about Protector but certainly would not want EGR313 over my property.				X	The Change Sponsor has noted the respondent's concerns about the safety aspects of RAFAT displaying over built up areas (BUAs) and the suggestion to relocate EG R313 away from RAF Waddington. Information on the safety assurance of RAFAT activity was provided within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 10) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at Annex A. In addition the Change Sponsor provides the following in response. The majority of the aerobatic manoeuvring and training will occur directly overhead the WAD airfield boundary itself and mostly to the East in the least built up part of the airspace. The larger villages of Branston and Bracebridge Heath are on the edges of the aerobatic box and will seldom see aerobatic overflight below 500ft. Aerobatic flight below 500ft will not occur to the West of the airfield where the more BUAs exist (Hykeham, South Lincoln etc). RAF Barkston Heath is considered unsuitable for RAFAT flying and RAF Syerston can only support limited flying for a limited winter period. Neither options can replace EG R313.	
7		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
8		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Nothing of note	N/a	N/a	Advance communication of increased sudden noise levels as can have a detrimental affect on animals so domestic pets can be helped			X	The airspace will be activated by NOTAM which will be promulgated via the AIS website. However, the Change Sponsor does not think that this is what the respondent is suggesting. Rather a request for actual RAFAT display times to be published on a daily basis. The Change Sponsor considered the possibility of publishing airspace activation for RAFAT activity. RAFAT display times can be published but there is a risk balance to be had. If display times are published/advertised in advance then the risk of additional secondary spectators in the display area/build up of traffic on A15 is increased. This is partly why display practice times were never published at Scampton.	
9		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
10		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments for consideration.	
11		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
12		Chief Flying Instructor, York Gliding Centre (Aviation Stakeholder)	No	Object	Object	Strongly Support	We would LIKE to be able to support the combined proposals in terms of better enabling the RAF to defend the people of the UK. Our objection focuses on two important aspects of detail which, if appropriately address, would enable us to support the proposal in the round. Our issues are: 1. The strong suggestion in the Options Appraisal is that RAFAT may use the low airspace design around lunchtime but EG R313 (or an alternative elsewhere) at others. Particularly of the 'at other times' alternative is the adjoining EG R313, this will be confusing for low level air traffic. It will make it very difficult to plan even approximate routings for slow moving traffic such as gliders that cannot be sure when they set off their exact arrival time at each waypoint as this is dependent on meteorological conditions. In other words we will not know whether it is the Scampton area or the Waddington area we will need to avoid when we set off and we do not have the ability to re-route without bounds. For example, see breeze fronts that develop during the day would make it impossible to soar further East as the frontal system develops in the summer months. Moreover, the reason given for 'lunchtime', practices by RAFAT over Waddington appears to be the entertainment of dignitaries and commercial partners. This is an inadequate justification for jeopardising safety through confusion of airspace users. The RAF must decide whether to use the Waddington practice area; the Scampton practice area or an alternative practice area but it should not reserve options on all three at the cost of reducing safety margins. 2. We support the use of temporary danger areas to deconflict RAFAT and Protector from other traffic. However, the mechanism for notification and obtaining a crossing service needs to be refined and simplified to make it useable by amateur/recreational pilots, especially as the danger area is likely to be activated from time to time at weekends. We note that ATC will only be staffed when the danger area is activated making the confirmation of 'cold' status difficult at other times. Across the areas commonly flown by pilots from Rufforth West (York Gliding Centre), we note sporadic provision of air traffic services when RAF airfields have no military activity. We suggest an ATIS-like service whereby passing aircraft can at least tune to an automated message in flight to find out if the danger area is likely to be hot or cold when they arrive in the vicinity. If these two issues were to be resolved we feel we would be able to support the whole proposal.	1. The RAF must decide whether to use the Waddington practice area; the Scampton practice area or an alternative practice area but it should not reserve options on all three at the cost of reducing safety margins. 2. We suggest an ATIS-like service whereby passing aircraft can at least tune to an automated message in flight to find out if the danger area is likely to be hot or cold when they arrive in the vicinity. If these two issues were to be resolved we feel we would be able to support the whole proposal.	The Defence Infrastructure Organisation, which is part of the MoD, is managing the sale of the RAF Scampton technical site. Under government policies regarding "Assets of Community Value", community groups are required to be privileged in the disposal process. West Lindsey District Council is exercising its right to be considered first and has identified five potential commercial partners based on track record and financial backing. Shortly, the number of potential partners will be further reduced as the Council has stipulated strict planning constraints on the site. These include a wish to see the airfield remain open as an airfield; for EG R313 to remain available to RAFAT and the preferencing of proposals that provide a visitor centre for the Red Arrows that would facilitate corporate and VIP visits. It is entirely within the gift of the MoD and DIO to firm up the relationship between this ACP and the Scampton disposal process and remove the uncertainty around RAFAT's practice area that has resulted in the modification of the ACP to negate the need for "back-up" plans. We would like to see public assurances that, should EG 313 continue to be available to RAFAT, the elements of the ACP that relate to accommodating RAFAT practice over Waddington will be rescinded without the need for a further ACP to remove them. The outcome of the Scampton sale to WLDC and its chosen business partner should be known before the ACP process concludes. If there are delays, the ACP decision should be delayed until the outcome of the sale is formally confirmed.	X	The Change Sponsor has considered the respondent's concerns about the potential for RAFAT to activate more than one piece of segregated/restricted airspace simultaneously and the impact this could have on other airspace users. In response RAFAT has provided further indications as to how the proposed airspace at RAF Waddington may be used alongside EG R313, depending on the viability of EG R313 for RAFAT practice displays. This is attached to this document, but in summary there will be no requirement for the proposed airspace at Waddington and EG R313 to be activated on the same day for RAFAT activity. Therefore, a DACS through one or the other should be approved (dependent on any other conflicting airspace activity, of course). How the RAFAT airspace options will be managed will be defined at Stage 4 of the ACP. The Change Sponsor is also committed to publicise further decisions on airspace for RAFAT display training once details on the sale of Scampton are announced. The Change Sponsor has also considered the respondent's suggestion for the provision of an ATIS facility. For technical, regulatory and ATC workload reasons, the provision of a useful ATIS to broadcast real-time status of the proposed airspace is not considered possible. The MOD investigated the provision of such a service during the SkyGuardian deployment in 2021 and for the TDA which is currently in place at RAF Syerston. The aspiration to provide airspace users with a means to determine whether a piece of airspace is hot or cold is unmanageable from a resource/workload point of view and, therefore, has flight safety implications (RAF Waddington ATC has conducted a safety assessment into the amount of information that can safely and accurately be uploaded for transmission via ATIS). However, Waddington Radar will provide a DAAS and DACS on the Waddington LARS frequency of 119.5MHz. In the event of a last minute cancellation of the airspace and Waddington Radar is not available, London Information will provide a DAAS on 124.6MHz.				
13		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	I have lived in Washingborough for the last 50 years also under the flight path into RAF Waddington. I have lived with Vulcans, ANACs and just about every aircraft the RAF has ever flown. I and my wife have no problems with extra flights in the airspace around our village. The noise is after all a small price to pay for our freedom.							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments for consideration.
14		Director, AP Alarms & CCTV Ltd	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
15		Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	The red arrows have been at scampton for many years why can't they use the air space round scampton ?						X	The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Q12 & 13) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1 at para 1.19 and further in Annex A.	
