

LBA-001

Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 12:00 PM
To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>
Subject: ACP Feedback - No Reference to NPRs or Changing NPRs

Good morning,

With regards to the recent LBA Step 2a-Design Option Update Brief - April 23, we would request that the failure of the ACP to consider NPRs as part of current and future stakeholder engagement following be noted and acknowledged.

Without the inclusion of NPRs, it is not clear to community stakeholders where these are. In future engagement, please can we request for the ACP to include the NPRs on images for reference.

There also appears to be no acknowledgement or highlighting that the NPR may have to change as a consequence of the ACP. Reference should be made to the Gatwick Route 4 ACP which initially failed to accurately present the NPR to stakeholders during engagement. In addition, the Gatwick Route 4 ACP failed at the Post Implementation Review (PIR) stage and the CAA's decision to approve it was eventually quashed as part of a Judicial Review. Failure to comply with the transparency on the NPR was one of the points that lead to this.

From: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 6:02 PM
Subject: RE: ACP Feedback - No Reference to NPRs or Changing NPRs

Thank you for taking the time to respond to the second round of engagement at Stage 2 of our ACP. Your comments regarding the failure to refer to the NPRs in the engagement material are duly noted. I would like to reassure you that the presence of the NPRs has not been ignored and there will be reference to them in the material submitted to the CAA for the Stage 2 Gateway Assessment. As these documents will be available on the ACP Portal, consideration of the NPRs vs the Design Options will be transparent for all stakeholders to see. The NPRs will be depicted to ensure stakeholders can understand the difference between the Design Options and the existing NPRs.

Leeds City Council are not averse to the idea of the NPRs changing if it can be proven that there will be a net environmental benefit and as such, we are not viewing the NPRs as a 'holy cow'. The potential for any change to the NPRs will be addressed in the submission to the CAA however, it is far from a foredrawn conclusion that this will happen. The Design Options that have been conceived have been done so with a blank sheet of paper in mind to encourage freedom of thought and not stifle creativity.

Again, thank you for your valuable comments.

LBA-002

Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 5:44 PM
To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>
Subject: Leeds Bradford Airport Airspace Change -

Hello,

Thank you for your request for feedback.

As the current proposals do not include any actual airspace designs, we are unable to comment on whether you have complied with your Design Principles 5 and 6, requiring that:

The volume and classification of controlled airspace required for LSA should be the minimum necessary to deliver an efficient airspace design, considering the needs of all airspace users

The airspace design should seek to reduce complexity and bottlenecks in controlled and uncontrolled airspace and contribute to a reduction in airspace infringements.

In the absence of proposed Airspace Designs we cannot at this stage properly assess what the impact on gliding activity might be.

We refer you to the responses from the Regional Soaring Airspace Group (RSAG) and Bowland Forest Gliding Club for further detail on specific issues and areas of concern at this stage.

Finally we would emphasise that whilst this represents the formal response of the BGA as an organisation, we expect that you will receive separate responses from potentially-affected gliding clubs and groups thereof, and you should also take full account of those responses.

LBA-003

Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2023 5:17 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: Stage 2A Stakeholder Query

I spent a long time printing off and evaluating routes. Not once were my initial comments addressed. The use of maps hides reality. The straight lines fail to address current practice. End of runway and actual takeoff need to be considered. 6% climb gradient is meaningless. No reference to onboard navigation equipment software. The exercise reminds me of my flight to Rome with jet2. I paid a fine because the parking concession was concerned only to demonstrate that it followed its own rules. I made life easier for the airport by taking advantage of jet 2 service to collect bags the night before. On return the escalator was not working. The airport exists because of passengers and the companies that fly them. In November I chose Manchester. My grandson lives next to a semi rural main road. He is used to noise. He panicked when an aircraft took the usual short cut. When it's cloudy pilots think we don't know where they are. Take off and landing follow very different routes. Bradford policy is to move road traffic from areas of population. LBA appears not to have noticed. I cannot support you

On 21 Apr 2023, at 14:46, Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk> wrote:

good afternoon

Thank you for your email.

