A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н			K	L M	N
1	Organisation / Stakeholder Type (Q4 - 7)	Support the ACP?	Response to combined airspace design (Q9)	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1)	Response to medium airspace design (refined Stage 2 Option 8)	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 ma	y impact final Response do not impact final propos	es : Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification al (You said, we did)
1	CEO, British Helicopter Association	Yes	Strongly Support	(Q10) Strongly Support	(Q11) Strongly Support	The BHA supports this ACP and requires no alterations				Impacted	Not Impacted X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.
3 4 2	(NATMAC Organisation) 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 Vulan 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.
6 ₄ 7 ₅	Individual Individual	Yes Yes	Strongly Support Strongly Support	Strongly Support Strongly Support	Strongly Support Strongly Support						X X	Response of support for ACP with no further comments. Response of support for ACP with no further comments.
8 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	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.		х	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.
9							for years remember the mid air collision over the village of Wethon involving RAFAT. Another crashed on finals for Runway 21, for fortunately not fortun and. With the Wandington 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 familles heads. RAF Barkston Heath or RAF Syerston would, in my opinion be much safer locations for EGR313.					Information on the safety assurance of RAFAT activity was provided within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FADs 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 manneuvring and training will occur directly overhead the WAD airfield boundary itself and mostly to the East in the least built up part of the airgoace. The larger villages of stranton and first-exhiging theath are on the edges of the aerobatic loss and will seldom see aerobatic overflight below 500ft. Aerobatic flight below 500ft will not occur to the West of the airfield where the more BUAR exist (hykeham, South Lincoln etc.). RAF Barkson 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.
8	Individual Individual	Yes	Strongly Support Strongly Support	Strongly Support 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	Response of support for ACP with no further comments. 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
11									pers van de negeu			sporoso does not united to the class when the reporteding a suggestion, the time of the possibility of publishing alrepace times to be published on a daily basis. The Change Sponsor considered the possibility of publishing alrepace 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/publid up of traffic on A15 is increased. This is partly why display practice times were never published at Scampton.
12 9	Chief Flying Instructor, York	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	 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. 	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	Х		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
	Gliding Centre (Aviation Stakeholder)						In the strong suggestion in the Options Appraisal is that RAFAT may use the low airspace design around functitime 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 a lighters that cannot be sure when they set off off their exact arrival time at each waypoint as this is dependent on meteroological 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 brezee fronts will 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 "funchtime," practices by RAFAT over Waddington appears to be the entertainment of dignitaries and commercial partners. This is an inadequate justification for repearatings refer through continuous of airspace users. The RAF	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.	to be privileged in the disposal process. West Undersp District Council is exercising its right to be considered first and has identified the operation 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 stress. These include a wint to see the arried for remain open as an arriedit, for EG 1331 or remain validable to RAFAT and the preferencing of proposals that provide a visitor centre for the Red Arrows that would facilitate corporate and YIP 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 £G 313 continue to be available to RAFAT, the elements of the			users. In response RAFAT has provided further indications as to how the proposed airspace at RAF Waddington may be used alonguide EG R313, depending on the validity of SE 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 DAGS 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 the provision of an ATIS facility, for the provision of an ATIS facility of the schenical result of the Stone and the state of the schenical result of the Stone activation of an ATIS facility.
							and commercial partners. In its is an anaequiate justimation for jeoparating steept protogo corrusion or airspace users. In eva- must decide whether to use the Waddington practice area; be Kamption 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 plots, especially set danger area is likely to be activated from time to time at weekends. We note that ATC will only be staffed		we would use to see public assurances that, shoold be stated on the Art, the elements of the ACP that relate to accommodating BAFAT 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.			tecninica, regulatory and n.t. workload reasons, the provision of a useful n Is to discoactat real-time status of the proposed airspace is not considered possible. The MOD investigated the provision of such a service during the SysGuardian 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/overload point of view and, therefore, has flight safely implications (RAF Waddington ATC has conducted a safety assessment into the amount of information that can safely and accurately be uploaded for transmission six ATS). However, Waddington Rafard will provide a DAMS and DACS on the Waddington LARS
13 10	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support		when the danger area is activated making the confirmation of 'cold' status difficult at other times. Across the areas commonly from the plots from Rufforth West (rots (diding centre), we note sporatic provision of air traffic services when RAR 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.				x	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 DAAIS on 124.6MHz. Response of support for ACP with no further comments for consideration.
						also under the flight path into RAF Waddington. I have lived with Vulcans, AWACS 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.						
14 15	Director, AP Alarms	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support						Х	Response of support for ACP with no further comments.
12	& CCTV Ltd 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?				х	The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington. This can be found in the FAGs 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 13	Individual	No Yes			Strongly Object	Local infrastructure such acreade and rurks wave	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 practises See above for infrastructure. Equally, accommodation for new staff may need to be considered in the light of		×	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 FAGs 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 FAGs 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 Indiponse Appraisal which is on the CAA CAP Portal. The Change Sponsor also provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington. This can be found in the Indiponse Appraisal which is on the CAA ACP Portal. The Change Sponsor also provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington. This can be found in the Indiponse Appraisal which is on the CAA ACP Portal. Response of support for ACP with suggestion for consideration of infrastructure requirements, which is out of
14	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.		×	Response of support for ACP with suggestion for consideration of infrastructure requirements, which is out of scope for the ACP.
20 21 15 22	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 have	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			х	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-
43		ı		i .	i .	1	frequently flown over Harmston village at heights well below 500 ft. This is in contravention of CAA airspace procedures for	not built up and would reduce the risk to life to the public, when compared to RAF Waddington. The argument	1		L	flying and displaying over built up areas (BUAs), additional aircraft noise, concerns about increased traffic

А	В	C	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K	L	M	N
1 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)		nay impact final oposal Not Impacted	Response does not impact final proposal	s Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)
24							Waddington there is a strong likelihood of these occurrences at an increased frequency which will adversely affect the reputation of the RARFAT and RAF a targe. The RAFAT presence will incur additional aircraft noise in the local area around RAF Waddington. Will the RAF provide for additionally (Triple) glazing to local residents - specifically tramston where I live? Additionally, the presence of the RAFAT will attract numerous aircraft enthuisats to the locality who will part their cars on the local rada and surrounding estates thus causing a nutsance to local residents and result in nod congestion. There would be an increase in the risk of a road traffic accident on the AGP and ALS as drivers could be distracted by two 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 the either the Senior or Operational Duty Holder of the RAFAT. We will such that the RAFAT Duty Holder personally if any of my family or property are adversely affected following an incident caused by the RAFAT.	bordering the aerodrome.					congestion and road safety associated with RAFAT at RAF Waddington and the suggestion to relocate EG R313 ways from RAF Waddington. Information on the safety assurance of RAFAT activity was provided within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAGA page upplaced for 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 overlight. The majority of the aerobatic manoeuving and training will occur directly overhead the WAD airded boundary itself and mostly to the East in the least built up and r0 the airspace. The larger villages of Branaton and Braceloting Heath are on the eights of the earobatic box and will seldom see aerobatic overlight below 500ft. Aerobatic flight below 500ft will not occur to the West of the aerifed where the more BLAs exist lythekam, South Lincole etc.) In addition RAFAT confirm that there would be no aerobatic overlight below 500ft of Harmston as the village is located just outside the main displays area taff a 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; seep area 5.1, 5.9.1 & 5.9.4). More information can be found in the Full Options Apparisal which is on the CAAACP 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 studies better for all RAFAT training programme due to its Sociation in the Trent Valley Transit Area. This limits its use to the quieter winter months only. Also, to minimise the impact on local avaitation, RAFAT will look to minimise its use to that which is deemed essential. As Syerston is a runway which is required for Synchro-Pair training, they will focus on using it over the main formation. Also, it has limited verti
25 16	CFI, 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.	If the MOD could keep all but essential activity above 5000ft Then GA aviation would have space for various operations.	If the MOD can consolidate operation days for efficiency. This would leave more time for other to engage in their evarious activates. With the benefit that the MOD would be making itself more efficiency minded.	x			The respondent's concerns are largely with regard to access to the airspace by other airspace users in the vicinity of ARF Waddington as well as the potential for RAFAT or train in alternative locations. Both of these areas for concern have been covered in the consultation material and do not impact the final proposals. The change Sponsor has considered the respondent's concerns about the potential for both the proposed airspace at Waddington and 66 R331 to be activated 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 6 R313, deepending on the viability of 6E R313 for RAFT practice (splays. This is attached to this document, but in summary there will be no requirement for the proposed airspace at Waddington and EG R3131 to be activated on the same day for RAFAT activity. Freefore, a DACF through one or the other should be approved (dependent on any other conflicting airspace activity, of course). The Change Sponsor provided information on the MOD's options to use alternative locations for RAFAT artising within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citten Space portal (see Questions 13 & 14). The design principle "Minimise the impact to other airspace users" was afforded joint 3rd priority in Stage 1 of the ACP and the Change Sponsor so provided information on the mechanism to be in place to minimise the impact on other airspace users within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 4.1. The suggestion to keep all but essential MOD flying activity above 5000ft is outside the scope of this ACP.
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 dianger. 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.			х	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).
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			х	The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but has concerns about the use of drones in general. There is a note of caution about the safety of drones. The Change Sponcy 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).
19 30 31	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 thriain, specially over urban areas. But anywhere as there are people living in rural areas. I am also aware that the larger drone with 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.			х	The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but has concerns about the use of diones in general. There is a note of caution about the safety of diones. The Change Spongor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the PAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6).
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	Don't do it.				х	The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but has concerns about the use of armed drones in the UK.
21	Aviation Stakeholder	r No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		Britain Tim a paraglider pilot. It will be almost impossible to fly any long cross country flights if this proposal goes ahead. Derbythire and the Peaks are THE place in the UK to fly from for many people simly due to centres of population. Derbythire is the biggest and most active dub in the country. We are already very affected by Manchester, Britingham 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 Anglia. Practicing acrobatics 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.	Fly off shore or NE of Waddington				х	The respondent's concerns are largely with regard to access to the airspace by other airspace users in the vicinity of RAF Waddington as well as the potential for RAFAT to train in alternative locations. Both of these areas for concern have been covered in the consultation material and do not impact the final proposals. The Change Sponsor provided information on the MOD's options to use alternative locations for RAFAT training within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FADs age uploaded to the Cittles Pages portal (see Questions 18.8 t.gl). The design principle "Minimise the impact to other airspace users' was afforded joint 3rd priority in Stage 1 of the ACP and the Change Sponsor is committed to make most efficient use of the proposed segregated airspace. The Change Sponsor so provided information on the mechanism to be in place to minimise the impact on other airspace users within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 4.1.
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	Not app, unable	None	Controlled access for residents to appreciate the operations on the base			х	The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but is supportive of the basing of RAFAT and Protector at Waddington .