16		Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Live close to RAF Waddington and the proposed airspace Risk to property due to flight display practise and potential mid air collision Increase in aircraft noise Display routines will attract increase traffic and congestion on side roads and on estates to try and photograph and view RAFAT	Should have kept Scampton airspace open or use of RAF Syerston for RAFAT purposes	Look at other less built up areas or do not move from Scampton or use RAF Syerston for display routine practices				X	The Change Sponsor is not totally clear if the respondent is solely concerned with the safety of RAFAT flights, so has also included comment about Protector's safety assurance below. The Change Sponsor has noted the respondent's concerns about the safety aspects of RAFAT, additional aircraft noise, concerns about increased traffic congestion and the suggestion to relocate EG R313 away from RAF Waddington. These points were covered in the consultation material as follows. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of RAFAT activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 10) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at Annex A. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6). The Change Sponsor provided information on the noise impact of both RAFAT and Protector activity within the consultation material. This can be found in the Consultation Document Issue 1 (see paras 5.1, 5.9.1). More information can be found in the Full Options Appraisal which is on the CA ACP Portal. The Change Sponsor also provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Q12 & 13) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1 at para 1.19 and further in Annex A.	
17		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Local infrastructure such as roads and cycle ways and footpaths would need to be improved to cope with current and future increased land based traffic.		See above for infrastructure. Equally, accommodation for new staff may need to be considered in the light of current building and flood plain land and green wedge. Sewage works on the Witham may need updating rather than expanding. Health care provision may need upgrading.				X	Response of support for ACP with suggestion for consideration of infrastructure requirements, which is out of scope for the ACP.	
18		Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	The airspace change proposal will allow the RAFAT to practice flying displays over RAF Waddington and the immediate surrounding area. When conducting displays and practices over RAF Waddington in the past, the aircraft of the RAFAT frequently flown over Haverston village at heights well below 500 ft. This is in contravention of CAA airspace procedures for the area.	The rationale for moving the RAFAT to RAF Waddington was to facilitate the closure of RAF Scampton. The airspace above RAF Syerston is available to accommodate the RAFAT needs. The area surrounding RAF Syerston is not built up and would reduce the risk to life to the public, when compared to RAF Waddington. The argument					X	The respondent is most concerned with the impact that RAFAT will have on the local area surrounding Waddington. The Change Sponsor has noted the respondent's concerns about the safety aspects of RAFAT low flying and displaying over built up areas (BUAs), additional aircraft noise, concerns about increased traffic	
19		Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
20		Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
21		Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
22		Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	
23		Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object							X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K		L	M	N	
		Organisation / Stakeholder Type (Q4 - 7)	Support the ACP? (Q8)	Response to combined airspace design (Q9)	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Response to medium airspace design (refined Stage 2 Option 8) (Q11)	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	Response may impact final proposal		Response does not impact final proposal	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)		
											Impacted	Not Impacted				
1																
2																
24																
25	16	CFL Derbyshire Flying Centre (Aviation Stakeholder)	No	Object	Object	Neutral	The RAF do not need Airspace over RAF Scampton and RAF Waddington. The imposition of Two areas of Airspace will seriously affect GA aviation safety in the Area.	overflight of built up areas and RAF Waddington flying regulations. With the RAFAT to be permanently based at RAF Waddington there is a strong likelihood of these occurrences at an increased frequency which will adversely affect the reputation of the RAFAT and RAF at large. The RAFAT presence will incur additional aircraft noise in the local area around RAF Waddington. Will the RAF provide for additional (night) glazing to local residents - specifically Hamerton where I live? Additionally, the presence of the RAFAT will attract numerous aircraft enthusiasts to the locality who will park their cars on the local roads and surrounding estates thus causing a nuisance to local residents and result in road congestion. There would be an increase in the risk of a road traffic accident on the A607 and A15 as drivers could be distracted by low flying aircraft of the RAFAT. The presence of the RAFAT will increase the mid-air collision risk in the RAF Waddington area which will incur increased risk to life to members of the public and risk of damage to public property. This increase in risk to life will have to be met by either the Senior or Operational Duty Holder of the RAFAT. As individuals of the Armed Forces are no longer protected by Crown Immunity I will sue the RAFAT Duty Holder personally if any of my family or property are adversely affected following an incident caused by the RAFAT.	that the proximity of the A16 would lead to an increased risk of a road traffic accident if the RAFAT operated above RAF Syerston is no different to that at RAF Waddington given the station has the A607 and A15 trunk roads bordering the aerodrome.				congestion and road safety associated with RAFAT at RAF Waddington and the suggestion to relocate EG R313 away from RAF Waddington. Information on the safety assurance of RAFAT activity was provided within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 10) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at Annex A. In addition the Change Sponsor provides the following regarding RAFAT overflight. The majority of the aerobatic manoeuvring and training will occur directly overhead the WAD airfield boundary itself and mostly to the East in the least built up part of the airspace. The larger villages of Branston and Bracebridge Heath are on the edges of the aerobatic box and will seldom see aerobatic overflight below 500ft. Aerobatic flight below 500ft will not occur to the West of the airfield where the more BUAs exist (Hykeham, South Lincoln etc). In addition RAFAT confirm that there would be no aerobatic overflight below 500ft of Hamerton as the village is located just outside the main display area at RAF Waddington. The Change Sponsor also provided information on the noise impact of both RAFAT and Protector activity within the consultation material. This can be found in the Consultation Document Issue 1 (see paras 5.1, 5.9.1 & 5.9.4). More information can be found in the Full Options Appraisal which is on the CAA ACP Portal. Whilst the concerns over road congestion and safety are outside the scope of this ACP, the Change Sponsor will pass the general concern to RAF Waddington for consideration. RAF Syerston is not a suitable site for a full RAFAT training programme due to its location in the Trent Valley Transit Area. This limits its use to the quieter winter months only. Also, to minimise the impact on local aviation, RAFAT will look to minimise its use to that which is deemed essential. As Syerston has a runway which is required for Synchro Pair training, they will focus on using it over the main formation. Also, it has limited vertical extent which really only makes it suitable for Synchro Pair training. Syerston is currently being assessed as part of the Team's contingency planning against the potential loss of EG R313.			
26																
27	17	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	It will be dangerous for all those living in the area as accidents are bound to happen especially on take off and landing. RAF Waddington is a populated area surrounded by roads, a schools, local housing and work places. Properly tested and approved safety measures have not been taken. There is a clear intention to grow and for training and use by other international militaries that will increase the level of flights and thus of danger. More importantly, this proposal is opening up the skies of the UK to large remotely controlled drones on a regular basis without a wide and properly informed public debate.	The only place that would genuinely reduce the impact to people in the UK would be to base these drones at sea, outside of shipping areas and not close to ports or fishing areas.	A major problem not just for the UK but for the whole world is the quantity of resources put into war rather than peace. Continuing the disastrous militarisation of our whole society will not help any of us. Demonsing the 'other', making enemies rather than friends, opposing rather than cooperating, and supporting corporate control of our resources for a small global elite will continue to harm all people on our fragile planet. Therefore the MOD should be spending more time and resources considering real security and how to work with ALL nations and peoples to solve the existential crises facing us.				The respondent has concerns about the future proliferation of drones in the UK and on the safety of drone activity. This does not impact the proposed airspace design. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6).			
28	18	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	No to drones. I'm not in support of more wars.	Don't have drones	No drones							
29	19	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	I am aware that all drones can and some have crashed. For this reason I do not believe that we should have armed drones flying over Britain, specially over urban areas. But anywhere as there are people living in rural areas. I am also aware that the larger drones will be seen as more aggressive and may lead to an unexpected more aggressive response or the outbreak of war. I believe we should avoid engaging in this development in this interests of our futures and our children's futures.		The result of crashes on the people living around.							