Whilst your feedback is noted, we'd appreciate your assistance with the CAP1616 process by completing the questionnaire linked below. This enables us to collate feedback against all of the design options.

<https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=i7sUVi6NDEOZuRiVS-BNsifBUIQFrZZMo7ajvDHR8DVUMFdWMUZGSjEzNFJZROFENU9XNzFSNzhLTi4u>

Airspace Change

Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 5:35 PM
To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>
Subject: Re: Stage 2A Stakeholder Query

Good afternoon. I spent ages before I completed the questionnaire. I dropped you a note after I completed it. If it's possible to include my general comments I would be grateful.

Bottom line. The survey does not allow me to make the necessary comments.

If you would like more detail feel free to ask. I shall provide it next week. Provided I have not thrown away my annotations

LBA-004

Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 4:08 PM
To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>
Subject: Leeds Bradford Airport - Airspace Change

Dear Sirs

We refer to your email dated 31 March in which you provide an update on progress with the Leeds Bradford Airport FASI(N) Airspace Change Proposal and requested feedback by Friday 28 April. We have already completed and submitted our feedback using the form provided in which we have made reference to an accompanying letter which follows below.

Although Airspace Change is a complex matter requiring careful analysis, we have endeavoured to evaluate the consequences of what is proposed.

The Agreed Design Principles (DP) set out in your progress report include as criteria DP2 Noise, DP3 Tranquillity, and DP4 Emissions and Air Quality, each of which we endorse. Since the consultation document suggests routes that would potentially impact flights over Otley, we have circulated the proposals to our members who are far from satisfied for the following reasons.

Routing

Although options labelled RW32 describe these departure routes as "South Easterly" and "South & Westerly Options F&G".

This is misleading because all of these routes depart to the North West, thereby overflying Otley and the neighbourhood.

Similarly, RW14 South & West Departures leave in that direction but are then shown as turning to overfly Otley.

In the evaluation tables, which include the criteria referred to above, reference is rightly made to impacts on communities including Keighley, Ilkley, Burley-in-Wharfedale, North Leeds and Bradford.

However, no reference is made to the impact on Otley, one of the closest communities to Leeds Bradford Airport. This is amplified below.

Departures

Proposal RW32SE – Although recognising the impact of noise (DP2) on Ilkley created by RW32SEG, there is no reference to the same impact on Otley.

Furthermore, all of these options impact Tranquillity (DP3) and there appears to be no consideration of the impact on Emissions & Air Quality (DP4).

Proposal RW32SW - Although recognising the impact of noise (DP2) on Ilkley created by RW32S&WG and RW32S&WH, there is no reference to the same impact on Otley.

Furthermore, all of these options impact Tranquillity (DP3) and there appears to be little consideration of the impact on Emissions & Air Quality (DP4) other than recognising “More air miles” for some options.

Proposal RW32NW - Although recognising the impact of noise (DP2) on Ilkley created by RW32NW, there is no reference to the same impact on Otley.

Furthermore, all of these options impact Tranquillity (DP3) and there appears to be no consideration of the impact on Emissions & Air Quality (DP4).

Proposal RW32NE - Although recognising the impact of noise (DP2) on Ilkley, Burley in Wharfedale and Keighley created by RW32NW, there is no reference to the same impact on Otley.

Furthermore, all of these options impact Tranquillity (DP3) and there appears to be no consideration of the impact on Emissions & Air Quality (DP4).

Arrivals

Noise (DP2) - All of the options appear to potentially affect new people, although there is no reference to the very same impact on Otley.

Tranquillity (DP3) - All of the options appear to impact, although there is no reference to Otley.

Emissions & Air Quality (DP4) - All of the options appear to impact, although there is no reference to Otley.

We would appreciate your confirmation that these Airspace Changes will be re-evaluated taking into consideration the above facts.

We propose to copy these representations to Leeds City Council, Otley Town Council and to our Member of Parliament.

LBA-006

Sent: 26 August 2022 13:33

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: Airspace change Stage 2 Stakeholder Engagement Questionnaire Response

Good afternoon

Please find attached responses to the Stage 2 Stakeholder Engagement Questionnaire. I have also filled out the online questionnaire but unfortunately there is not enough space in the free text boxes to accommodate the entirety of my responses so the letter is also necessary.