23	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	with such history	It is one more step toward Armageddon. The USA is pushing the whole world into world war 3. It already, effectively, controls	No.	And the return of the WADDINGTON AIRSHOW No.			х	The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but has concerns about the use of
35	Chair KESTEVEN	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Do not sopport due to the proposal being some 5nm	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 armsed forces have ever inclustaged have been on foreign soil. Even www. was initiated on behalf of Empire and resulted directly from the Treaty of Versailles. We oppose this does to the proposal below gower flev to six nautical miles out.	Reduce the distance of the no fly zone, 5nm is a very long way out!	Have you considered members of the public riding horses and dog walkers if you are going to be carrying out low	x			armed drones globally. The Change Sponsor contacted the respondent prior to the Consultation drop in events to draw attention to the
36	MODEL FIVERS (Aviation Stakeholder)					out and down to ground level.	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 7.50K and above 400th as per article 16 with the 8MFA. The Options 18.2 finish right on our flying limit and so in theory would allow us to continue winhindered, but it does raise safety questions if something did go wome, and we found a model in your self-imposed on fly sone! Options 18.2 finish right on our flying altogether! We feel this is totally unacceptable! Or our sopion 78.8 as are the options that can out affects up, only softent then only sone 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 finging hours have been set up to allow for our neighbour to go out riding. Our location is: What three woods, diverged duos surreal \$3.000730, 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. Richal Regards.	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.	level flying operations?				fact that the MOD had rejected all but the SMM radius option, consulting on a single airspace design option instead that would not unduly impact the Skreven Model Flyers. Woodington ATC to working on a letter of agreement to enable Kesteven and other locally situated BMFA club's activity to operate with minimal disruption. The respondent was murth relieved and did not feel it necessity to attend either of the live events. The suggestion regarding a stepped airspace design had been considered by the Change Sponsor during Stage 2 but not take forward due to Protector's flight profile when conducting automatic take-off and inding primarily. There had also been some stakeholder feedback which expressed a desire to keep the airspace design simple. The Change Sponsor notes the respondent's comment about consideration for the welfare of humans and animals with regard to low flying aircraft. As part of the regulation process laid down in CAP1516, the Change Sponsor is required to consider any impact on ones as a consequence of the airspace change. The Change Sponsor provided information on the impact of noise by both RARAT and Protector activity within the consultation material. This can be found in the Consultation Document tissue 1 (see paras 5.1, 5.9.1 & 5.9.4). More information can be found in the Polytons Appraisal which is on the CAA ACP Portal.
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			t	Х	The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but has concerns about the use of

	A B	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K	L M	N
1	Organisation Stakeholder Ty (Q4 - 7)	Support the ACP?	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 in propos		Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)
2					(44.7)		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 lime allows large uncrewed aircraft to operate beyond visual line of sight on a regular basis — to be based in a populated area. 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. According to the consultation documents it is only a "working assumption" that DAA equipment will enable Protector to fly within Classes A and Cairspace 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 training hub at RAF Waddington both for RAF Crevas to train on Protector but a last for other international millitaries to train to use similar uncrewed aircraft. While the consultation documentation suggests that Protector Eights 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 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 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 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 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 a	opening UK skies to BVLOS drones.				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 Constitution 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 fify in Classes A. & Cairspace, the Change Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in Classes A. C. Cairspace 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 rare 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.
20												
39 26 40 41	(Aviation Stakeholder)	No	Object	Strongly Object	Neutral		Alrepace user below 500th not considered: We already have a restriction area for 5km at runway ends and 3km at sides which has been safely protecting existing operations with includes the Ambusopter etc. The proposed area includes many large populated areas of the Lincoin City and surrounding villages so the 500th and below area for 518m Diameter will affect those alrespace users and the 1500th cut to 18m by 1.5mm will affect those alrespace users and the 1500th cut to 18m by 1.5mm will affect to 18mm part of 18mm and	ow level flying over these large populated villages and the City of Lincoln should be minimized to, Take-off and		х		The respondent is a BMFA member and attended one of the consultation drop in sessions where his concerns were discussed with a MOD representative. Waddington ATC is in the process of drawing up a letter of agreement to enable other locally situated BMFA club/members activity to operate with minimal disruption.
43 27 44 28	Individual Individual	No No	Object Strongly Object	Object Strongly Object	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 lake eff and lending. ARF Waddington is surrounded by housing, local businesse, 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 not a regular basis — to be based in a populated area. 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. According to the consultation documents it is only a "working assumption" that DAA equipment will enable Protector to fly within Classes A and Cairspace without restriction. At the same time, the consultation document makes clast risk are 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 go one a training hub at ARA Waddington both for RAG creas to train on Protector to that shot protecting flats will intellige be interested aircraft. While the consultation obscure that or Protector flats will intellige be interested aircraft. While the consultation obscure that or Protector flats will intellige be intelligent to the six object to this change as it will allow large remotely controlled drones to fly within the UK on a regular basis without proper national debate about the use of these systems or assessment of the wider risks of opening UK skies to BVLOS drones.				X X	No content other than objection Duplicate of Serial 25 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 FAGs 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 studied the ACP. Smillarly, 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 that 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 derives the respondent to the detail provided in response to Stakeholder No 106 in this table for amplification on these areas A722.
45 29	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	N/A	It have recently moved to the area, knowing there is an operating air base nearby which is fine. However having previously lived near where the red arrows practice the noise is unbearable. If work a mixture of early/late/qilet shifts, and the practicing the air space nearby will disrupt my sleep when sleeping during the day. Even with windows shut the noise will still manage to disrupt this and will have an effect on me and my work. The airspace for them to practice should be as far away as possible to residential properties to manage the noise pollution caused by the aircraft's. Take off and landing noise, is quick and over within a couple of seconds however practice noise is constant.	N/A	Do not approve air space for practicing.		x	The Change Sponsor has noted the respondent's concerns about aircraft noise, As part of the regulatory process laid down in CAP1516, 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 RART 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.
48 30	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support						X	No further content other than Support
49	individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		Heighington has had AWACS for years, finally having a beak from the constant roaring. The airspace should not be redesigned for a new nulsance for the substantial population that lives here.	using less well populated areas le not over or near avoidable villages.			×	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 RAAT and Protector activity within the consultation material. This can be found in the Consultation Occument Issue 1 (see paras 5.1, 5.5.1 & 5.9.4). More information can be found in the full Options Appraisal which is on the CAA ACP Portal.
32 50		Yes	Support	Neutral	Support	I operate UAS commercially. In function, with current ER 8133 and RF2 of Waddington & Sampton, fiving is limited without coordination with Waddington/Sampton ATCs. If EG 8131 remains operational, activation of the lower singase at RAF Waddington S mm radius should be active by NOTAM so that more alispace isn't restricted for UAS flights.		Propose that low airspace is active by NOTAM when required and that access to airspace for UAS flight (for commercial jobs) is still granted with coordination with Waddington ATC			x	The respondent has concern over gaining access to the proposed low airspace design and requests that it only be activated when it is required, using the NOTAM system. This was stated as being the case in the Consultation material as below so does not impact the final proposal. The design principle "Minimize the Impact to other airspace users" was afforded joint 3rd priority in Stage 1 of the ACP and the Change Sponsor is committed to make most efficient use of the proposed segregated airspace. The Change Sponsor also provided information on the mechanisms to be in place to minimize the impact on other airspace users within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at part a.1 (In particular para 4.1 2 pagericlift that the airspace will be activated by NOTAM) as well as in the FAQ page on the Citteen Space portal (see Q3).
51 33	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		Too much noise and pollution. They're not essential by any means. The Red Arrows are a flying circus without Monty Python. If they have to practise do it over the North Sea, but they're an anachronism and need retiring. Pointiess disruption to local residents.	Stop having planes flying in circles round and round for hours. The noise has increased enormously in the past month. Why? 'd love RAF Waddington to be closed. Noise pollution. Air pollution.	RAF Waddington makes local residents more of a target. Increasing its use makes this worse.		x	The respondent has concerns over the existence of RAF Waddington in general and about aircraft noise in the local area in particular. The former area for concern sits outside the scope of the ACP. 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 winthis the consultation material. This can be found in the Change Sponsor provided in the Change of the Change Sponsor provided in the Change of the Change
52 53 34	Individual	No		Strongly Object	Strongly Object		I do not support additional aircraft flying over the local area for noise reasons. I also do not support the increasing use of military drones.				х	The respondent has concerns over the use of drones in general and about aircraft noise in the local area in particular. The former area for concern sits outside the scope of the ACP. As 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 RAPAT and Protector activity within the consultation material. This can be found in the Consultation Document Issue I (see pares 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.
55 35	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		I object to this proposal because I think it will prove too dangerous for both airspace users and people on the ground in the affected area. Dones are unreliable, and the fact that they are unmanned creates a fig repater risk than with other aircraft. Safety measures are not in place for these large drones, and we have not been able to have a national debate concerning the use of them in our sike. A child in Pakistan is reported as saying, "I like cloudy days because the drones can't fly." Where they are used in other parts of the world, drones are threatening and create anxiety for innocent people, including children. We should not be doing that to anyone, not least the people of the UK.		No.		x	The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but has concerns about the use of discones 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).