30																
31																
32	20	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	It's a question of control, we don't have armed police for a reason, the public does not want them, the principal here is the same, armed drones operated in secret by anonymous people making unaccountable decisions. I don't want to see this anywhere in Britain.	Don't do it.								
33	21	Aviation Stakeholder	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	I'm a paraglider pilot. It will be almost impossible to fly any long cross country flights if this proposal goes ahead. Derbyshire and the Peaks are THE place in the UK to fly from for many people simply due to centres of population. Derbyshire is the biggest and most active club in the country. We are already very affected by Manchester, Birmingham and East Midlands air space plus some military bases to the north east and this proposal will close off a highly valued route to East Angles. Practicing aerobatics over the sea off Anglesey or off the East coast would seem like a better idea for the display team, the local inhabitants and us paragliders.	Practice when it is raining. Fly off shore or NE of Waddington Practice in the mornings (our thermals don't really get going until 11:00) Practice when the wind is S, SE or E as we can't really get that way then especially if the wind is over 15mph.								
34	22	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	There are none we should welcome our drone defence team and the iconic red arrows to a base with such history	Not applicable	None	Controlled access for residents to appreciate the operations on the base and the return of the WADDINGTON AIRSHOW						
35	23	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	It is one more step toward Armageddon. The USA is pushing the whole world into world war 3. It already, effectively, controls UK foreign policy and will indirectly control all activity at Waddington. Britain is under no threat whatsoever from any nation other than through association with the USA (disguised as NATO membership) or from the USA directly (if we ever had the temerity to choose a decent government). Every military adventure that British armed forces have ever instigated have been on foreign soil. Even ww2 was initiated on behalf of Empire and resulted directly from the Treaty of Versailles. We oppose this due to the proposal being some five to six nautical miles out. We run a model aircraft club just outside the village of Welbourn and have been there for the last 21 years. We fly models up to 7.5KG and above 400ft as per article 16 with the BMFA. The Options 1&2 finish right on our flying limit and so in theory would allow us to continue unhindered, but it does raise safety questions if something did go wrong, and we found a model in your self-imposed no fly zone! Options 3,4 & 5 will stop us flying altogether! We feel this is totally unacceptable! For us option 7 & 8 are the options that can not affect us, or you shorten the no fly zone down to 4 miles. I would have thought you will have a minimum height to fly at anyway of at least 3000ft due to members of public riding horses, our flying hours have been set up to allow for our neighbour to go out riding. Our location is: What three words, diverged,duos,surreal 53.080730,-0.574228 We allow for a 600m radius from the centre for the take off point. Please contact me to discuss, we will try and get to the consultation at Waddington on the 28/9 around 4PM. Kind Regards, Terry	No.	No.							
36	24	Chair KESTEVEN MODEL FLIERS (Aviation Stakeholder)	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Do not support due to the proposal being some 5nm out and down to ground level.	Reduce the distance of the no fly zone, 5nm is a very long way out! You can look at setting minimum height ie 5000ft at the 5nm and as you get closer to Waddington this can become less. This way low level operating aircraft such as light aircraft and model aircraft clubs can still operate, and never the two will mix.	Have you considered members of the public riding horses and dog walkers if you are going to be carrying out low level flying operations?							
37	25	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	I object to this proposal as I believe it will endanger airspace users, those living and working in the immediate vicinity of RAF	There should be a proper national debate about the use of these systems or assessment of the wider risks of								

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
		Organisation / Stakeholder Type (Q4 - 7)	Support the ACP? (Q8)	Response to combined airspace design (Q9)	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Response to medium airspace design (Refined Stage 2 Option 8) (Q11)	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q 12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	Response may impact final proposal		Response does not impact final proposal	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)
											Impacted	Not Impacted		
42	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		The drone noise that drones emit when sat in our garden or just being out and about in North Hyesham. There is absolutely no reason for all these extra flights taking off from a heavily populated area. Extra Red Arrow, AWACS (or whatever the new ones are called) Drones and all the other air traffic. Trouble is that the vast majority of residents will only find out about the excess air traffic once it is up there. Just found out today 22/9 that there was a consultation yesterday 21/9 top secret obviously. It will be the same response as it was with the 40% uplift in trains cutting off the city centre, no one new about it	Use a base near the coast, test over the north sea	All of the above				X	The respondent has concerns about the noise produced by drones and an increase in the numbers of aircraft operating in the local area. He found out about the consultation on 22 September, the day after the first drop-in session, which he indicates was too late notice to participate. Whilst this might not have been convenient there was a second opportunity to participate in a live drop-in session on 28 September. The Change Sponsor had planned to provide up to six-weeks' notice to interested stakeholders of the public drop-in sessions. Not only was this shortened by the period of national mourning following the death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, but the final approval of the consultation material had been delayed by 4 weeks due to unforeseen problems within the CAA and the timing of the Stage 3 Gateway. In all respects the Change Sponsor adhered to the previously approved consultation strategy and went ahead with the CAA's approval with regard to timelines. A reasonable turnout was achieved at the second session. The comments do not impact the final proposal, although they have been noted by the Change Sponsor. As part of the regulatory process laid down in CAP1616, the Change Sponsor is required to consider any impact on noise as a consequence of the airspace change. The Change Sponsor provided information on the noise impact of both RAFAT and Protector activity within the consultation material. This can be found in the Consultation Document Issue 1 (see paras 5.1, 5.9.1 & 5.9.4). More information can be found in the Full Options Appraisal which is on the CAA ACP Portal. The Change Sponsor provided information about RAFAT and Protector's flying tempo in the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at Section 4 Utilisation of Airspace. More information can be found in the Full Options Appraisal which is on the CAA ACP Portal.
43	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support		I fully support all design stages, whilst there shall certainly be some changes to the area both immediately local and wider area, I am exceptionally						X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
44	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support		Would like to ensure that all major roads along the perimeter have double yellow lines to prevent persons stopping to view the red arrows practicing on the live highways (A608 A15) much the same as was outside Scampton to ensure safety of other road users.	reduce unless absolutely necessary flying in the night time hours 2200-0600hrs					X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
45	Individual	Yes	Support	Support	Support								X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
46	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support								X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
47	Aviation Stakeholder	Yes	Support	Support	Support								X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
48	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support								X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
49	Poniton and Boston Aviation Club (Aviation Stakeholder)	Yes	Support	Support	Support		At the Lincolnshire Air Users Group I asked the question concerning the transit height for the RAFAT Syerston and Donna Nook. The member representing RAFAT advised me it would be between 500 and 1500ft. For most pilots flying from Boston or Poniton it should provide little problem, more than enough time to climb above this altitude. I cannot comment on the reaction of those based at North Coates. When I do visit North Coates, it is very close to the boundary of Donna Nook and may be problematic to achieve adequate altitude for adequate separation.						X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal. Whilst the respondent's concerns do not specifically impact the final proposal, the Change Sponsor has passed the concern regarding light aircraft operating in the North Coates area to RAFAT for consideration. A personal response will be provided to the respondent in due course, but the Change Sponsor can offer the following as a guide. A LARS service is provided by Humberside that reaches the Donna Nook/North Coates area. RAFAT would always promulgate usage of Donna Nook via NCTAM and any formation would be in receipt of a air traffic service during the practice from Humberside. North Coates have always kindly suppressed their activity and/or warned local users of a practice display at Donna Nook. RAFAT would always ring North Coates before take off to confirm timings.