From: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Date: Thursday, 15 September 2022 at 09:43

Subject: RE: Airspace change Stage 2 Stakeholder Engagement Questionnaire Response

Good morning

Apologies for the tardy reply. Our original one got stuck during a change of firewall so resending.

Your response is acknowledged and will be taken into consideration.

Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2022 12:50 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: Re: Airspace change Stage 2 Stakeholder Engagement Questionnaire Response

Please can you keep me update on progress with the responses to the questions I raised on behalf of the Moor Lane Residents.

We are keen to cooperate with the Airport to address these matters as they are right at the heart of the departure aircraft noise issues that the residents of Burley in Wharfedale (-and Menston) experience on virtually a daily basis.

LBA-007

Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 3:41 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: Stage 2a

Good afternoon,

Apologies for the late email and lack of questionnaire response; we have been late in replying to due to the responsible parties being on leave etc.

We are happy that all the presented procedure options have been designed to the correct standard, we have no objections at this stage.

LBA-008

Sent: Friday, August 12, 2022 5:04 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: LBA CAP1616 Stage2 Engagement Feedback Form - Burn Gliding Club Ltd

Please find attached feedback form.

The online form took ages to wade through and then at the end came up with an error message stating "This form is currently not accepting responses".

So I have laboriously copied each answer into a word document so that I could still submit it to you.

NO REPLY BOXES TICKED

LBA-009

Sent: Friday, August 12, 2022 4:54 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: LBA Airspace Change Stage 2 Feedback

I provided my feedback today but found the online form wasn't accepting updates.

Difficult to save a Microsoft Form with the responses so I've done a crude copy in Word with my responses in Red. Should be sufficient for you to add to the feedback results.

Welcome

We are very grateful to you for completing this feedback survey. If you need any assistance completing this form please contact acp@lba.co.uk

1. Please enter your name?

2. What organisation do you represent?

Bramhope & Carlton Parish Council

3. Please provide an email for future correspondence?

4. Which discussion session did you attend?

☒

5th July AM

☐

5th July PM

☐

I received the presentation

5. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-NW-A**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐

Yes

☐

No

☐

DP3 - the swathe overflies Ilkley Moor, arguably a rural area much used for leisure activities. However, the height at which aircraft pass is a significant factor that may result in little noise.

6.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-NE-A**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐

Yes

☐

No

☐

DP2. If "overflies Ilkley" is a factor in Swathe D32-NE-B, surely it is a factor for D32-NE-A? Swathes A and B seem to have their boundary line on Ilkley.

7.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-NE-B**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐

Yes

☐

No

☐

8.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-NE-C**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐

Yes

☐

No

☐

9.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-NE-D**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐

Yes

☐

No

☐

10.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-NE-E**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐

Yes

☐ No

☐

11.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-SE-A**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

DP 2 Unclear what the comment "Baseline affects less people at lower levels than this option - Burley in Wharfedale / Bramhope"

12.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-SE-B**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

DP 2 Unclear what the comment "Baseline affects less people at lower levels than this option - Burley in Wharfedale / Bramhope"

13.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-SE-C**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

DP 2 Unclear what the comment "Baseline affects less people at lower levels than this option - Burley in Wharfedale / Bramhope"

14.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-SE-D**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

15.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-SE-E**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

16.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South & West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-S&W-A**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

DP2 - as before Unclear what the comment "Baseline affects less people at lower levels than this option - Burley in Wharfedale / Bramhope"

17.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South & West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-S&W-B**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

18.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South & West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-S&W-C**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

19.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South & West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-S&W-D**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

20.DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South & West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-S&W-E**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

21.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-NW-A**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

DP2 - Noise -impacting Headingley and Leeds

22.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-NW-B**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

23.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-NW-C**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

24.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-NW-D**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

DP2 - Noise. The comments for D14-NW-B must also apply to D14-NW-D as the boundary of the swathes bisects Bradford.