	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	н	I	Ţ.	К	L	М	N
					Response to low	Response to						y impact final	Response does	s
1		rganisation / seholder Type	Support the ACP?	Response to combined airspace	airspace design	medium airspace design (refined	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q 12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	pro	posal	not impact	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification
		(Q4 - 7)	(Q8)	design (Q9)	(Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Stage 2 Option 8) (Q11)					Impacted	Not Impacted	final proposal	l (You said, we did)
36	Aviatie	ion Stakeholder 1	No	Object	Support	Strongly Object		The medium airspace design, if a danger area, as contiguous with adjacent controlled airspace, would require civil traffic to be vectored away from it, including proximity to the the eisting Doncaster's Dir route to the east. This would be wholy unacceptable as any new change should not force changes upon third parties. If the design is controlled airspace, clearance will require to be issued, and if this is not by the relevant authority for esisting adjacent airspace then procuedures would be required to enable state operations in the meantime of which there is no merchion. Saing availability of a clearance, the assumption would text the military controller would take 5' or operate in accordance with existing SCP in this area. However, given the medium option is above FLUD and all other traffic should be transponder equipped in this region, there should be no requirement for any medium airspace here at all.	operations for Protector clearly provides ample availability for sharing with RAFAT and this should therefore be	Closing and moving R313 to the new proposed site would provide additional flexibility to outbound egzc traffic routing to the west. At there would be a combined requirement for any new area for RAFAT and Protector, waddington should also expect increased requirement to potentially work egyd inbound training traffic depending on arrival direction.	x			The Change Sponsor has considered the type of airspace to be proposed as outlined in the consultation material (see Q2 in FAQ pages on Citzens Space portal). Working with National Air Traffic Services (NATS), the Change Sponsor aims to sensue that the application of the CAR Special Use Arspace —Safety Buffer Policy for Airspace Design Purposes (dated 22 August 2014) can be met with suitable mitigations for Protector's operation both within the low and medium airspace edispins, without the requirement for vib traffic to be vectored away. The Change Sponsor has considered the applicability of other airspace constructs in place of Danger Areas. The Stage 2A submission, which can be found on the CAAR CPP portal, covern this ap para 10. As Stated in the Stage 2A submission, which can be found on the CAAR CPP portal, covern this ap para 10. As Stated in the Stage 2A submission, which can be found on the CAAR CPP portal, covern this appara 10. As Stated in the Stage 2A submission, which can be found on the CAAR CPP portal, covern this appara 10. As Stated in the Stage 2A submission, which can be found on the CAAR CPP portal, covern this of a Danger Area. The Change Sponsor has considered the respondent's concerns about the potential for RAAT to activate more than one piece of suggregated/restricted airpace simulateneously and the inspect this could than on the airpace to the carbon of the Carbon CPP portal coverns about the potential for RAAT at schiate to this document, but in summary there will be no requirement for the airpace at Waddington and 65 8313 to be activated on the same day for RAAT activity. Therefore, a DACS through one or the other should be approved. Now the RAAT airspace options will be managed will be defined at Stage 4 of the ACP. The respondent also makes comment about the air traffic management of local military traffic patterns. This is outside the scope of the ACP, although it could be noted that with the establishment of the Terminal Air Traffic Control Centre (TATCC) at RAF Coningsby, a mor
37	Individ	dual	No	Strongly Object	Neutral	Strongly Object		I am a local resident and the increase in noise pollution causes by the aircraft is too much. I work from home and the noise interrupts meetings regularly and makes it impossible to hold a conversation.	Move the active airbase to Scampton or another base away from civilians. Or make the air craft silent.	No			х	Duplicate of Serial 25 & 28 above.
								interrupts meetings regularly and makes it impossible to loval a context atoms. It is distributed that the context area to collaboration and are a family. It disturbs children's naps and upsets them. The noise continues long after the aircraft have gone and resonates in the area because of how low they are flying whisti coming into to land.						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 romes. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAGs page uploaded to the Citten Space poral (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's No 10 in this
58 59 38	Individ	dual 1	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 aire dangerous and evidence shows that they are particularly prone					х	table for amplification on these areas. Duplicate of Serial 25 & 28 & 37 above.
								to accident during take-off and landing. RAP 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 unnerwed aircraft to possible byond visual line of sight on a regular basis — to be based in a populated area. I also object as this change will enable large remotely controlled drones to fif within the UK before 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 fily 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 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 west— this is clearly intended to grow and this will investibly be limited — with 1 or 2 aircraft in the air at any one time up to 3 times per west— this is clearly intended to grow and this will envitably for increase the safety riversal envis and any any and the proper national debate about the use of these systems or assessment of the wider risks of opening UK skies to BVLOS drones						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 FAGs 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. 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.
60 39	Aviatic	ion Stakeholder 🤋	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	N/a	of the motor etc. While selecting where to base the military areas already suitable would, I assume make more sense?	impressive, maybe it is time to remove them. Also, thet are not an essential military activity, so should be considered in the same way a private club would apply?	No			x	The respondent has concerns about the accessibility of the proposed airspace whilst he is flying his paramotor. The design principle "Minimise the impact to other airspace users' was afforded joint 3rd priority in Stage 1 of the ACP and the Change Sponsor is committed to make most efficient use of the proposed segregated airspace. The Change Sponsor slop crowided information on the mechanisms to be in place to minimise the impact on other airspace users within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document issue 1.0 at para 4.1 The respondent also has concerns about the basing of RAFAT and Protector at RAF Waddington. The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAGa page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see C12 & 313) and was published within the Consultation Document issue 1.0 at para 1.13 and further in Annex A.1 and addition the Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of Protector at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation focument issue 1.0 at para 1.13 and further in Annex A.1 and addition the Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of Protector at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Concurned tissue 1.0 at para 1.14. The final concern (categorisation of RAFAT) is outside the scope of this ACP.
62	Individ	r dual r	No Tolerand	Object	Object	Object		In Section 5 of the consultation document it states "that there will be no change to noise or air pollution for local communities as result of this singuace change." The RAFT doesn't currently operate/practicle in airspace over Waddingtons so how can their be true? Moreover, in Section 5.9.1 it states "Noise." The Change Sponsor has assessed that the proposed change will not result in an increase in the number of aircraft operating in the local sera, now will the aircraft types be altered. Therefore, the same amount and type of noise is likely to impact the local population as is currently the case. Why is it that the Sponsor is "only responsible for assessing the consequential environmental impact on civil air traffic." (Options Appraials Section 5.1)? Can the Sponsor therefore state why the training and operation of the Red Arrows is not considered an addition over and above current Base movements: they are not operating/practising overhead Waddington now or in my area? It shere an assumption being made by the Sponsor that RAAT operations are exactly the same as the routine departures and arrivals currently operating from RAF Waddington? In support of the above, I note that Section 4.6b states a potential for "3-6 display practises per day". That doesn't happen here now!					x	CAP 1616 specifies (at para 842) that for proposals sponsored by the Ministry of Defence, the environmental impacts that are a direct result of military aircraft or military operations (including cull aircraft carrying out military function under contract) are not required to be considered or assessed. However, consequential environmental impacts from other airgapec users (i.e. civil valiation) that are a result of the proposed change must be assessed. For example, if the proposed change is likely to have an effect upon General Aviation activity and/or traffic patterns, the environmental impacts from that effect (such as noise) need to be appropriately considered and assessed and reflected in consultation material. The Change Sponsor has complied with the regulation outlined in CAP 1616 Appendix B paras 842 - 843 (page 163) and assessed the consequential effects of the proposed airspace on civil traffic. Noise created by the Protector or RAFAT activity does not need to be assessed.
63	Individ	dual	Yes	Strongly Support	Neutral	Object		You should have the freedom to do what you need to do without objection, if people don't like it, they can move.	As long as the air ambulance can operate its fine	No, go for it.			х	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has only one concern regarding the ability for the air ambulance to be able to operate efficiently. The letter of agreement between Helimed and Waddington ATC is being reviewed by the relevant stakeholders to accommodate procedures to minimise the impact on air ambulance operations.

А	В	С	D	F	F	G	н	1	1	К	1	M	N
 				Pares :	Response to				·	Response ma	y impact final		
1	Organisation / Stakeholder Type	Support the ACP?	Response to combined airspace	Response to low airspace design	medium airspace design (refined	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q 12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	pro		Response does not impact	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification
	(Q4 - 7)	(Q8)	design (Q9)	(Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Stage 2 Option 8)	Anterdations to improve the Proposition (Q 12)	Explanation of Objection to Fropositi (423)	Troposed integrations of Ancientons to the Troposis (424)	Central Considerations (Q23)	Impacted	Not Impacted	final proposal	(You said, we did)
2	Individual				(Q11)			Use a base near the coast, test over the north sea	All of the above	impacteu	Not impacted		
42	individual	NO	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		The droning noise that drones emit when sat in our garden or just being out and about in North Hykeham. There is absolutely no reason for all these extra flights taking off from a heavily populated area. Extra Red Arrow, AWACS(or	Ose a base near the coast, test over the north sea	All of the above			^	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
							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						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.
							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!						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.
64	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	I fully support all design stages, whilst there shall				1		×	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
65		[-		эррог		certainly be some changes to the area both							
66 44	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	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.
45	Individual	Yes	Support	Support	Support	Would like to ensure that all major roads along the perimeter have double yellows to prevent persons		reduce unless absolutely necessary flying in the night time hours 2200-0600hrs				х	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
	1					stopping to view the red arrows practicing on the live highways (A608 A15) much they same as was							Comments about road traffic safety and the minimising of night flying have been noted and will be passed to RAF Waddington for information.
						outside Scampton to ensure safety of other road							
67						users.							
46	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							Х	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
68	Aviation Stakeholder	r Yes	Support	Support	Support							X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
69 70 48	Individual	Vac	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							Y	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
49	Pointon and Boston Aviation Club	Yes	Support	Support	Support	At the Lincolnshire Air Users Group I asked the						X	Whilst the respondent's concerns do not specifically impact the final proposal, the Change Sponsor has passed the
	(Aviation					question concerning the transit height for the RAFAT Syerston and Donna Nook. The member							concern regarding light aircraft operating in the North Coates area to RAFAT for consideration.
	Stakeholder)					representing RAFAT advised me it would be between 500 and 1500ft. For most pilots flying from Boston							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.
						or Pointon it should provide little problem, more than enough time to climb above this altitude. I							RAFAT would always promulgate usage of Donna Nook via NOTAM 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
						cannot comment on the reaction of those based at							and/or warned local users of a practice display at Donna Nook. RAFAT would always ring North Coates before take-
						North Coates. When I do visit North Coates, it is very close to the boundary of Donna Nook and may be							off to confirm timings.
71						problematic to achieve adequate altitude for adequate separation.							
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	No.	No.			Х	Duplicate of Serial 25 & 28 & 37 & 38 above.
							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						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.
							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						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
							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						uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6).
							up to 3 times per week – this is clearly intended to grow and this will inevitably increase the safety risk.						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
72													table for amplification on these areas.
51	Director, Drone Wars (Aviation	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.get/drone-crash-database/). While to some the use of remote-controlled UAVs.					Х	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.
	Stakeholder)						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						The design principle "Provide a safe environment for airspace users including consideration of the risk to life of
	1						review of military drones crashes', June 2019, Available at www.dronewars.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/DW-Accidents-						those on the ground during RAFAT display practices" remains the number one priority for MOD in delivering this
	1						WEB.pdf)						airspace change.
	1						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						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).
							as 'lost link'), engine failure (often due to oil or coolant loss), weather problems (including lighting 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						- 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
							phase. We believe these proposed flights will endanger both airspace users and those living and working in the immediate						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
							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						Protector and RAFAT activities in the Full Options Appraisal (see para 6) which can be found on the CAA ACP Portal.
							visual line of sight on a regular basis – to be based in a populated area.						Specifically this document touches on the limited DAA capability that Protector will be equipped with when introduced into the UK.
							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						With regard to the "working assumption" that Protector will be able to fly in Classes A & C airspace, the Change
							decade without a need to operate from RAF Waddington. While it may be more convenient for the RAF to locate Protector at						Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in Classes A - C airspace and
							Waddington along with other crewed ISTAR aircraft, other more remote locations may well prove to offer less risk given the safety record of large UAVs.						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
							We also object to this proposal as this change will enable large remotely controlled drones to fly within the UK before						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.