50	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		I object to this proposal as I believe it will endanger airspace users, those living and working in the immediate vicinity of RAF Waddington and those beyond. Remotely controlled aircraft are dangerous and evidence shows that they are particularly prone to accident during take-off and landing. RAF Waddington is surrounded by housing, local businesses, a major road and a school. It seems an unnecessary risk for this significant change - which for the very first time allows large uncrewed aircraft to operate beyond visual line of sight on a regular basis - to be based in a populated area. Separately, the Ministry of Defence have also made clear that they intend to open a training hub at RAF Waddington both for RAF crews to train on Protector but also for other international militaries to train to use similar uncrewed aircraft. While the consultation documentation suggests that Protector flights will initially be limited - with 1 or 2 aircraft in the air at any one time up to 3 times per week - this is clearly intended to grow and this will inevitably increase the safety risk.	No.	No.				X	Duplicate of Serial 25 & 28 & 37 & 38 above. The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but has concerns about the use of drones in general, calling for a national debate on their use. This is outside the scope of this ACP. However, the respondent cautions about the safety of drones. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6). With regard to the "working assumption" that Protector will be able to fly in Classes A & C airspace, the Change Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in Classes A - C airspace and that this area of concern sits outside the ACP. Similarly, the Change Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in an active TRA and that this area of concern sits outside the ACP. That said, the Change Sponsor directs the respondent to the detail provided in response to Stakeholder No 106 in this table for amplification on these areas.
51	Director, Drone Wars (Aviation Stakeholder)	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		We object to this proposal primarily on safety grounds. Drone Wars UK has tracked the safety record of large military UAVs for more than a decade (see https://dronewars.net/drone-crash-database/). While to some the use of remote-controlled UAVs appears to be becoming normalised, the reality is that the technology is far from mature and, as the data demonstrates, accidents occur frequently - around twice per month on average over the past decade (See Chris Cole, 'Accidents Will Happen: A review of military drones crashes', June 2019, Available at www.dronewars.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/DW-Accidents-WEB.pdf) Importantly, there is no one particular reason for these accidents, meaning there is no simple technological fix. Losses occurred due to mechanical failure (such as tails shearing off or propellers snapping), electrical issues, communications problems (known as 'lost link'), engine failure (often due to oil or coolant loss), weather problems (including lightning strikes) and pilot error. Analysis of our dataset shows that 64% of accidents occurred mid-flight, while 28% occurred during the take-off and landing phase. We believe these proposed flights will endanger both airspace users and those living and working in the immediate vicinity of RAF Waddington. RAF Waddington is surrounded by housing, local businesses, a major road and a school. It seems an unnecessary risk for this significant change - which for the very first time allows large uncrewed aircraft to operate beyond visual line of sight on a regular basis - to be based in a populated area. While the MoD proposal says there is "a requirement for a large Remotely Piloted Air System (RPAS) to operate out of RAF Waddington from the mid-2020s", the reason for this is not spelled out. The RAF has been operating Reaper for more than a decade without a need to operate from RAF Waddington. While it may be more convenient for the RAF to locate Protector at Waddington along with other crewed STAR aircraft, other more remote locations may well prove to offer less risk given the safety record of large UAVs. We also object to this proposal as this change will enable large remotely controlled drones to fly within the UK before appropriate safety measures - such as properly tested and approved 'Detect and Avoid' equipment - are in place. According to the consultation documents it is only a "working assumption" that DAA equipment will enable Protector to fly within Classes A and C airspace without restriction. At the same time, the consultation document makes clear that a proper and satisfactory argument that Protector can operate safely within the TRA has yet to be made by the Ministry of Defence. Separately, the Ministry of Defence have also made clear that they intend to open a Protector training hub at RAF Waddington, both for RAF crews but also for foreign militaries. While the consultation documentation suggests that Protector flights will initially be limited - with 1 or 2 aircraft in the air at any one time - up to 3 times per week - this is clearly intended to grow and will inevitably increase the safety risk. It is inevitable that those who have less experience of flying a UAV are more likely to make mistakes, leading to accidents. Again we would argue that RAF Waddington, surrounded as it is by homes and businesses, is not the place for people to learn to fly this type of aircraft.				X	The respondent's concerns are largely to do with the safety of operating drones in the UK in general and at RAF Waddington and its local area in particular. The design principle "Provide a safe environment for airspace users including consideration of the risk to life of those on the ground during RAFAT display practices" remains the number one priority for MOD in delivering this airspace change. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6). - How can we be assured that the unmanned aircraft operating in the proposed airspace are safe? All aircraft in military service are subject to a comprehensive safety approval that meets the same standard as its manned equivalent. This safety approval covers all aspects of design, maintenance, envelope, operation and training and is applicable to RPAS. In addition the Change Sponsor has provided a Safety Assessment for both Protector and RAFAT activities in the Full Options Appraisal (see para 6) which can be found on the CAA ACP Portal. Specifically this document touches on the limited DAA capability that Protector will be equipped with when introduced into the UK. With regard to the "working assumption" that Protector will be able to fly in Classes A & C airspace, the Change Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in Classes A - C airspace and that this area of concern sits outside the ACP. Similarly, the Change Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in an active TRA and that this area of concern sits outside the ACP. That said, the Change Sponsor directs the respondent to the detail provided in response to Stakeholder No 106 in this table for amplification on these areas. The respondent has concerns about a potential increase in the number of flights by RPAS at RAF Waddington if a training hub is developed and alongside that an increased risk of accident. The Change Sponsor provided information about Protector's flying tempo in the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at Section 4 Utilisation of Airspace. More information can be found in the Full Options Appraisal which is on the CAA ACP Portal. An estimate was provided for the first 6 months, out to first 24 months of Protector's in-service activity with a forecast of up to 6 flights per week as the operation matures. It is also worth stressing that much routine training will be managed in a synthetic flying environment, using a bespoke simulator, as opposed to live flying training.		
52	Individual	No	Neutral	Neutral	Support		whilst I do not support the proposal, it is solely down to the lateral limits of the RAFAT display teams approach to landing route. This is down to the fact that the larger aircraft previously operated from RAF Waddington go around the Branton village between Heshington and Waddingborough. Having seen RAFAT and all of the smaller aircraft descend onto the approach - there appears to be a lack of consideration of local villages as they 'cut the corner', and transit directly over the villages. Thereby I object.		Ensure that the landing approach route for the RAFAT team go around the village and not over it!				X	The respondent has concerns about the final approach path taken by some aircraft (including RAFAT) to land on Waddington's RW20. The Change Sponsor has passed the concerns to RAFAT and RAF Waddington for consideration, although it will not impact the final proposal.
53	Supporter of Drone Wars UK	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		I believe drones are a danger to civilians, are the beginning of perpetual warfare and do not reach the proposed target in most cases.						X	The respondent has concerns about the operation of drones in general from a moral standpoint and has no impact on the final proposal.

1	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
2		Organisation / Stakeholder Type (Q4 - 7)	Support the ACP? (Q8)	Response to combined airspace design (Q9)	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Response to medium airspace design (Refined Stage 2 Option 8) (Q11)	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q 12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	Response may impact final proposal		Response does not impact final proposal	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)
											Impacted	Not Impacted		
85	62	Clerk to the Council Dunston PC (Local Authority Stakeholder)	Unsure	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral							X	The respondent is unsure as to his/her support for the ACP but has no comments which would impact the proposal.
86	63	Aviation Stakeholder	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Neutral			I fail to see why the existing minimum height rule of 500' agl has to be removed, surely this is a real reduction in safety measures.				X	The Change Sponsor is not clear about which 500ft rule to which the respondent is referring. The feedback cannot, therefore, impact the final proposal. However, RAFAT has provided the following clarification regarding display flying over built-up areas: The majority of the aerobically manoeuvring and training will occur directly overhead the WAD airfield boundary itself and mostly to the East in the least built up part of the airspace. The larger villages of Brantson and Bracebridge Heath are on the edges of the aerobically box and will seldom see aerobically overflight below 500ft. Aerobically flight below 500ft will not occur to the West of the airfield where the more BUA's exist (Hykeham, South Lincoln etc).