25.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-NE-A**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

26.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-NE-B**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

DP2 - the comment on D14-NE-A "Overflight of populated areas" must apply to D14-NE-B

27.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-NE-C**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

28.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-NE-D**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

DP2 - the comment on D14-NE-A "Overflight of populated areas" must apply to D14-NE-D

29.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-NE-E**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

DP2 - the comment on D14-NE-A "Overflight of populated areas" must apply to D14-NE-E

30.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-SE-A**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

31.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-SE-B**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

32.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-SE-C**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

33.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South East

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-SE-D**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

34.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South & West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-S&W-A**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

35.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South & West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-S&W-B**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

36.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South & West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-S&W-C**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

37.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South & West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-S&W-D**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

38.DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South & West

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D14-S&W-E**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

39.ARRIVALS Runway 32/14

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to **Arrivals Option A**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

No matrix provided of RAG status against Design Principles

40.ARRIVALS Runway 32/14

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to **Arrivals Option B**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

41.ARRIVALS Runway 32/14

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to **Arrivals Option C**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

42.ARRIVALS Runway 32/14

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to **Arrivals Option D**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

43.ARRIVALS Runway 32/14

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to **Arrivals Option E**?

If no, please provide the Design Principle number and reason in the free text 'other' field.

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐

LBA-010

Sent: Friday, August 12, 2022 12:20 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: RE: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

Importance: High

We have today submitted the RSAG response as requested. A hard copy is attached for your information. Please note the following RSAG concerns which your survey form was unable to accommodate. Please cc my colleagues if your respond to this email.

RSAG is primarily concerned with the following Design Principles: DP1 – Importance of Safety; DP5 Airspace Dimensions and DP6 Airspace Complexity.

However, we are unable to make meaningful comment with regards to DPs 1, 5 & 6 until more detailed information of any proposed controlled airspace (CAS) have been provided for our examination, for instance, altitudes and Flight levels. We are concerned that many of the swathes do not align with current airspace constructs, potentially leading to more complex airspace and bottlenecks in controlled and uncontrolled airspace. Therefore, our responses in the absence of specific detail will be No i.e., the DPs have not been met and with a recommendation for an AMBER, or possibly, even a RED grading. However, we have added our concerns on certain areas as appropriate, for example, the existence of the Upton Corridor and agreed Wave Boxes.

Finally, as a matter of principle, we would regard any extension of CAS as requiring very significant justification and which will be the subject of intense scrutiny from our members, particularly our many commercial pilots, especially those with experience of operating out of LBA. Naturally, we would expect any justifiable CAS extension to be complemented by a reduction in unrequired CAS elsewhere. Accordingly, we await with interest to see specific detail in future documentation to allow us to fully consider the implications of any proposals on other users of CAS.

Have a good weekend.

1. Please enter your name?

2. What organisation do you represent? RSAG (Regional Soaring Airspace Group) - RSAG represents British Gliding Association (BGA) and British Hang Gliding & Paragliding (BHPA) clubs in Yorkshire, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire: eleven clubs and over 2,000 regular pilots in total. Individual RSAG club may also submit their own response to this survey.

3. Please provide an email for future correspondence?

4. Which discussion session did you attend?

- ☐ 5th July AM
- ☒ 5th July PM
- ☐ I received the presentation

5. **DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North West A**

Do you think we have correctly applied the Design Principles to swathe **D32-NW-A**?

Yes/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

6. **DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North East A**

Yes/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

7. **DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North East B**

Yes/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

8. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North East C

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. We are concerned that your documentation does not acknowledge the existence of the Temporary Reserved Areas for Gliders (TRA(G)) [AIP ENR 6-64/65] or the Non-Secondary Surveillance Radar Gliding Areas [AIP ENR 6-63]. Moreover, gliders are likely to operate above FL100 in mountain wave conditions in swathe 32NE-C. Accordingly, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

9. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North East D

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. We are concerned that your documentation does not acknowledge the existence of the Temporary Reserved Areas for Gliders (TRA(G)) [AIP ENR 6-64/65] or the Non-Secondary Surveillance Radar Gliding Areas [AIP ENR 6-63]. Moreover, gliders are likely to operate above FL100 in mountain wave conditions in swathe 32NE-D. Accordingly, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

10. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - North East E

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. We also need to understand the Flight Levels likely to be set within this swathe and the proposed entry point into NATs airspace. Accordingly, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

11. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South East A

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. We are concerned that your documentation does not acknowledge the existence of the Temporary Reserved Areas for Gliders (TRA(G)) [AIP ENR 6-64/65] or the Non-Secondary Surveillance Radar Gliding Areas [AIP ENR 6-63]. Moreover, gliders are likely to operate above FL100 in mountain wave conditions in swathe 32SE-A. Accordingly, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

12. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South East B

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. We require information upon any impact on the Upton Corridor Agreement existing between the BGA and DSA whereby, in suitable weather conditions, the floors of DSA CTA 8 & 9 are raised to facilitate transiting North/South (and vice versa) cross country gliders. Accordingly, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

13. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South East C

~~Yes~~/No

Comment: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

14. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South East D

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

15. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South East E

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

16. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South & West A

~~Yes~~/No.

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

17. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South & West B

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

18. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South & West C

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

19. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South & West D

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

20. DEPARTURES Runway 32 - South & West E

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

21. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North West A

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1,5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

22. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North West B

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

23. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North West C

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. We are concerned that your documentation does not acknowledge the existence of the Temporary Reserved Areas for Gliders (TRA(G)) [AIP ENR 6-64/65] or the Non-Secondary Surveillance Radar Gliding Areas [AIP ENR 6-63]. Moreover, gliders are likely to operate above FL100 in mountain wave conditions in swathes 14NW-C. Accordingly, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

24. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North West D

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

25. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North East A

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. Swathe 14NE-A covers an AIGA (Area of Intense Gliding Activity) in all soaring conditions, whereby gliders can be operating in thermals up to cloud base and in mountain wave above FL1000. In addition, RAF and other jets operate from RAF Leeming in this area, as well as transiting military traffic. The Temporary Reserved Areas for Gliders (TRA(G)) [AIP ENR 6-64/65] and the Non-Secondary Surveillance Radar Gliding Areas [AIP ENR 6-63] are not acknowledged. Accordingly, we

reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

26. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North East B

Yes/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

27. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North East C

Yes/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

28. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North East D

Yes/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

29. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - North East E

Yes/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

30. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South East A

Yes/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. As no flight level information is provided, it is difficult to determine how swathe14SE-A will integrate with the Yorkshire CTA and DSA CTA and the potential adverse impact on the Camphill Wave Box. Accordingly, we reserve our position

until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

31. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South East B

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. In addition, will swathes 14SE-B impact the Upton Corridor Agreement existing between the BGA and DSA whereby, in suitable weather, the floors of DSA CTA 8 & 9 are raised to facilitate transiting North/South (and vice versa) cross country gliders. We also recognise the potential for adversely impacting the Camphill Wave Box.

Accordingly, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

32. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South East C

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. In addition, will swathes 14SE-C impact the Upton Corridor Agreement existing between the BGA and DSA whereby, in suitable weather, the floors of DSA CTA 8 & 9 are raised to facilitate transiting North/South (and vice versa) cross country gliders. Furthermore, swathe 14SE-C overflies busy gliding and GA areas and is an AIGA. Accordingly, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

33. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South East D

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. In addition, will swathes 14SE-D impact the Upton Corridor Agreement existing between the BGA and DSA whereby, in suitable weather, the floors of

DSA CTA 8 & 9 are raised to facilitate transiting North/South (and vice versa) cross country gliders. Furthermore, swathe 14SE-D overflies busy gliding and GA clubs with gliders in particular potentially flying up to FL195 and possibly higher if utilising AIP ENR 6-64/65. Accordingly, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

34. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South & West A

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

35. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South & West B

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1,5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

36. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South & West C

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

37. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South & West D

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

38. DEPARTURES Runway 14 - South & West E

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1,5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

39. ARRIVALS Runway 32/14 (Option A)

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Evaluation Information on Option A was **not** provided in the presentation? Therefore, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