							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						The respondent has concerns about a potential increase in the number of flights by RPAS at RAF Waddington if 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.						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
							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						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
							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						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.
73		ļ					mistakes, leading to accident. 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.						
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.		Ensure that the landing approach route for the RAFAT team go around the village and not over it!	+		х	The respondent has concerns about the final approach path taken by some aircraft (including RAFAT) to land on
							This is down to the fact that the larger aircraft previously operated from RAF Waddington go around the Branston village between Heighington and Washingborough. Having seen RAFAT and all of the smaller aircraft descend onto the approach -						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.
75							there appears to be a lack of consideration of local vilages as they "cut the corner@, and transit directly over the villages. Therby I object						
76 ⁵³	Supporter of Drone	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		Tobleton drones are a danger to civilians, are the beginning of perpetual warfare and do not reach the proposed target in most					х	The respondent has concerns about the operation of drones in general from a moral standpoint and has no impact
	I Wats UK					•	11.0353.			•			ron ure man of 0605df.

А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K	L	M	N
				Response to low	Response to					Response r	nay impact final	Response de	PK.
1	Organisation / Stakeholder Type	Support the ACP?	Response to combined airspace	airspace design	medium airspace design (refined	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q 12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	pr	oposal	not impact	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification
	(Q4 - 7)	(Q8)	design (Q9)	(Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Stage 2 Option 8)					Impacted	Not Impacted	final proposa	al (You said, we did)
2	Individual	la.	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	(Q11)			The operation of the Red Arrows cannot realistically be described as essential military activity.	The RAF Aerobatic Team currently use an extraordinarily large amount of diesel fuel and chemical dyes to produce	Impueteu	Not impacted		The respondent has concerns about the environmental impact of RAFAT. Since RAFAT is moving its display flying
54	Individual	NO	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Support			The operation of the Red Arrows cannot realistically be described as essential military activity.	the smoke trails during displays. This is in addition to the jet fuel that is burnt in the engines.			×	training activity from RAF Scampton to RAF Waddington, no additional flying is anticipated from RAFAT and,
									A freedom if information request (Ref, 2019/02712) dated 29 Mar 2019 describes the team using 643,000 litres or				therefore, the comment does not impact the final proposal.
									diesel and 36,000 litres of dye to produce the smoke trails during the financial year 2017/2018.				However, RAFAT has provided the following response which will also be forwarded to the respondent individually. "Diesel is used primarily for flight safety but also adds to the visual spectacle of a display. This diesel is, however,
									Most other aerobatic display teams have switched to non toxic aerobatic smoke oils which are more				atomised when injected into the hot exhaust gases. Coloured dye is only used later in training due to cost, and then
									environmentally friendly. However, the red arrows continue to use diesel. From experience of living close to RAF Scampton the diesel oil smoke vapour coats all surfaces with an oily film and can be smelt in the air when practice				for actual displays. It is not routinely used for the majority of training. The RAF takes its responsibilities in the area of sustainability very seriously. The Chief of the Air Staff has set the
									displays are taking place.				RAF the ambitious challenge of being climate change resilient and net-zero by 2040, with all indications pointing towards a requirement to get ahead of this at the earliest opportunity.
									When are the Red Arrows planning to update their smoke apparatus to provide a (slightly) less environmentally				The Red Arrows display team fall within the RAF boundary and in direct response to the climate challenge, the team are actively working towards a reduced, or neutral, carbon footprint.
									damaging display?				•Engaging with the RAF's Rapid Capabilities Office, industry partners and academia, work is currently taking place
													to reduce their carbon emissions and positively contribute toward the RAF's drive towards net-zero target. The Red Arrows carry out world-class displays at home and overseas, showcasing the excellence of the Royal Air
													Force and representing the United Kingdom. Shaping these performances, carried out since 1965, has been a culture of innovation – the journey towards a more sustainable output is a continuation of that pioneering spirit
													and this work is underway.
77	1												
55	Aviation Stakeholder	r No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		Point 1 safety case	Options 1 Done Integration.				×	The respondent champions the requirement for a "safety case" and is supportive of the airspace modernisation strategy, both of which the Change Sponsor is aware and supports. The Change Sponsor assumes that the
							From CAP1818	2. Relocation to an existing MOD site in day Scotland or Wales.		Ī			respondent is solely concerned with the "integration" of Protector into UK airspace and is not concerned with the RAFAT activity at RAF Waddington.
							a. No part of a current functional system may be changed until a valid safety case exists that shows that the safety risk will be						
	1						acceptable according to valid risk criteria for the change.						Whilst it is believed that the respondent's comments regarding drone integration have no impact on the final proposal, the Change Sponsor makes the following points for clarification.
							b. A safety case is: "a structured argument, supported by a body of evidence that provides a compelling, comprehensible and valid case that a [functional] system is safe for a given application in a given operating environment".						As per Military Aviation Authority (MAA) regulations, the MOD is developing a Protector Air System Safety Case (ASSC).
							The purpose of the impact analysis is to identify all POSSs whose existing assurance (arguments and evidence that their			Ī			However, it is useful to distinguish between policy decisions, such as those made by the CAA, MAA and the Department for Transport and the MOD's responsibilities as the sponsor of an ACP. The Change Sponsor must
							The purpose of the impact analysis is to identify all POSSs whose existing assurance (arguments and evidence that their specifications are trustworthy) will be invalidated by the change, and hence establish the Scope of the change (see below).						comply with current policy and regulation relating to the activity to be undertaken, which it does. It is quite beyond
							The purpose of the safety case is to convince the Service Provider that the proposed change will be safe and to communicate the			Ī			both the Change Sponsor's control and the scope of this ACP to effect change in regulation or policy. Protector will be operated in accordance with MAA Regulatory Article (RA) 2320 – Role Specific requirements for RPAS, which
							reasons for that belief to an interested stakeholder e.g. directors and senior management, regulator, judicial review or court.						states that Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS) operations should either employ an appropriately approved Detect And Avoid (DAA) capability to enable compliance with the Rules of the Air appropriate to the class of airspace, or
							Point 2 airspace modernisation			Ī			be conducted within segregated airspace using a flayered safety approach — i.e. a range of measures to reduce the likelihood of loss of safe separation of the RPAS with other air users.
							CAP1711 airspace modernisation. There are many references to integration rather than segregation.						
							For example						The respondent also suggests relocation of Protector (and possibly RAFAT) away from RAF Waddington. The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of Protector at RAF Waddington within the
							"Airspace modernisation is also expected to improve access to airspace for General Aviation, by enabling greater integration						Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1,14. The Change Sponsor also provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington within the Consultation
							(rather than segregation) of different airspace user groups. The same is true for new airspace users such as drones and						material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Q12 & 13) and was
							spacecraft."						published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1,19 and further in Annex A
							Point 3 air transport Act 2000 section 70						
							https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/38/section/70						
							"(e)to facilitate the integrated operation of air traffic services provided by or on behalf of the armed forces of the Crown and other air traffic services;"						
							It clearly requires integration not segregation.						
78													
70 56	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		Killing people is morally and spiritually wrong and inconsistent with Christian Teaching and that of other faiths.					х	The respondent has concerns about the operation of weaponised drones in general from a moral/spiritual
57	Aviation Stakeholder	r No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		Inappropriate behaviour	Mitigation.				х	standpoint and has no impact on the final proposal. The respondent has already provided other comment at serial 56. The content of this response is targeted at the
							In making the following point I use the world of IFR flying as a broad parallel to BVLOS.	Learn from the LAAfor the introduction of new aircraft types. Learn from the French for the use of drones BVLOS into genealogy airspace					methods by which aircraft can be brought into service. This is outside the scope of an airspace change.
							My conventional world classifies aircraft as either.						
							1. Those types that will never be suitable for flight in IFR. (The 'flying flea' is an example)						
							2. Those types which can be flown IFR but are not suitably equipped.						
							3. Those types which can be flown IFR and are suitably equipped.						
							The pilot must be suitably rated.						
							If I as a qualified IFR pilot was to approach the CAA and ask to fly a type 1 aircraft IFR, I would, quite rightly be given short shrift.						
							If I as a qualified IFR pilot was to approach the CAA and ask to fly a type 2 aircraft IFR, I'd be told to go away and equip it and						
							come back when it's certified.			Ī			
	1						I don't need to ask anyone whether I can jump in a type 3 aircraft and blat off into wild blue yonder in IMC.						
	1						There would be not a cats chance in hades of getting a TDA to fly a type 1 or type 2 aircraft IFR.						
							Both the CAA LAA MAA and DAA have existing processes for introducing new aircraft types and these should be agreed to.			Ī			
00							New aircraft types can be integrated into UK airspace quite quickly using these procedures			Ī			
80 81 ₅₈	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	No change's required.		No.	No.			Х	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
59	Chief Pilot National Grid Electricity	Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	National Grid helicopters may require access to lower airspace portion to inspect powerlines for	No opposition if access to airspace is reasonably provided during daylight activation times via the proposed DACS to provide deconfliction in the lower airspace portion for routine or emergency helicopter powerline inspections / fault-finding.	ATC co-ordination/hotline to enable routine and emergency access for helicopter powerline inspections. Ability to co-ordinate concurrent activity via ATC/DACS or avoidance of lengthy daylight activation periods to facilitate	ATC co-ordinated/preferential access to the airspace during activation times for TCAS or ADS-B Out equipped helicopters. Airspace users could notify intended use of the lower airspace portion via the CADS system. NOTAM	х			The respondent is supportive of the ACP but has concerns about access to the proposed airspace for routing and emergency powerline inspections. The Change Sponsor acknowledges that delays in providing a DACS to this
	Transmission (Aviation					routine or emergency patrols to maintain critical national infrastructure using flight profiles below	PATE IN THE HOPE COME I	access for powerline patrols and provide 2-3hr windows where the airspace reverts to MATZ status.	action should be 48hrs in advance.	Ī			activity are likely to be greater when the proposed low airspace design is occupied by RAFAT activity. Waddington ATC reported that National Grid helicopters would be held outside the proposed low airspace design if it were
	(Aviation Stakeholder)					500ft agl at low speed/hover in daylight hours. This				Ī			active for RAFAT, since it would not be possible to ensure safe separation otherwise. As soon as practicable (i.e.
	1					will require permissive ATC co-ordination (DACS as per Options Appraisal Phase II 6.6a&d) and a means							safe) entry would be approved. In this instance, the maximum period that an aircraft is likely to be held is 30 minutes. When the proposed airspace is active with Protector, access is likely to be easier since Protector will
						of pre-booking into the airspace between or during activation times depending on the criticality of the							either need to take-off and climb above the height of the powerline inspection aircraft or complete its approach to land before access can be granted.
						inspection.				Ī			
										Ī			Waddington ATC reported that ATC Co-ordinated access would be provided by the DACS service throughout to minimise the impact of the proposed airspace when it is active and maximise its flexible use. Waddington ATC has
	1												created procedures to ensure the maximum use of airspace below 500ft to limit the impact upon such essential movements.