87	64	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	I'm very happy to back the opportunity for safer training of operators and pilots associated with any activities as required.	Not applicable	As the base already flies heavy jets and occasionally fighter jets, there does not need to be any further mitigation.	The only down-side to further operations is the traffic generated by extra personnel. Some of these personnel are already driving modified vehicles with very loud exhausts in the vicinity.			X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal. The concern about additional traffic levels is outside the scope of this ACP.
88	65	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
89	66	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
90	67	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object							X	The respondent objects to the ACP but has no comments which would impact the proposal.
91	68	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		Military drones are weapons of war outside the control of everyone except the military. They kill, maim and damage infrastructure (as in Ukraine as I write). Only peaceful uses of drones eg for agriculture and archaeology should be allowed. The use of drones is unaccountable, like so much other military activity.	Just don't use military drones.				X	The respondent has concerns about the operation of military drones in general from a moral standpoint. This has no impact on the final proposal.
92	69	Individual	Yes	Support	Strongly Support	Support	Commit to a deactivation date for EG R313.						X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and but would like a decision to be made to "deactivate" EG R313. This is outside the scope of the ACP.
93	70	CEO British Gliding Association (NATMAC Organisation)	No	Object	Object	Support		Low Design Activation Periods. The proposal states that: "The proposed airspace will not be permanently active; it will only be activated when RAFAT or Protector flying is due to take place. Proven procedures will be adopted to ensure that the airspace is activated and notified as and when required. This will involve appropriate NOTAM action being taken at least 24 hours in advance. " "To ensure minimum disruption to other airspace users a Danger Area Crossing Service (DACS) will be offered within any implemented airspace. This means that, even if the airspace has been notified as being active, it may be possible for both civil and military aircraft to transit through it under a clearance from either Waddington ATC. " "RAF Waddington ATC will be manned at all times during RAFAT and Protector operations. Confirmation on the current status of the airspace will be available from other appropriate military ATC units...when Waddington ATC is closed. We note that the proposed airspace should be accessible via a DACS. From wider engagement, we understand that the military radar system brought into use in Lincolnshire has been specified to screen out slow moving traffic and, as a result, identifying some non-transponder equipped traffic is problematic. The resulting likelihood of a need for a procedural crossing for some airspace users is more complex for the controller and therefore likely to be denied as a matter of course. We would like to know how the proposer anticipates providing a reliable DACS service for slow moving non-transponder traffic. In the event of operations being cancelled during the period of the NOTAM, the proposed airspace will still be considered active by potential users of the airspace. Waddington ATC will be closed, and therefore access to the airspace is only possible by contacting an "appropriate military ATC unit". We believe that this is an unworkable alternative. We suggest that in addition to notifying activation by NOTAM, an ATIS is established to permanently provide real time status of the proposed airspace. Significantly increased volumes of restricted airspace. The proposed Waddington lower airspace serves two purposes. It supports Protector operations and RAFAT practices, including corporate events. The RAF should be able to operate the RAFAT and Protector in one volume of shared airspace. We are aware that due to Duty Holder concerns, elements of RAFAT practice cannot take place at Waddington. As a result, practice will take place in either R313 if it continues to be established and available to RAFAT, or in proposed airspace over another site (ref the RAF Sycamore ACP), thus effectively doubling the airspace impact of RAFAT practice activity on other users. The decision-making that has resulted in the RAFAT moving to an unsuitable location is resulting in negative impacts on other airspace users. The MoD are pressing forward with ACPs to address currently unknown scenarios. We recognise that this wider issue of potentially doubled volumes of restricted airspace allocated for RAFAT use is not part of ACP 2019-18. Had that been so, we would have suggested that this proposal is paused until a decision is made regarding the future of R313. Movements at RAF Waddington. Activity information is an important part of any ACP. The proposal notes that the number of movements at Waddington in 2022 and going forward is likely to be 20% less than the 9000 experienced in 2021. Around 18% of those movements are practice diversion from other RAF airfields. Of the 5000 or so movements by RAF Waddington based aircraft, how many are associated with the RAF Waddington Flying Club operations?	For the reasons stated in para 1.3 above: 1. We would like to know how the proposer anticipates providing a reliable DACS service for non-transponder traffic. 2. We suggest that in addition to notifying activation by NOTAM, an ATIS is established to permanently provide real time status of the proposed airspace. 3. For reasons associated with this ACP, we suggest that this proposal is paused until a decision is made regarding the future of R313.	"General aviation" includes a broad range of activity from foot launching paragliders through to business jets. Clearly the main impact of the proposal is on recreational aviation, which has limited capability to route around airspace, and hence the need for real time awareness of activation of the proposed airspace. And in many cases, recreational aviation has to comply with "over-controlling" which is a feature of engagement with military controllers in any class of airspace. The analogy of phones being distracting while driving applies equally to radios when pilots are concentrating on, for example, staying airborne in rising air. Any DACS arrangement needs to work with the needs of recreational pilots and hence our request for more information on that topic. Planning ahead is an important part of flying. Knowing that a portion of airspace is available through listening to an ATIS service will be more useful than hoping a military controller is a. available and b. has the current information regarding the current status of the proposed airspace.	X		The respondent has concerns about access to the airspace by other users, in particular the ability of the MOD to provide a useful DACS for slow-moving, non-transponder traffic and the provision of an ATIS-like service to permanently provide status of the proposed airspace. The Change Sponsor will be in direct contact with the respondent, but has the following points for clarification: Response from the Lincolnshire TATCC, ref DACS to slow-moving, non-transponder aircraft: The MOD views a DACS for slow moving aircraft as no different to how a MATZ / ATZ crossing would currently be facilitated. After obtaining the intended route and height / altitude, the airspace would be blocked off appropriately to allow the crossing to go ahead. For extra awareness ATCOs may ask the pilot to report overhead significant areas so that their progress could be tracked through the crossing. One factor to preclude a DACS from being approved for slow moving aircraft, is the perceived time it would take to complete the crossings if the airspace would shortly be going "HOT". Regarding the suggestion of pausing the ACP pending a decision regarding the future of EG R313, the Change Sponsor has considered this, but to continuing with the ACP in order to meet the tight timescales for implementation of the proposed airspace in line with the Protector and RAFAT operational requirements. RAFAT has provided further indications as to how the proposed airspace at RAF Waddington may be used alongside EG R313, depending on the continued viability of EG R313 for RAFAT practice displays. This is attached to this document. How the RAFAT airspace options will be managed will be defined at Stage 4 of the ACP. The Change Sponsor has requested details of aircraft movement statistics for the Waddington Flying School and will provide them directly to the respondent.	
94	71	[Redacted]	Yes	Neutral	Support	Neutral	I do not believe the proposal will adversely affect our operations out of Langar Airfield, but as a busy airfield with in excess of 7000 turboprop movements per year for parachute-dropping sorties, I am a little concerned with the growth of the airspace at Waddington. The low airspace option really doesn't change a lot for any GA operators, ourselves including, but the boundaries of the medium option (and thus the combined option) do come significantly closer to our area of operation than we would like. I am just wary of potential conflict at the airspace boundary. We already have issues with the East Midlands CTA boundary, whereby controllers are nervous if our aircraft approach the boundary.		I think we will need a letter of agreement between ourselves and Waddington to ensure that the controllers are content with our aircraft movements near the boundary of this airspace.				X	The respondent has been in frequent communication with the Change Sponsor throughout the ACP. Regarding the requirement for a letter of agreement, the Change Sponsor will propose the following directly with the respondent. Discussions within the Lincolnshire TATCC suggest that provided the Langar activity remains outside the proposed airspace, there is no requirement for a letter of agreement. All information regarding airspace activation, timings, frequencies etc will be included in the relevant NOTAM. Clarification may be sought by Langar through the ATC switchboard at the Lincolnshire TATCC or via the Waddington LARS frequency of 119.5MHz. Langar could request a DACS if access to the proposed airspace is of benefit to Langar aircraft. However, if Langar feels that a letter of agreement would be preferable the Change Sponsor will make arrangements to draw one up.