40. ARRIVALS Runway 32/14 (Option B)

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. Options B & E do not acknowledge the Temporary Reserved Areas for Gliders (TRA(G)) [AIP ENR 6-64/65] or the Non-Secondary Surveillance Radar Gliding Areas [AIP ENR 6-63], nor that gliders operate in thermals up to cloud base and in mountain wave above FL100. Moreover, and of significant concern, is that both options may require additional CAS (controlled airspace) to the East in contrast to Options C & D. Therefore, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

41. ARRIVALS Runway 32/14 (Option C)

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

42. ARRIVALS Runway 32/14 (Option D)

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 AMBER: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. However, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

43. ARRIVALS Runway 32/14 (Option E)

~~Yes~~/No

Comments: DPs 1, 5 & 6 RED: Our initial assessment based on our knowledge of the area and LBA's own evaluation. Options B & E do not acknowledge the Temporary Reserved Areas for Gliders (TRA(G)) [AIP ENR 6-64/65] or the Non-Secondary Surveillance Radar Gliding Areas [AIP ENR 6-63], nor that gliders operate in thermals up to cloud base and in mountain wave above FL100. Moreover, and of significant concern, is that both options may require additional CAS (controlled airspace) to the East in contrast to Options C & D. Therefore, we reserve our position until details of any proposed airspace are supplied in order for RSAG members to fully understand the ramifications on other airspace users.

Sent: Friday, August 12, 2022 10:32 AM

Subject: NERL Feedback - LBA Stage 2 Engagement 5th July 2022.

We would like to offer the following narrative as feedback to the recent Leeds Bradford ACP Stage 2 Engagement, which we found very informative and well presented.

We interpret appropriate application of the LBA design principles to the swathes presented but wish to caveat that NERL does not have sufficient local knowledge to comment upon application of design principles 2,3,4 and 9 that primarily relate to local geographical and environmental factors.

Additionally, we would wish to generically comment against each swathe question that: -

- a) Design Principle 7. Ongoing Options Development - we shall assume any final design will be PANS-Ops & CAA compliant.
- b) Design principle 9. LBA and NERL shall continue to undertake collaborative technical engagement activities through all CAP1616 stages to ensure optimal systemisation and integration with the En Route Network in any final design(s) in both LBA and NERL ACP's.

We also observe some swathes appear to have been discounted (Red) at this point in a form of early DP evaluation. From our joint workshops over the past couple of months or so we believe some of these examples may, in our opinion, still be potentially beneficial in terms of LBA - NERL Network connectivity, RWY14 Left turn out and RWY32 straight ahead West for example. We would therefore like to understand if these swathes will still be available for onward dialogue with us ahead of your formal DP evaluation.

We appreciate long list option presentation and subsequent options down selection (formal DP evaluation) is a complex and lengthy process, we would like to assure you of our ongoing commitment to working closely with you throughout to ensure the best possible design outcomes for both LBA and NERL.

Please don't hesitate to contact me, Phil or Chris if there's anything you would like to discuss further Jamie however in the meantime, we look forward to continuing our close working relationship with you and LBA.

Kind regards

LBA-012

On 5 Aug 2022, at 17:20, Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk> wrote:

I've just seen an email from regarding your conversation with our consultants.

I can only apologise that you haven't received anything to date, that's certainly not the intention of LBA, I was not aware of the discussion or the response you received.

Attached is a copy of the presentation. We would request that you review the various options and using the questionnaire [HERE](#), let us know whether they meet the original Design Principles (Also Attached).

CLOSING DATE FOR RESPONSES IS FRIDAY 12TH AUGUST 2022.

The following links also take you to a copy of the [CAP1616](#) and also the [LBA Airspace Change Portal](#).

Thank you again for your continued support and hopefully in coordination with Martin you have enough time to respond to the questionnaire. Please let me know if you require any additional time.

Sent: 10 August 2022 17:21

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: Re: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

Thank you for your email recognising the BHPA as stakeholders and inviting us to contribute. We are disappointed to have been missed off your list of Stakeholders for a second time, especially following our exchange of emails on 26 and 29 Nov 21.