													The Change Sponsor has presented the suggestion to use CADS to Waddington for thought and comment and
										Ī			will provide more information to the respondent in due course.
										Ī			In accord with routine flight planning procedures, Waddington Station Operations will promulgate the proposed
82	Aviation Stakeholder	r Vec	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support						-	L .	airspace via the Military Airspace Management Cell prior to D-1 0900hrs local (i.e 24hrs notice). The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal
83	Aviation Stakeholder		Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support						1	X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
61	Individual	Yes	Support	Neutral	Neutral	As a resident who lives near RAF Waddington, the only concern I have safety, in the event of an aircraft			In general, my only concern ,as RaaF Waddington is getting busier at an operating level, is increased noise level but I do appreciate this can't be helped			×	The respondent is supportive of the ACP but has concerns about safety and aircraft noise levels. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the RAFAT activity within the Consultation
11						coming down,other than that I am for this proposal							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
	1												published within the Consultation Document issue 1.0 at Amilex 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).
	1												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
	1									Ī			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.
	1												
	1												
84													
						·							

А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	ı	J	К	L	М	N
			_		Response to		·			Response may i			"
1	Organisation / Stakeholder Type	Support the ACP?	Response to combined airspace	Response to low airspace design	medium airspace design (refined	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q 12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)	propos	al Res	ponse does ot impact	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification
П	(Q4 - 7)	(Q8)	design (Q9)	(Stage 2 Option 1) (Q10)	Stage 2 Option 8)	Attendions to improve the Proposal (Q 12)	explanation of objection to Froposal (q.5)	Proposed Mitagations of Atterations to the Proposal (Q24)	General Considerations (Q25)			l proposal	(You said, we did)
2				(42-7)	(Q11)					Impacted N	ot Impacted		
62	Clerk to the Council Dunston PC (Local	Unsure	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral							х	The respondent is unsure as to his/her support for the ACP but has no comments which would impact the proposal.
85	Authority Stakeholder)												
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				Х	The Change Sponsor is not clear about which 500ft rule to which the respondent is referring. The feedback cann
								safety measures.					therefore, impact the final proposal. However, RAFAT has provided the following clarification regarding display flying over built-up areas: The majorit
													of the aerobatic manoeuvring and training will occur directly overhead the WAD airfield boundary itself and mos 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).
													will not occur to the west of the all field where the filore boxs exist (hyserially, 300th circuit etc).
86													
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	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.			х	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.
97						activities as required.							
88 65	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support							х	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
89 66 67	Individual Individual	Yes No	Strongly Support Strongly Object	Strongly Support Strongly Object	Strongly Support Strongly Object					-		X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal. The respondent objects to the ACP but has no comments which would impact the proposal.
90													
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).	Just don't use military drones.				х	The respondent has concerns about the operation of military drones in general from a moral standpoint. This has no impact on the final proposal.
							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.						
							······································						
1										1			
91	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
92		No	Object	Object	Sunnort	The same of the sa	Low Design Activation Periods.	Enr the reacons stated in para 13 above:	'General aviation' includes a broad range of activity from foot launching paraeliders through to business jets.				outside the scope of the ACP. The respondent has concerns about access to the airspace by other users, in particular the ability of the MOD to
/"	CEO British Gliding Association		ouject	Object	support		Low Design Activation Periods. The proposal states that: The proposal states that: The proposal states will not be permanently active; it will only be activated when RAFAT or Protector flying is due to take place. Proven procedures will	For the reasons stated in para 13 above: 1. We would like to know how the proposer anticipates providing a reliable DACS service for non-transponder	Clearly the main impact of the proposal is on recreational aviation, which has limited capability to route around	^			provide a useful DACS for slow-moving, non-transponding traffic and the provision of an ATIS-like service to
	(NATMAC Organisation)						 The proposed airspace will not be permanently active; it will only be activated when RAFAT or Protector tilving 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 hrs in advance. 	traffic. 2. We suggest that in addition to notifying activation by NOTAM, an ATIS is established to permanently provide	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				permanently provide status of the proposed airspace.
	,						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	real time status of the proposed airspace.	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				The Change Sponsor will be in direct contact with the respondent, but has the following points for clarification:
							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	For reasons associated with this ACP, we suggest that this proposal is paused until a decision is made regarding the future of R313.	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.				Response from the Lincolnshire TATCC ref DACS to slow-moving, non-transponding aircraft: The MOD views a
							* Not waddington Art, will be marined at an ones doming notArt and Protection operations. Commination on the Correst status of the anspace will be available from other appropriate military ATC units when Waddington ATC is closed.		Planning ahead is an important part of flying. Knowing that a portion of airspace is available through listening to an				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
							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 Lincoinshire has been specified to screen out slow moving traffic and, as a result, identifying some non-transponder equipped traffic is problematic. The		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.				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 slo
							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.		regarding the current states of the proposed anspace.				moving aircraft, is the perceived time it would take to complete the crossings if the airspace would shortly be gol
							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						'HOT'.
							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 is an unreliable alternative. We suggest that in addition to notifying activation by NOTAM, an ATG is established to permanently provide real time status of the						Regarding the suggestion of pausing the ACP pending a decision regarding the future of EG R313, the Change Sponsor has considered this, but is continuing with the ACP in order to meet the tight timescales for
							proposed airspace.						implementation of the proposed airspace in line with the Protector and RAFAT operational requirements. RAFAT
							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						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
							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						document. How the RAFAT airspace options will be managed will be defined at Stage 4 of the ACP.
							R313 if it continues to be established and available to RAFAT, or in proposed airspace over another site (ref the RAF Syerston 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						The Change Sponsor has requested details of aircraft movement statistics for the Waddington Flying School and
							in negative Impacts on other airspace users. The MoD are pressing forward with ACPs to address currently unknown scenarios.						will provide them directly to the respondent.
							We recognise that this wider issue of potentially doubled volumes of restricted alispace 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 5900 or so						
							movements by RAF Waddington based aircraft, how many are associated with the RAF Waddington Flying Club operations?						
93													
71		Yes	Neutral	Support	Neutral	I do not believe the proposal will adversely affect our		I think we will need a letter of agreement between ourselves and Waddington to ensure that the controllers are			х		The respondent has been in frequent communication with the Change Sponsor throughout the ACP. Regarding the
						operations out of Langar Airfield, but as a busy airfield with in excess of 7000 turboprop movements		content with our aircraft movements near the boundary of this airspace.					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
						per year for parachute-dropping sorties, I am a little concerned with the growth of the airspace at							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 Lang
						Waddington. The low airspace option really doesn't change a lot for any GA operators, ourselves							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.
						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							However, if Langar feels that a letter of agreement would be preferable the Change Sponsor will make arrangements to draw one up.
						am just wary of potential conflict at the airspace boundary. We already have issues with the East							
						Midlands CTA boundary, whereby controllers are							
94 95 ₇₂	Aulation Carlos	No	Strongly Obl.	Strongly Obla	Strongly Obl.	nervous if our aircraft approach the boundary.	Two male noiets >	Yes - for RPAS - move the fiving activities to a remote and/or coastal located airfield (Aberporth, Macrihanish etc)	Vec. outlining you closely to local population that the second has followed.				The reconsidest by concern shout the effective of RNA - J RY
JJ //	Aviation Stakeholder	NO	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		1 RPAS		Yes - outlining very clearly to local population that they would be (almost uniquely for the UK) living inside an active DANGER AREA.			х	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
							1.RM30. 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	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					respondent's feedback can impact the final proposal.
							Waddington.	different flying training sites is ridiculous and confirms, entirely, why Waddington is NOT SUITABLE.					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
							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						published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at Annex A.
							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 (Otterburn, Spadeadam, Salisbury Plain etc.).						The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation
							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						material. This can be found in the FAQs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6).
							Waddington MATZ), which will now have operations severely hampered with this un-necessary proposal.						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) a
							2. RAFAT						Consultation material. This can be found in the FAUS page uploaded to the Citizen space portal (see Q12 & 13) a was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1,19 and further in Annex A
							- the move of the RAFAT to Waddington would seem extremely inappropriate, for the following reasons:						The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of Protector at RAF Waddington within the
							 a) - Moving the location of operation, of up to nine fast jets, performing aerobatic manoeuvres over a considerably more heavily populated location goes directly against the RAF's published promise of enhancing public safety. 						Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1,14.
							This is further confirmed by the need to move certain specific manoeuvres to a totally different location (Syerston) and yet a further location for more						With respect to the respondent's claim that the proposed airspace will be an active danger area and the
							training needs (Donna Nook). Such requirements clearly demonstrate that RAF Waddington is not the suitable base for RAFAT.						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
							 b.) - 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 						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
							special and specific (and totally different) airspace requirement.						Stage 2A submission, the most economical type of airspace to be implemented (in terms of hours of activation,
							 c.) - 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. 						access to airspace and manpower resource) would be segregated airspace in the form of a Danger Area. A Dange Area was considered to be the most suitable type of structure as the activities to be performed will not comply
							The original suggestion of a 6 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						with rules of the air and, therefore, anything other than segregated airspace was not considered to be appropria
							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 nunway and airfield boundaries, well outside of 8.8.13.						
							we company						
1													
96		Yes	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	No comments.	N/A	No comment.	No.	+	-+	х	The respondent has a neutral stance to the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
73							•						are included in the proposal.
73													
73	(Local Authority												

А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	ı	J	K	L	M	N
				Response to low	Response to						y impact final	Response does	55
1	Organisation / Stakeholder Type	Support the ACP? (Q8)	Response to combined airspace	airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1)	medium airspace design (refined	Alterations to Improve the Proposal (Q 12)	Explanation of Objection to Proposal (Q13)	Proposed Mitigations or Alterations to the Proposal (Q14)	General Considerations (Q15)		posal	not impact final proposal	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)
	(Q4 - 7)	(48)	design (Q9)	(Q10)	Stage 2 Option 8) (Q11)					Impacted	Not Impacted	final proposal	(tou said, we did)
74	Aviation Stakeholder	r 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	See above, locate RFAT and RPAS elsewhere. This is not a NIMBY response. It is a genuine belief that other	See above. Consider alternative locations.			х	The respondent is not supportive of the ACP, but has signalled support for the low and combined airspace design
							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.	locations will meet the needs more effectively.					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 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 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 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						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
							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.						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													
75	Airspace Officer, Derbyshire Soaring	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.	, х			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
	Club (Aviation Stakeholder)								As a result of this we are very concerned about the fact that this airspace proposal is being considered in isolation				time is noted. How the activation of these adjacent volumes of airspace will be managed will be defined at Stage 4 of the ACP.