95	72	Aviation Stakeholder	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		Two main points: 1. RPAS - there is no actual NEED to operate a "remote" system aircraft from RAF Waddington at all. The system is designed and has proven capable of being operated from a site far remote from the actual location of the flying vehicle. Therefore, there is NO NEED to have the flying vehicle actually located at RAF Waddington. I am a very local resident to RAF Waddington, my home village is under the flight path of runway 20 departures/02 arrivals. The RPAS airspace proposal will put my location inside an ACTIVE DANGER ZONE, together with many hundreds of thousands of others around the Lincoln area. This, in itself, should be something to be alarmed about, with all other UK DANGER AREAS located either at coastal airfields or locations on shorelines (thereby allowing departure and operation over water) or in extremely sparsely populated locations (Osterburn, Spadadam, Salisbury Plain etc.). I am also a locally based GA pilot, operating from Temple Bruer (an airfield with over 40 years continuous operation within Cranwell MATZ and alongside Waddington MATZ), which will now have operations severely hampered with this un-necessary proposal. 2. RAFAT - the move of the RAFAT to Waddington would seem extremely inappropriate, for the following reasons- (i) - Moving the location of operation, of up to nine fast jets, performing aerobically manoeuvres over a considerably more heavily populated location goes directly against the RAF's published promise of enhancing public safety. This is further confirmed by the need to move certain specific manoeuvres to a totally different location (Sycamore), and yet a further location for more training needs (Dome Hook). Such requirements clearly demonstrate that RAF Waddington is not the suitable base for RAFAT. (ii) - the already un-acceptable plan to locate RPAS at Waddington would seem another wholly obvious reason for NOT co-locating a team of up to nine fast jets at the same location, thus combining two very non-standard types of aviation operations, at the same location - either of which, alone, would require a special and specific (and totally different) airspace requirement. (iii) - I am a locally based GA pilot, operating from Temple Bruer (an airfield with over 40 years continuous operation within Cranwell MATZ and alongside Waddington MATZ), which will now have operations severely hampered with this un-necessary proposal. The original suggestion of a 4 mile restricted area would have encompassed Temple Bruer entirely, however, even the proposed 5 mile restricted area still brings a very real fear of the team "over-spilling" this suggested airspace. I have previous experiences of this happening when I based my aircraft at Sturgate airfield. On at least three occasions, I have been confronted with formations of Hawk jets overhead the Sturgate runway and airfield boundaries, well outside of R313.	Yes - for RPAS - move the flying activities to a remote and/or coastal located airfield (Aberporth, Macrihanish etc.) Yes - if the RAF continue to see the need of RAFAT, then a suggested base that does not come into such serious conflict with residents or existing operations that the training regime needs to be broken up amongst three different flying training sites is ridiculous and confirms, entirely, why Waddington is NOT SUITABLE.	Yes - outlining very clearly to local population that they would be (almost uniquely for the UK) living inside an active DANGER AREA.			X	The respondent has concerns about the safe operation of RPAS and RAFAT at RAF Waddington and the local area. The Change Sponsor has addressed these themes within the consultation material and does not feel that this respondent's feedback can impact the final proposal. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the RAFAT activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 10) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at Annex A. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6). The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Q12 & 13) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1.19 and further in Annex A. The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of Protector at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1.14. With respect to the respondent's claim that the proposed airspace will be an active danger area and the implication that the activity within it will be dangerous in nature, the Change Sponsor would like to make it clear that neither the Protector activity nor the RAFAT activity will be inherently dangerous. The Change Sponsor considered the use of other airspace constructs and requested feedback on the suitability of using some form of controlled airspace during Stage 2 of the ACP. The Stage 2A submission covers this at para 10. As stated in the Stage 2A submission, the most economical type of airspace to be implemented (in terms of hours of activation, access to airspace and manpower resource) would be segregated airspace in the form of a Danger Area. A Danger Area was considered to be the most suitable type of structure as the activities to be performed will not comply with rules of the air and, therefore, anything other than segregated airspace was not considered to be appropriate.
96	73	[Redacted]	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	No comments.	N/A	No comment.				X	The respondent has a neutral stance to the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
97	74	[Redacted] (Local Authority Stakeholder)	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	No comments.						X	The respondent has a neutral stance to the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.

1	2	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K		L	M	N		
		Organisation / Stakeholder Type (Q4 - 7)	Support the ACP? (Q8)	Response to combined airspace design (Q9)	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Response to medium airspace design (refined Stage 2 Option 2) (Q11)	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	Response may impact final proposal	Response does not impact final proposal	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)					
		Impacted	Not Impacted															
74	Aviation Stakeholder	No	Support	Support	Neutral		As an aviation stakeholder I accept the proposed airspace design as the least worst option if the proposed location of RPAS at Waddington and the use of airspace over Waddington for RAFAT training and displays HAS to be implemented. Waddington, as an airfield immediately adjacent to a major city, cannot be the best location for these activities. The very nature of RPAS makes them eminently suitable for operation from remote, unpopulated areas. Logically, these systems should be located accordingly, for example RAF Valley within short distance of established Danger Areas designed for UAS operations. The repetitive flying of RAFAT over a built up area during training, practice or displays must be questioned from a safety and nuisance point of view. Again, other locations more suited to these activities are available. Earlier steps of this ACP do not seem to have offered any information on Risk Assessments or a Considered Safety Case relating to the proposals. It can be argued that RPAS are inherently less safe than conventional systems until proved otherwise and RAFAT history indicates an identifiable risk of a crash involving property or persons on the ground.	See above, locate RFAT and RPAS elsewhere. This is not a NIMBY response. It is a genuine belief that other locations will meet the needs more effectively.	See above. Consider alternative locations.							X	The respondent is not supportive of the ACP, but has signalled support for the low and combined airspace design options. A neutral stance on the medium airspace design has been logged. As an aviation stakeholder this might indicate less likelihood to operate within the medium airspace design. The respondent has concerns about the suitability of operating Protector and RAFAT at RAF Waddington and has further concerns about the impact the proposed airspace may have on operations at Temple Bruer. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the RAFAT activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 10) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at Annex A. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6). The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Q12 & 13) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1,19 and further in Annex A The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of Protector at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1,14.	
98	Airspace Officer, Derbyshire Soaring Club (Aviation Stakeholder)	Unsure	Support	Support	Neutral					Our members pilot low performance soaring aircraft, without radio, or frequently, transponder capability. As such, any DACS arrangements are expected to be unavailable to us. As a result of this we are very concerned about the fact that this airspace proposal is being considered in isolation from any decision on the expected future Red Arrows practice area. If the Red Arrows retain their current practice area, unless operations of the new Waddington danger area and the Red Arrows practice area are deconflicted so they will not simultaneously be active, then there may be many days on which we have no possibility for cross country flights towards the east coast from our launch sites in the Peak District. We are therefore very interested in engaging on the operational design on this change to ensure these concerns are understood and considered.	X						The Change Sponsor notes the respondent's concerns about the use of the proposed airspace by RAFAT and Protector whilst EG R313 is still in existence. The impact of having both volumes of airspace activated at the same time is noted. How the activation of these adjacent volumes of airspace will be managed will be defined at Stage 4 of the ACP. RAFAT has provided further indications as to how the proposed airspace at RAF Waddington may be used alongside EG R313, depending on the viability of EG R313 for RAFAT practice displays. This is attached to this document. How the RAFAT airspace options will be managed will be defined at Stage 4 of the ACP.	