Given the late notification and the broad nature of the options at this stage, we are unable to comment in detail. The majority of our members fly outside CAS and, until we see more detail of any proposed changes to CAS, we are unable to consider the safety implications of revised choke points and low ceilings.

At this stage of the process, we suggest that it would be appropriate to colour code DP 1 (Safety), DP 5 (Airspace Dimensions) and DP 6 (Airspace Complexity) as a minimum of AMBER for all swathes and approach options.

On 11 Aug 2022, at 09:55, Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk> wrote:

As we've not given you sufficient time to respond, our proposition is to give you an additional 2 weeks (26th August), giving you the same 4 weeks that everybody else was given. Would that be acceptable to you?

Your second comment about the broad options is noted. However, the current phase we are at doesn't take into account the specific airspace requirements. Any comments that are made will be reviewed and form part of the options assessment process though.

As the options are whittled down and 'real world' procedures are designed, etc, I look forward to engaging with you on them.

Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2022 4:35 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: Re: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

Thank you for your email and the offer of an extended deadline. Even with more time I don't think that we will be able to make useful comparisons between the departure swathes and approach options at this stage. We look forward to contributing more fully once you have some details of the proposed CAS.

Kind regards

LBA-013

Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2022 2:17 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

Good Afternoon.

We attended your presentation via teams on behalf of ATC at Teesside International Airport.

I would say at this early stage it would be irrelevant for us to provide opinion on the questionnaire you sent us, as we only really want to be involved in the stages down the line where we can see if your change in procedures have an impact directly on our operations.

Many thanks for involving us, and we look forward to seeing how your ACP progresses down the line.

LBA-014

On 5 Aug 2022, at 17:20, Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk> wrote:

Good afternoon

I've just seen an email from regarding your conversation with our consultants.

I can only apologise that you haven't received anything to date, that's certainly not the intention of LBA, I was not aware of the discussion or the response you received.

Attached is a copy of the presentation. We would request that you review the various options and using the questionnaire [HERE](#), let us know whether they meet the original Design Principles (Also Attached).

CLOSING DATE FOR RESPONSES IS FRIDAY 12TH AUGUST 2022.

The following links also take you to a copy of the [CAP1616](#) and also the [LBA Airspace Change Portal](#).

Thank you again for your continued support and hopefully in coordination with Martin you have enough time to respond to the questionnaire. Please let me know if you require any additional time.

Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 5:21 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: Re: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

Thank you for your email recognising the BHPA as stakeholders and inviting us to contribute. We are disappointed to have been missed off your list of Stakeholders for a second time, especially following our exchange of emails on 26 and 29 Nov 21.

Given the late notification and the broad nature of the options at this stage, we are unable to comment in detail. The majority of our members fly outside CAS and, until we see more detail of any proposed changes to CAS, we are unable to consider the safety implications of revised choke points and low ceilings.

At this stage of the process, we suggest that it would be appropriate to colour code DP 1 (Safety), DP 5 (Airspace Dimensions) and DP 6 (Airspace Complexity) as a minimum of AMBER for all swathes and approach options.

LBA-015

Sent: 03 August 2022 16:50

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: LBA AC

Could you please supply me with a copy of the latest stakeholders list so I can ensure all the relevant soaring clubs are represented?

From: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Sent: 04 August 2022 08:59

Subject: RE: LBA ACP

Below are the Local Stakeholder organisations that we have been sending details out to. I can't send the whole list as it has personal information on it.

These being in addition to the BGA and yourself representing RSAG.

Burn Gliding Club
Camphill
Dales Hang gliding and Paragliding Club

Derbyshire Soaring Club
Pennine Soaring Club
Pocklington (Wolds Gliding Club)
Sutton Bank (Yorkshire Gliding Club)
York Rufforth (York Gliding Centre)

Sent: 04 August 2022 14:39

Subject: FW: LBA ACP

Are BHPA registered?