									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				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
									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.				document. How the RAFAT airspace options will be managed will be defined at Stage 4 of the ACP.
									We are therefore very interested in engaging on the operational design on this change to ensure these concerns				
									are understood and considered.				
99 76	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	The need for the RAFAT to operate over Waddington						x	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
				37		for its practice sessions are operationally, logistically and ecological 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							
100	Individual	Vac	Strangly Support	Strongly Support	Strangly Support	period can be managed in on operation room						X	The companied is supporting of the ACB and has no companies which would impact the property
78	Director Regulations, ARPAS UK (NATMAC	yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	No alterations. Our armed forces need to fly. N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			x	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal. The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
102	Organisation)												
103 ₇₉ 80	Individual Area Planning	Yes Yes	Strongly Support Neutral	Strongly Support Neutral	Strongly Support Neutral	None! Carry on!	N/A	N/A	N/A NKDC wishes to raise no objection to the Airspace Change Proposal and would welcome further consultation			X X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal. The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
	Officer, North Kesteven District								should the protected airspace, EG R313, above be withdrawn.				The decision surrounding the fate of EG R313 and subsequent consultation is outside the scope of this ACP.
	Council (Local Authority												
104 81	Stakeholder) Individual	Unsure	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	+		With regard to the R313 airspace, there seem to be limited options to Scampton. I would propose the airspace				х	The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington within the
								over the old RAF Cottesmore airfield would be very suitable, and is retained Crown land. It is not far from Waddington for transit journeys.					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													
106 ₈₂	Individual Aviation Stakeholder	Yes r Unsure	Strongly Support Object	Strongly Support Object	Strongly Support Object		I don't much fancy flying along coming face to face with one of these - probably armed drones	Yes	Don't do it			X X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal. The respondent has concerns of a moral nature regarding the operation of drones. This is outside the scope of this
107							Seems crazy to me when you could fly them over the sea - britain is after all surrounded by sea	Don't do it	You already do't have enough pilots to fly the fast jets you have why add to the mess				ACP.
107 108 ₈₄	Owner, Rectory	No	Object	Object	Object		Who will be responsible when it all goes wrong Concentration of RAFAT and remote piloted aircraft traffic at Waddington, together with the associated proposed satellite RAFAT	It would be reasonable to look again at location for basing of remotely piloted aircraft for deployment from			1	х	The respondent has concerns over the impact of this ACP on other airspace users and on the safety aspects of
	Farm Airfield (Aviation						training proposal for Syerston (ACP 2022-002) is an unreasonable burden to impose upon GA airspace users and residents in the area.						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
	Stakeholder)						It is important to realise that increasing the amount of controlled airspace to protect RAF asset activity comes at a direct cost of	RAFAT jet formation display training is inappropriate overhead local populated areas and especially above Lincoln city - there would be a significant safety gain by re-deploying this activity to less density populated area.					uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 10) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at Annex A.
							reduced safety for other airspace users.						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 FADs 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.
													,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
109	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	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
					and, sojett		replace the proposal or ly animal or invited within the anspace due to the list to chief the creeping use of save which we which is 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	and the second of the second o					on the final proposal.
							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.						
110 111 ₈₆	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 infrastructure already being	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Х	The respondent has concerns about the basing and safety of operating Protector and RAFAT at RAF Waddington.

А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	1	K	L	М	N
1	Organisation / Stakeholder Type (Q4 - 7)	Support the ACP?	Response to combined airspace design (Q9)	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1)	Response to medium airspace design (refined Stage 2 Option 8)	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 ma	y impact final oosal	Response does not impact final proposal	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)
2	(Q4 - 7)		design (Q9)	(Q10)	(Q11)					Impacted	Not Impacted		
							been identified for the RAF to increase it's RPAS capability but by it's very nature Protector can be based any where and flown remotely as such no requirement for RPAS to be based at Waddington exists. The proposal underlines that gross diminishment of defence infrastructure and particularly, the lack of redundancy regarding	location. Wales and Scotland have existing airfields to do this. The RAFATS display flying cannot be described as an essential military activity. They are the sole UK operator of Hawk T1 airframes, which were built between 1977 and 1982, making them older than the ill fated, former CFS	designed and built for protector, with plans to have much greater levels of activity than originally proposed by providing airframes and training facilities for the forces of other nations. The whole consultation process seems to be a sham. The very unfortunate death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II resulted in the public meetings at the				Concern is also expressed about the timing of the drop-in consultation sessions. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the RAFAT activity within the Consultation
							RAF Stations and their valuable national asset runways. RAF Waddington is totally unsuitable as a base for both RPAS and the RAFAT being located in the most urban area of all RAF stations, with the exception of Northolt.	Meteor and Vampire Vintage Pair. They represent yesterdays Airforce, flying yesterdays aircraft and seemingly, whilst on the ground and within the	Lincoln Guildhall on Sept 21st and the Redwood Drive Community Centre at Waddington on the 28th receiving virtually no public notification/advertisement of them happening at all. I am aware that only attendees of the				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.
							It would seem to me that GinetiQ already have a presence at Benbecula and Aberporth and oversee the operation of EDG 701 which extends Westwards from North and South Uist for some 200nm which has no vertical limit. EDG201 extends 50nm into the Irish sea from Aberporth again with no vertical limit. These environments are ideal and provide plenty of space in a very	team environment, display questionable behaviour and yesterdays social attitudes. If a suitable airfield, airspace and new airframes are unaffordable, they should be disbanded.	Lincoln meeting, were the local media, a member of the RAF from Waddington and a representative from QinetiQ. The general public have no idea what is about to happen. The public meetings should have been postponed until it was possible for them to be effectively and vigorously advertised.				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).
							sparsely populated areas where the RAF could develop and operate it's immature RPAS weapon system. Operating Protector from Waddington and placing the city of Lincoln in a danger area seems very arrogant, or at best as if it is being done to avoid						The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington within the
							creating postings, and the required infrastructure, at unpopular far flung but otherwise more suitable rural locations. If the UK wishes to have a RAFAT it needs to be properly funded, this includes the provision of a suitable airfield, suitable airspace and suitable new airframes.						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 Cranwell experiment never worked, the whole station breathed a huge collective sigh of relief when the team returned to Scampton. The team simply needs their own airfield to operate from. The idea of using Syerston and Dorna Nook are flawed and						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.
							highlight the RAF's own admission that Waddington's is unsuitable. The whole idea of moving the team to Waddington, was to allow continued access to the existing R313 at Scampton. With that option seemingly unavailable, Waddington should have immediately ceased to be seen as a potential base for the team. What safety study and criteria have been used and met prior to						Regarding the timing of the consultation drop-in sessions, 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
							the move and by whom? The RAFAT have had numerous accidents during their history and managed to drop two Hawks onto the village of Welton following a mid air collision. Additionally and have destroyed numerous airframes and sadly killed team						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
							members during off season practice sorties, by looping rolling and flying serviceable aircraft into the ground.						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.
112													
113 ₈₇ 114	Individual	No	Object	Object	Object		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.					х	Duplicate of Serial 25 & 28 & 37 & 38 & 50 above. The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but has concerns about the use of
							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.						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
							This change - which for the very first time allows large uncrewed aircraft to operate beyond visual line of sight on a regular basis						uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6).
							 is an unnecessary risk given these aircraft will be based in a populated area. I also object as this change will enable large remotely controlled drones to fly within the UK before safety measures – such as 						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.
							properly tested and approved 'Detect and Avoid' equipment – are in place.						Again the Change Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in an active
							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.						TRA and that this area of concern sits outside the ACP.
							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.						
115	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		Prones are dangerous weapons of war and have no place flying over civilian residential areas. These air craft 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					х	The respondent has concerns about the operation of drones in general from a moral standpoint and has no impact on the final proposal.
							prone to accidents during take on and landing which pose a risk to people's nomes and communities. Once in the air, they pose a risk to other aircraft including civillan aircraft.						on the imal proposal.
89	Individual	No	Object	Object	Object		I don't see any need for this croopsal or benefit to anyone other than multinational arms companies. 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	No	Now			х	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.
90	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Object	Object		malfunction and drop a missile there is no pilot to feel guilty. Protected airspace is not enough. First the airspace needs to be above only uninhabited areas such as the sea. Second something	Have the area in the middle of nowhere.	Move it to over the sea.			х	This is the second response by Respondent 90. Concerns are over (drone?) activity over inhabited areas, the safety
							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.						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).
91	DAATM - SO2 Airspace Plans, MOE	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	MOD response to stage 3 document sent directly to the sponsor via email.	MOD response to stage 3 document sent directly to the sponsor via email.	MOD response to stage 3 document sent directly to the sponsor via email.	MOD response to stage 3 document sent directly to the sponsor via email.	х			This response has no impact on the final proposals. The respondent has collated comprehensive feedback from a range of internal MOD aviation stakeholders. In
	(NATMAC Organisation)					the sponsor via email.							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
													operating procedures for both Protection and North at North Washington. The Change sports of an interconnect with the respondent and potentially impacted internal MOD stakeholders during this process. A summary of some of the salient points is included below.
													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 funnelling 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 airways 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.
													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.
													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. 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
110													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.
92	Manager Technical and Operations,	Unsure	Support	Support	Neutral	GATCO request confirmation that the medium airspace will not be used for any RAFAT or RPAS use,	N/A	The suggested crossing service and limited activation seem sensible.	The new airspace would potentially create a significant increased workload for RAF Waddington Air Traffic Controllers, with the requirement to provide crossing services and co-ordinte or control Cranwell arrivals when			х	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
	GATCO (NATMAC Organisation)					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			these areas are activated and as identified by the consultation, due to funnelling of traffic. Co-ordination workload between Conningsby and Waddington would also increase. What steps are being taken to manage this increased workload and to ensure that other traffic is not penalised if the Waddington controllers become too buys to offer				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 the acceptable militgations may be put in place to request dispensation from the safety buffer policy. Further
						would exist and dimensions for such a buffer to provide separation from the contiguous CAS. GATCO			the crossing service?				acceptable mingations may be put in piace to request dispensation from the safety burner policy. Further information on this will be included with the ACP submission at Stage 4. RAFAT will not use the Medium airspace design.
						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			Although not directly linked to the ACP, GATCO would like more information regarding how comms are maintained with the RPAS operator and ATC during entry into and transit through Controlled Airspace?				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
						therefore CAA Buffer Policy would not be required to be applied within the adjacent Lincolnshire CTAs			RPAS inside controlled airspace would presumably be operating at a significant performance difference to other traffic, so GATCO would like clarification of any mitigations for potential workload issue for controllers with RPAS				civilian airspace regulators as well as NATS.
						when the danger area is activated. Without this safety case being presented, this			operating inside CAS. If it is not operationally sensitive information, we request the reason for the potential lack of full Detect and Avoid				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.
						proposal has a significant impact on GAT traffic flows within the Lincolnshire CTA and would impinge on			in to short operationally sensitive information, we request the reason for the potential lack of full better and avoid capabilities?				