99	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support		The need for the RAFAT to operate over Waddington for its practice sessions are operationally, logistically and ecologically sound. Operationally the teams training would less flight time rather than practicing over another airfield. Logistically you operate one airfield which is a huge cost saving. The current view place for aircraft enthusiasts is already in place. The amount of fuel saved by not having to transit to another airfield makes sense. Planning the other activities around the winter period can be managed in on operation room										X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
100	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support		No alterations. Our armed forces need to fly.										X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
101	Director Regulations, ARPAS UK (NATMAC Organisation)	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support		N/A	N/A	N/A								X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
102	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support		None! Carry on!	N/A	N/A								X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
103	Area Planning Officer, North Westlees District Council (Local Authority Stakeholder)	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral					NKDC wishes to raise no objection to the Airspace Change Proposal and would welcome further consultation should the protected airspace, EG R313, above be withdrawn.							X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal. The decision surrounding the fate of EG R313 and subsequent consultation is outside the scope of this ACP.
104	Individual	Unsure	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral					With regard to the R313 airspace, there seem to be limited options to Scampton. I would propose the airspace over the old RAF Cottesmore airfield would be very suitable, and is retained Crown land. It is not far from Waddington for transit journeys.							X	The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Q12 & 13) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1,19 and further in Annex A. The respondent's suggestion to use the airspace over Kendrew Barracks will not be followed at this time since RAFAT's basing study scoped it out.
105	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support												X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
106	Aviation Stakeholder	Unsure	Object	Object	Object		I don't much fancy flying along coming face to face with one of these - probably armed drones. Seems crazy to me when you could fly them over the sea - Britain is after all surrounded by sea. Who will be responsible when it all goes wrong?	Yes Don't do it	Don't do it You already don't have enough pilots to fly the fast jets you have why add to the mess								X	The respondent has concerns of a moral nature regarding the operation of drones. This is outside the scope of this ACP.
107	Owner, Rectory Farm Airfield (Aviation Stakeholder)	No	Object	Object	Object		Concentration of RAFAT and remote piloted aircraft traffic at Waddington, together with the associated proposed satellite RAFAT training proposal for Syerston (ACP 2022-002) is an unreasonable burden to impose upon GA airspace users and residents in the area. It is important to realise that increasing the amount of controlled airspace to protect RAF asset activity comes at a direct cost of reduced safety for other airspace users.	It would be reasonable to look again at location for basing of remotely piloted aircraft for deployment from locations with lower airspace use than the busy N/5 transit route in the East Midlands. RAFAT jet formation display training is inappropriate overhead local populated areas and especially area Lincoln city - there would be a significant safety gain by re-deploying this activity to less densely populated area.								X	The respondent has concerns over the impact of this ACP on other airspace users and on the safety aspects of flying Protector and RAFAT at RAF Waddington and the local area. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the RAFAT activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 10) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at Annex A. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6). The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Q12 & 13) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1,19 and further in Annex A The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of Protector at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1,14. The Change Sponsor has taken steps to minimise the impact that this ACP may have on other airspace users by working hard with Protector's manufacturer to minimise the volume of airspace of the low airspace design. The provisions of a DACS will also enable activity at Rectory Farm to continue with minimal disruption.	
108	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		I oppose the proposal to fly armed drones within UK airspace due to the risk to communities and the creeping use of such vehicles for surveillance and security, which undermines our democracy and freedom. Drones have done immense harm around the world to communities in Pakistan, Yemen, Afghanistan, Somalia and elsewhere and there is not enough scrutiny about a largely secretive program that impacts negatively on the health and wellbeing of the men, women and especially children living beneath their constant presence. The proliferation of drones needs limiting, not expanding and we must not allow drones and autonomous vehicles to become a normalised presence in our airspace.	A full national debate on the subject and scrutiny as to safety measures, and the aims of the UK drone program.									X	The respondent has concerns about the operation of drones in general from a moral standpoint and has no impact on the final proposal.
109	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Object	Object		I object to the whole premise that a requirement has been identified to base RPAS at RAF Waddington. A requirement may have	Build some Family Quarters and base the engineering elements and RPAS airframes at a suitable rural coastal	Proposal? The RAFAT are already at Waddington. Ground has been broken with infra-structure already being								X	The respondent has concerns about the basing and safety of operating Protector and RAFAT at RAF Waddington.
110	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Object	Object		I object to the whole premise that a requirement has been identified to base RPAS at RAF Waddington. A requirement may have	Build some Family Quarters and base the engineering elements and RPAS airframes at a suitable rural coastal	Proposal? The RAFAT are already at Waddington. Ground has been broken with infra-structure already being								X	The respondent has concerns about the basing and safety of operating Protector and RAFAT at RAF Waddington.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N			
		Organisation / Stakeholder Type (Q4 - 7)	Support the ACP? (Q8)	Response to combined airspace design (Q9)	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Response to medium airspace design (refined Stage 2 Option 2) (Q11)	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	Response may impact final proposal		Response does not impact final proposal	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)			
											Impacted	Not Impacted					
1																	
2																	
112																	
113																	
114																	
115	Individual	No	Object	Object	Object	Object	<p>I object to this proposal as I believe it will endanger airspace users, people living and working in the immediate vicinity of RAF Waddington, and other people beyond.</p> <p>Remotely controlled aircraft are dangerous. Evidence shows that they are particularly prone to accident during take-off and landing. RAF Waddington is surrounded by housing, local businesses, a major road and a school.</p> <p>This change - which for the very first time allows large uncrewed aircraft to operate beyond visual line of sight on a regular basis - is an unnecessary risk given these aircraft will be based in a populated area.</p> <p>I also object as this change will enable large remotely controlled drones to fly within the UK before safety measures - such as properly tested and approved "Detect and Avoid" equipment - are in place.</p> <p>According to the consultation documents it is only a "working assumption" that DAA equipment will enable Protector to fly within Classes A and C airspace without restriction. At the same time, the consultation document makes clear that a proper and satisfactory argument that Protector can operate safely within the TRA has yet to be made by the Ministry of Defence.</p> <p>Separately, the Ministry of Defence have also made clear that they intend to open a training hub at RAF Waddington both for RAF crews to train on Protector but also for other international militaries to train to use similar uncrewed aircraft. While the consultation documentation suggests that Protector flights will initially be limited - with 1 or 2 aircraft in the air at any one time up to 3 times per week - this is clearly intended to grow and will inevitably increase the safety risk.</p>							X	<p>Duplicate of Serial 25 & 28 & 37 & 38 & 50 above.</p> <p>The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but has concerns about the use of drones in general, calling for a national debate on their use. This is outside the scope of this ACP. However, the respondent cautions about the safety of drones. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6).</p> <p>With regard to the "working assumption" that Protector will be able to fly in Classes A & C airspace, the Change Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in Classes A - C airspace and that this area of concern sits outside the ACP.</p> <p>Again the Change Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in an active TRA and that this area of concern sits outside the ACP.</p>		