						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. If a safety argument is presented that demonstrates							
						If a safety argument is presented that demonstrates containment within the proposed medium airspace, then this impact would be completely mitigated.							
120													
121 93	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					Х	Duplicate of Serial 25 & 28 & 37 & 38 & 50 & 87 above.

A	В	C	D	E	F	G	Н	1	1	К	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 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 propo		oes ct Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification sal (You said, we did)
122							Waddington and those beyond. Remotely controlled aircraft are disagenous and evidence shows that they are particularly group to accident during take off and landing. RAP Waddington is currounded by housing, local businesses, a major road and a school at seems an unnecessary risk for this significant change — which flor the very first time allows large uncrewed aircraft to operate beyond visual fine of sight on a regular basis — to be based in a populated area. I also object as this change will enable large remotely controlled drones to fly which in But IX before safety measures — such as properly tested and approved Detect and Avoid requipment — are in place. According to the consultation documents it is only a properly tested and approved Detect and Avoid requipment— are in place. According to the consultation documents it is only a Working assumption" that DAA equipment will enable Protector to fly within flasses a And Ciaragues without restriction. At the same time, the consultation document makes clear that a proper and satisfactory argument that Protector can perate safely within the TAA has yet to be made by the Ministry of Defence. Separately, the Ministry of Defence have also made clear that the just and 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 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 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 initially live 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 initially live limited—with 1 or 3 aircraft in the air at any one time up to 3 times per week.— The clear that the air and the air and the					The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design, but has concerns about the use of dirones 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 dirones. The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAGs page uploaded to the Citten Space portal (see Question 6). With regard to the "working assumption" that Protector will be able to fly in Classes A & Cairspace, the Change Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in Classes A - Cairspace and that this airs of concern sits outside the ACP. 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.
94	CAA Accountable Manager, Wickenby Aerodrome (Aviation Stakeholder)	Unsure	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral				Wickenby Aerodrome conducts are obtain training flights up to 4,000 ft. above aerodrome ground level. The MOD should have regard to this as part of it's ACP. Wickenby Aerodrome is considering introducing an instrument Approach Procedure Outside of Controlled Airspace. The approaches to the serodrome's runways need to be protected. The MOD should have regard to this as part of it's ACP. Wickenby Aerodrome is the base for flight training organisations and GA aircraft owners and operators. The aerodrome also hosts visiting GA aircraft. The MOD should have regard to this as part of it's ACP.		х	RAF Waddington has a letter of agreement with Wickenby airliefs, but sees no requirement for it to be amended due to this proposed change. Safe management of aerobatic activity at Wickenby is covered in the existing letter of agreement. With respect to the potential future introduction of instrument Approach Procedure Outside of Controlled Airspace at Wickenby, the Change Sponsor is unsighted to any detail. The Change Sponsor will respond directly to the respondent inviting Wickenby to provide more detail if available. Regarding the 3rd comment "Wickenby Aerodrome is the base for flight training organisations and GA aircraft owners and operators. The aerodrome also hosts visiting of aircraft. The MOD should have regard to this as part of it's ACP.", the Change Sponsor is aware of this current activity and does not believe it impacts the ACP.
124 ₉₅ 125 ₉₆	Individual Individual	Yes No	Strongly Support Strongly Object	Strongly Support Strongly Object	Strongly Support Strongly Object	NA .	As a resident of nearby Coleby, currently the noise and disruption from RAF Waddington is just about tolerable. Any increase in	suggest the MOD consider utilisation of other airspace, away from built-up residential areas.	I suggest the MOD consider utilisation of other airspace, away from built-up residential areas.	-	X	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal. The respondent is most concerned with the impact that the introduction of additional aircraft will have on the local
126			- Cy - cycle				The control of the co					are surrounding Waddington with respect targety to noise and the potential impact on road safety created by low- flying aircraft. 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 pairs \$1,5.9.1 & 9.9.1). More information can be found in the Full Options Appraisal which is on the COA ACP Portal. Whist the concerns over road safety are coulded the exope of this ACP, the Change Sponsor will pass the general concern to IAF Waddington for consideration. Finally the suggestion to relocate the activities to other airspace is noted. Of course the MOD gave careful consideration to the basing options for both Protector and RAFAT - information was presented in the consultation material. This can be found in the Consultation Document issue 1.0 at para 1.14 for Protector. The Change Sponsor provided information regarding the basing of RAFAT at RAF Waddington within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FAGs page uploaded to the Citzen Space portal (see Q12 & 13) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1.19 and further in Annex A.
127 128 or 129	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	NA .	As a resident of nearby Coleby, currently the noise and disruption from RAF Waddington is just about tolerable. Any increase in local air traffic would be unbearable and would lead to significant decline in wellbeing, mental health and quality of life. At present, noise from RAF Waddington regularly disrusts glave, but cally work profile and telephone meetings, when working from home, despite having all windows and doors closed and having double glazing. The noise has disturbed rest and sleep during the object of the control	suggest the MOD consider utilisation of other airspace, away from built-up residential areas.	I suggest the MOD consider utilisation of other airspace, away from built-up residential areas.		x	Duplicate of Serial 96 The respondent is most concerned with the impact that the introduction of additional aircraft will have on the local area surrounding Waddington with respect largely to note and the potential impact on road safety created by low-flying aircraft. The Change Sponsor provided information on the noise impact of both RAFAT and rotector activity within the consultation material. This can be found in the Consultation Document issue 1 (see pars \$1.2, \$3.18.5.9.4). More information on a be found in the foull Options Appraisal which is on the CAAC PPORTAL Whilst the concerns over road safety are outside the scope of this ACP, the Change Sponsor will pass the general concern to RAF Waddington for consideration. Finally the suggestion to relocate the activities to other airspace is noted. Of course the MOD gave careful consideration to the basing options for both Protectors and RAFAT -information was presented in the consultation material Consultation Document issue 1.0 at para 1.14 for Protector. The Change Sponsor provided information material Consultation Document (see Q12.8.13) and was published within the Consultation Document Issue 1.0 at para 1.19 and further in Annex A.
98	Individual	Unsure	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral		Lack of available Environmental Impact Assessment and lack of equipment noise certification and assessment. If the change of use of an MDO site is not subject to CAA commercial noise requirements (https://www.co.uu/commercial-industry/Aircraft/Aircraft-coise_cut/Commercial-industry/Aircraft/Aircraft-coise_cut/Commercial-industry/Aircraft/Aircraft-coise_cut/Commercial-industry/Aircraft/Aircraft-coise_cut/Commercial-industry/Aircraft-coise_cut/Coise_		Has an environmental impact assessment been carried out for current use and proposed future use?! Imagine liquous documents from Waddington and Scampton may support this work if they exist. Due to the change of use and type of operations there will investably be a change in the amount and type of noise the local community will be exposed to. What level of certification have platforms been subjected to and are they liquid to the control of the local community will be exposed to What level of certification have platforms been subjected to and are they liquid to community to the more Toltering toolse type? This was evident when the RPAS was flown from Waddington previously and on the arrival of the Red Arrows earlier this year.		x	The respondent has concerns about the availability of an "environmental impact assessment" and "equipment noise certification". The Change Sponsor conducted an environmental assessment at Stage 3A of the ACP, it can be found in Annex A of the Options Appraisal (Phase II - Full) issue 1.1 which was presented with the Consultation material on the Citizen Space portal and can also be found on the CAA ACP Portal at https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?piD=142
99	Parish Clerk, Coleby Parish Council (Local Authority Stakeholder)	Unsure	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral				The Parish Council has concerns about noise levels when the Red Arrows are flying over the immediate area of Waddington Airfield given that the village is located a mile from the end of the main runway. Concern has been openessed about noise levels during the day which could impact on local residents and in particular the school on the basis that the Parish Council had been advised that the Red Arrows would continue to practice over Scampton.		x	The respondent is concerned about noise levels associated with the RAFAT activity since the parish represented is located close to the end of the main runway at RAF Waddington. As part of the regulatory process laid down in CAP1015, the Change Sponsor required to consider any impact on noise as 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 Decoment issue 1 (see pairs 3.1, 5.9.1, & 5.9.4). More information can be found in the Parl Options Appraisal which is on the CAA ACP Portal. Clarification from RAFAT regarding overlight to fault up areas is as follows. The majority of the aerobatic nunoeuving and training will occur directly overhead the WAD airfield boundary itself and mostify to the East in the least built up part of the airspace. The larger vilages of Branch and Bracebridge Heath are on the edges of the aerobatic box and will seldom see aerobatic overlight below SOOR. Aerobatic flight below SOOR will not occur to the West of the airfield where the more BUAs exist (Hykeham, South Lincoln etc.). The Change Sponsor will respond to this respondent directly in due course and direct further communication if required with RAFAT.
133 100	Individual	Yes	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	None	None	Perhaps minimise throttle response for as far away from Waddington as possible	None		х	The respondent is supportive of the ACP and has no comments which would impact the proposal.
134 101	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		As I live near to Waddington, the increased activity will undoubtedly cause an unacceptable increase in noise levels. Currently, the noise levels are unacceptable at times. In addition, with the increased activity, particularly with the field Arrows, there is, as a consequence, an increased likelihood of accidents over the surrounding housing.	Geep the Scampton airspace open and carry out the training there.			x	The respondent has concerns about increased aircraft noise and safety and suggests retaining EG R313 at Scampton. As part of the regulatory process led 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 I bee para \$5.1,5.2.18 at \$9.3,1 More information can be found in the Fall Options And Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the RAFAT activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the RAGs 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 RAGs page uploaded to the Citizen Space portal (see Question 6). The option to retain EG R313 for RAFAT use is outside the scope of this ACP.