116	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	<p>Drones are dangerous weapons of war and have no place flying over civilian residential areas. These aircraft are particularly prone to accidents during take off and landing which pose a risk to people's homes and communities. Once in the air, they pose a risk to other aircraft including civilian aircraft.</p> <p>I don't see any need for this proposal or benefit to anyone other than multinational arms companies.</p>								X	<p>The respondent has concerns about the operation of weaponised drones in general from a moral/spiritual standpoint and has no impact on the final proposal.</p>	
117	Individual	No	Object	Object	Object	Object	<p>Armed drones being used over civilian areas the U.K. should be banned. If they want to fly in military areas only, fine. At least piloted war planes are flown by pilots risking their own lives. These drones could crash Willy Nilly into civilian aircraft. Also if they malfunction and drop a missile there is no pilot to feel guilty.</p> <p>Protected airspace is not enough. First the airspace needs to be above only uninhabited areas such as the sea. Second something must be done to ensure no civilian aircraft can enter the air space by mistake. Third, there needs to be a boundary safety zone as appropriate for the missile range of the drones.</p>								X	<p>This is the second response by Respondent 90. Concerns are over (drone?) activity over inhabited areas, the safety of other aircraft and internal boundary requirements. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6).</p> <p>This response has no impact on the final proposals.</p>	
118	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Object	Object	Object	<p>MOD response to stage 3 document sent directly to the sponsor via email.</p>								X	<p>The respondent has collated comprehensive feedback from a range of internal MOD aviation stakeholders. In summary the respondent is supportive of the ACP and of the Low, Medium and Combined airspace designs. The feedback provided is being taken into consideration by the Change Sponsor during the development of ATC and operating procedures for both Protector and RAFAT at RAF Waddington. The Change Sponsor is in direct contact with the respondent and potentially impacted internal MOD stakeholders during this process. A summary of some of the salient points is included below.</p> <p>Provision of a DACS was thought to be of importance in order to effectively manage Quick Reaction Alert activity from RAF Coningsby, unplanned and planned military diversion requirements. DACS availability would alleviate potential issues with traffic funneling within the local area and would assist with military training in the Lincolnshire area and positioning for aircraft recoveries when Coningsby is using RW07. A DACS of the Medium Airspace design was thought to be a significant enabler for military instrument departures from Cranwell and for Gamston/Lichfield radar corridor access on departure and recovery as well as always joiner and leaver profiles for Cranwell aircraft. The Change Sponsor provided information on the MOD's intention to provide a DACS within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 4.1.3.</p> <p>Efficient notification of the proposed airspace was thought to be key in terms of period of notice of airspace activation as well as minimising the length of activation. It was thought that this would increase safety and enable other airspace users to plan around Protector and RAFAT activity to maximise the opportunities for obtaining crossing approvals. The Change Sponsor provided information on the MOD's intention to provide an efficient and robust notification system within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 4.1.1 and 4.1.2. The Change Sponsor is developing procedures for the management of the proposed airspace, drafts of which will be included with the ACP submission at Stage 4.</p> <p>Of particular relevance to RAFAT, the local military airspace users were keen to understand and influence RAFAT's pre-positioning procedures and emergency/break-off profiles to minimise any infringement of adjacent ATZ/MATZ airspace and to minimise the impact on local ATC patterns. The Change Sponsor has noted the suggestion of drawing up an internal MOD Service Level Agreement/Letter of Agreement between relevant units to determine priorities and develop procedures. Whilst this may not ultimately be required, the Change Sponsor will discuss this with the respondent.</p> <p>The local units were keen to understand who would be the Control Authority for the proposed airspace, the likely duration of Protector sorties, whether Protector will be allocated an RPAS-specific squawk and whether it was necessary to activate the proposed airspace for the full sortie duration of Protector. These items have all been under discussion and the local units will be advised in due course in conjunction with the Change Sponsor via the respondent. The Change Sponsor is refining and documenting procedures for the management of the proposed airspace, drafts of which will be included with the ACP submission at Stage 4. RAFAT will not use the Medium Airspace design.</p>	
119	Manager Technical and Operations, GATCO (NATMAC Organisation)	Unsure	Support	Support	Neutral	Neutral	<p>GATCO request confirmation that the medium airspace will not be used for any RAFAT or RPAS use, other than entry or exit from CAS. If the proposed medium airspace were to be used for other activities, we would like clarification that a buffer would exist and dimensions for such a buffer to provide separation from the contiguous CAS. GATCO would expect a safety argument to be developed and presented in this consultation material to show that the RPAS can remain within the danger area and therefore CAA Buffer Policy would not be required to be applied within the adjacent Lincolnshire CTAs when the danger area is activated.</p> <p>Without this safety case being presented, this proposal has a significant impact on GAT traffic flows within the Lincolnshire CTA and would impinge on traffic following ATS route L603, with traffic departing MTMA and Leeds Bradford particularly affected. This would involve tactical ATC headings in order to avoid the area and associated buffer, which would put them head on to westbound traffic following ATS route Y70 also inbound to MTMA/Leeds. This would increase Controller workload and have an impact on sector capacity, plus increase track miles for the aircraft concerned.</p> <p>If a safety argument is presented that demonstrates containment within the proposed medium airspace, then this impact would be completely mitigated.</p>									X	<p>The respondent has raised concerns regarding the operation of Protector within the Medium Airspace design and has requested clarity on how safety will be assured against traffic within the Lincs CTA. The Change Sponsor will be in direct contact with the respondent to address these items. However, the Change Sponsor is keen to confirm that work is ongoing with NATS regarding the operation of Protector within the Medium Airspace design such that acceptable mitigations may be put in place to request dispensation from the safety buffer policy. Further information on this will be included with the ACP submission at Stage 4. RAFAT will not use the Medium Airspace design.</p> <p>The MOD is completing its safety assurance associated with the introduction of both Protector and RAFAT into UK airspace in general and the Waddington area specifically. It is in close liaison of course with both the military and civilian airspace regulators as well as NATS.</p> <p>Whilst outwith the scope of the ACP, the Change Sponsor will engage directly with the respondent to address its request for information as listed under the "general considerations" tab.</p>
120	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	<p>I object to this proposal as I believe it will endanger airspace users, those living and working in the immediate vicinity of RAF</p>								X	<p>Duplicate of Serial 25 & 28 & 37 & 38 & 50 & 87 above.</p>	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K		L	M	N
1		Organisation / Stakeholder Type (Q4 - 7)	Support the ACP? (Q8)	Response to combined airspace design (Q9)	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Response to medium airspace design (refined Stage 2 Option 6) (Q11)	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q 12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	Response may impact final proposal		Response does not impact final proposal	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)	
2											Impacted	Not Impacted			
142		NATS Continued													<p>NATS also asked "if the assumption on operation within CAS can be validated, could the sponsor consider the application of other airspace constructs using Flexible Use of Airspace principles (FUA) such as a Control Area (CTA) (see Airspace Modernisation Strategy intent) above RAF Waddington to support the operation on a time bound basis? This may negate the need for segregated airspace, comply with the safety buffer policy and provide a contiguous airspace environment."</p> <p>In this regard, the Change Sponsor certainly considered the use of other airspace constructs as an option and requested feedback on the suitability of using some form of controlled airspace during Stage 2 of the ACP. The Stage 2A submission covers this at para 10. Whilst you suggest some kind of time-bounding for the promulgation of any proposed associated controlled airspace, the nature of RAFAT and Protector activity is likely to lead to unnecessary hours of activation and/or a lack in flexibility in the ability to operate the Protector capability when required. As stated in the Stage 2A submission, the most economical type of airspace to be implemented (in terms of hours of activation, access to airspace and manpower resource) would be segregated airspace in the form of a Danger Area. A Danger Area was considered to be the most suitable type of structure as the activities to be performed will not comply with rules of the air and, therefore, anything other than segregated airspace was not considered.</p>