А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K	L	M	N
1	Organisation / Stakeholder Type	Support the ACP?	Response to combined airspace	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1)	Response to medium airspace design (refined	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 ma		Response does not impact final proposal	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification [You said, we did]
2	(Q4 - 7)	(4-7	design (Q9)	(Q10)	Stage 2 Option 8) (Q11)					Impacted	Not Impacted		(,
102	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		ACP-2019-18 Gateway documentation Stage 2 Develop& Assess Para 14.3 States that "the Change Sponsor requests that formal noise modeling be scoped out of the airspace change requirement. Therefore, the Change Sponsor has not confirmed a noise modelling category for this ACP." A full assessment on the noise impact in the local area should be carried out	Map ICAO noise certification requirements into MoD Policy	Surely the least the MoD can do for the local community is to carry out noise modelling before it commits to any change. I have previously submitted my concern about noise in the local area on another feedback form prior to inding this statement in the documentation. The whole document pack has the underploming assumption that RAPAT and Protector MUST be based at Waddington and pays lip service to the impact on the local community. These impacts should be fully assessed and understood before any decision is made. When was the last noise assessment carried in the local area of Waddington? I suspect it is out of date and did not include Sentinel RI, Shadow and Sentry operations and therefore is no basis to build on for the assumptions in this consultation.			x	Same respondent as Serial 98 The Change Sponsor has compiled with the requirements of CAP 1616; the CAA accepted the rationale presented at Stage 2 of the ACP to scope out the requirement for noise modelling for this ACP as it was felt disproportionate to the impact created by the proposed change.
136		Yes	Support	Support	Neutral	Please keep dimensions to lowest value required, as			The new airspace will create an increase to workload due to the requirement to obtain crossing clearances.			x	Whilst supportive of the proposal, the respondent has concerns about the impact the proposed change may have
127	(Aviation Stakeholder)	t				direct arrivals to Humberside from the South may be impacted, particularly when runway 02 in use.							on (ATC*) workload and requests that airspace dimensions are kept to the minimum. The Change Sponsor is unclear as to whose workload the respondent refers, but in the case of the MOD full safety work is being conducted within the military ATC units to ensure safety is assured from all aspects of the implementation of proposed airspace and the associated frling activities. The design principle "Minimise the impact to other airspace users' was afforded joint 3rd priority in Stage 1 of the ACP and the Change Sponsor is committed to make most efficient use of the proposed segregated airspace. Integral to this is the commitment to minimizing volume and duration of activation; the Change Sponsor has worked hard with the manufacturer of Protector to minimise the volumes of airspace with regard to the low and medium airspace design options. The Change Sponsor also provided information on the mechanism to be in place to minimise the impact on other airspace users within the Consultation material. This was published within the Consultation Downert Issue 10.0 a typar 4.1.
104	Individual	No	Strongly Object	Strongly Object	Strongly Object		We live in Coleby in line with end of the runway where planes both take off and land. Our concern is the risk when remote					х	The respondent has concerns about RPAS overflight of his home from a safety perspective.
138							aircraft are flying overhead during take off and landing. We therefore object to this proposal.						The Change Sponsor provided information on the safety assurance of the Protector activity within the Consultation material. This can be found in the FADS page uploaded for the Citzen Space poral (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.
105	Individual	No	Object	Object	Object	i do not support it.	Lobject because it could endanger alrepace users, both those living and varieting near RAF Waddington and those beyond. Remotely controlled airst air st alegoes and evidence shows that they are particularly prone to accident—unsprean atound the world including in 2022. AAF Waddington is surrounded by housing, local businesses, amplor road and a school. It is an unnecessary risk for this significant change—which for the very first time allows large aircraft without crew on board to operate beyond visual line of sight on a regular basis – to be based in a populated area. And although I live a bit further ways, for the same reasons, I don't want remotely piloted aircraft flying over me. I'm water, from the noise sometimes, that milliary aircraft fly over the city in which I live, so no matter how high hey are flow, they pose a risk until they are shown to have a 100% safety record, so ask me again in 10 years time. My city, Peterborough is close to the edge of the 'potentially affected area' although I consider the whole of the UK could be affected at some point.	resolved if they stopped flying them. I would also like to see more scrutiny of the operations, including the training ones, preferably by Parliament and		e		x	The respondent makes no comment regarding the proposed airspace design but has concerns about the use of drones in general and the requirement for further consultation should another base be considered for RPAS activity. This does not impact the final proposal.
139	Manager NATS	Object	Object	Object	Object		NATS understands and supports the need for change outlined in this proposal which presents the MOD requirement to establish suitable airspace to support	NATS would like to continue work with the MOD to ensure that the airspace and procedures to support Protector		x			The Change Sponsor has sent a full response directly to this respondent and is continuing to work closely with
140	Operational Policy, NATS (NATMAC Organisation)						Defence operations and integration of new air platforms (Protection) into the U. airapace. However, the consultation proforms design and question set members a contrast on our regions that force an appeal ventum. We are consulted to writing with MLD worker the include of the designated approach to be consulted to writing with MLD worker the include of the designation of the consultation document. It is difficult to see how the VLD we are required to the provided of the provided of the VLD was a consultation document. It is difficult to see how the VLD was presented below, MLTs is currently unable to support that, AP did not the lack of information within the consultation document. It is difficult to see how the VLD was presented with the VLD was presented below, MLTs is currently unable to support that AP did not the lack of information within the consultation document. It is difficult to see how the VLD was presented below, MLTs is currently unable to support that AP did not the lack of information within the consultation document been not less than the VLD was presented from the present of the pre	to understand: I. The safety argument, and its acceptance by the CAA, for Protector operations without a full detect and avoid system within Classes A to C airspace, in order to validate the assumption that operating in Classes A-C is acceptable. 2. The Safety Argument, and its acceptance by the CAA, for Protector operations without a full detect and avoid system within an active TBA. 3. The Safety Argument/mitigations, and their acceptance by the CAA, for the containment of activities and the prevention of "inactive TBA.	environment.				them to enable their concerns to be addressed and to enable the respondent to support the proposed change prior to submission. NATS requested to understand more about: The Safety Argument, and its acceptance by the CAA, for Protector operations the assumption that operating in Classes A-C is acceptable. 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. That said, the Change Sponsor acknowledges that integration of Protector into UK airspace in general and Classes A-C in particular is of significant importance to NATS. A full description of the MOD process to provision of a Safety Argument has been provided. NATS requested to understand more about: The Safety Argument, and its acceptance by the CAA, for Protector operations without a full detect and avoid system within an active TAA. Again the Change-Sponsor does not believe that this airspace change relates to Protector's operation in an active TAA and that this press of concern sits outside the ACP. Never theless, the Change-Sponsor acknowledges that the meaning that the present of the CAA, and the change-Sponsor acknowledges that the meaning that the change-Sponsor according to the CAA, ATS will be fully engaged in the MOD process being progressed at this time. NATS requested to understand more about: The Safety Argument/miligations, and their acceptance by the CAA, for the containment of activities and the prevention of "indivientent excursions" by RAFAT and Protector operations within the lower area (such that the CAAs SUB Biffer Policy for Airspace Design Purposes (after Policy for Airspace Design Purposes (after Policy for Airspace Design Purposes and not provided the CAA's Special Use Airspace—Safety Biffer Policy for Airspace Design Purposes (after Policy for Airspace Design Purposes (after Policy for Airspace Design Purposes and not provided that the CAA's Special Use Airspace—Safety Biffer Policy for Airspace Design Purposes (af
141	NATS Continued						Invested of the Low Area Minist a Danger Area requires compliance with the CAA SUA Buffer policy for HEM, a Restricted Area does not. In relation to this ACP, the elekted use of a Danger Area to encompass RAFAT activities is a departure from the existing Restricted Alrea does morphole currently inequipoled (168133). A Restricted area fillers that protection is regulared by RAFAT from other airspace users (which is also the case for display activities undertaken at various sites throughout the display season) i.e., RAFAT activities in themselves are not dangerous but the presence of other airspace users for the regulared pAFAT activities. The restricted. However, a Danger Area implies that RAFAT activities are a danger to other airspace users pose a risk to RAFAT and mathematical. By stating that RAFAT activities are dangerous to other airspace users to be considered. It is systematically that RAFAT activities are dangerous to other airspace users be CAAS SUA Buffer Policy needs to be contained and notified as such. By stating that RAFAT activities are dangerous to other airspace users to be contained to the system of the state of the system of the state of the system of the sys						"whilst a Danger Area requires compliance with the CAA SIAA Buffer policy for HEM, a Restricted Area does not. In relation to this ACP, the selected use of a Danger Area to encompass RAFAT activities is a departure from the esisting Restricted Arispace principle currently employed (EGR313). A Restricted area inferts that protection is required by RAFAT from other airspace users (which is also the case for display activities undertaken at various sites throughout the display season). In a,RAFAT activities in themselves are not dangerous but the presence of other airspace users pose a grief to RAFAT activities in themselves are not dangerous but the presence of other airspace users pose as agrief to other airspace users and therefore be restricted. However, a Danger Area implies that RAFAT activities are as darger to other airspace users than a stranger of the airspace but the containing and notified as such." NATS requested to understand more about: The Safety Argument/mitigations, and its acceptance by MOD does not consider RAFAT to propose a threat to external airspace users. In addition the Danger Area construct has been assessed by RAFAT a providing adequate protection for its fiving display training. Since RAFAT was a late addition to this ACP, it was felt that purposing the Danger Area as dual purpose (RAFAT and Protector) would be less confusing and less exerticive to other inspace users than to propose both Restricted Area and Danger Area constructs for the same volume of airspace. In addition, MOD does not believe that Protector offers a threat to external airspace users plant to propose both Restricted Area and Danger Area constructs for the same volume of airspace. In addition, MOD does not believe that Protector offers a threat to external airspace users; joint work managed by MOD/DAFAT has been conducted into the likelihood of MOD BVLOS RAFAS unintentionally departing notified operating airspace. A DASOS Reserth found no instances of such in the IVE. The MOD has proposed suitable mitigations to sup

	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	I	J	K	L	M	N
1		Organisation / Stakeholder Type	Support the ACP?	Response to combined airspace	Response to low airspace design (Stage 2 Option 1)	Response to medium airspace design (refined	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		Response does not impact	Change Sponsor Reasoning / Justification (You said, we did)
2		(Q4 - 7)	(40)	design (Q9)	(Q10)	Stage 2 Option 8) (Q11)					Impacted	Not Impacted	final proposal	(Tou Salo, we dio)
142	7	NATS Continued												NATS also asked "If the assumption on operation within CAS can be validated, could the sponsor consider the application of other airspace constructs sing flexible but of Airspace principles (PLM) such as a Control Area (CTA) (see Airspace Modernisation Strategy intent) above ARF Wardington 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." In this regard, the Change Sponsor certainly considered the use of other airspace constructs as an option and in the safety are considered to the substitution of the safety buffer policy and provide a contiguous airspace environment." In this regard, the Change Sponsor certainly considered the use of other airspace constructs as an option and or a sponsor of the safety and the safety and 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 flickbillty in the ability to operate the Protector capability when conjugied, As tasted in the Stage 2. As unbinsion, the most occumulately upon a fusion to be implemented in terms of hours of activation, access to airspace and mangower resource) would be segregated airspace to be implemented in terms of hours of activation, access to airspace and mangower resource) would be segregated airspace to the form of a surgary Ana. A Danger Area as Candidered to be the most studied 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 available stage of structure.