Sent: 05 August 2022 16:31

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: Re: LBA ACP

I certainly hope so. As NATMAC members they should be automatically included along with the BGA. Having been missed off the original list of stakeholders, the BHPA asked to be included on 26 Nov 21. In her email to me of 2 Feb 22 (Cyrrus) included the following statement:

'Please accept my apologies that the British Hang gliding and Paragliding Association (BHPA) were not listed as a stakeholder in the report, this was an administrative oversight on our part. BHPA are an important stakeholder and will be listed and fully engaged in the process going forward.'

The email of 26 Nov 21 made it clear that is the BHPA POC.

From: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Sent: 05 August 2022 17:22

Subject: RE: LBA ACP

Thanks for the email.

I was unaware of the discussion that took place and we received the NATMAC list from our consultants.

I've sent a copy of the engagement email and added him to my list (which is what we use to send out the emails)

As I've said to, I can only apologise for the oversight and have assured him that hie will be included in all future emails.

I hope that's all ok.

Sent: 06 August 2022 10:24
To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>
Subject: Re: LBA ACP

Thanks - better late than never!

Is no longer part of the Cyrrus team?

From: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>
Sent: 06 August 2022 11:10
Subject: RE: LBA ACP

Yes but not LBA's ACP.

LBA-016

Sent: Friday, August 5, 2022 7:06 PM
To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>
Subject: Acp consultation questionnaire

I attended the 5th July morning briefing as one of two people representing NWLTF.
In preparing our response to the stakeholder questionnaire we realise that the two of us have different interpretations of the arrivals options which means that we are unable to formulate a response. Would it be possible to have a brief phone conversation with a member of the team so that we can clarify a few points regarding the options?
Given the deadline of 12th August, this would need to be ASAP.

LBA-017

Sent: 03 August 2022 14:25
To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>
Subject: Burn Gliding Club Ltd

Dear Leeds Bradford Airport,

As far as I can tell my email address is registered as that of an interested party in relation to your latest ACP but so far I haven't seen any information on this subject at all?

Please ensure that Burn Gliding Club Ltd is registered on the list of aviation stakeholders so that we can express our views and voice any concerns as your ACP progresses.

Please confirm that Burn Gliding Club Ltd has now been added to the list of stakeholders and forward any relevant information so that we can respond before the next 12th August deadline.

On 4 Aug 2022 at 08:44, Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk> wrote:

good morning

We have (We understand to be your Chairman) listed on our stakeholder list.

Could you please confirm the address you would like to use and I'll ensure that its added.

Sent: Thursday, August 4, 2022 9:35 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: Re: Burn Gliding Club Ltd

Hi There,

has resigned as Chairman. Our new chairman. I am the airspace representative for the club so please add me to your circulation list using this email address.

LBA-018

Sent: 22 July 2022 14:59

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: RE: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

Good afternoon

For a variety of reasons I have had to miss recent LBA events, including the stakeholder consultation below.

I think Baildon Town Council (BTC) may want to formally respond as an organisation, and to facilitate this I have included this item on our Council agenda for next Monday evening @7pm, which you can see on baildowntowncouncil.gov.uk

I am writing to request your help please. Although I have had an initial look at the presentation below, it is very long and detailed and I am defeated in grasping what it might mean for Baildon.

I wonder if you are able to let me have a couple of paragraphs which focus on the potential impact on Baildon from the proposed changes – which I can circulate to councillors, or perhaps you have an alternative idea as to how we can get to grips with this complex issue?

As context, there is considerable comment locally on the increase in planes flying over Baildon, especially in the morning before and after 7am. I regularly hear them myself. This is surprising to me as the previous proposed changes which included plans for take off over Baildon, were, I understood scrapped, and this current exercise is the re-run of that consultation.

So I am interested to hear the explanation as to why this could be the case.

I note that the deadline for response to the consultation is 12th August.

Of course, we would be very happy to host a stakeholder event here in Baildon if you could be persuaded to do that? But I am not optimistic ...

Anyhow, your urgent advice would be appreciated please as to how best to approach this and what we can usefully do at our meeting on Monday evening,

Kind regards

From: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Sent: 22 July 2022 17:04

Subject: RE: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

Good afternoon

Thank you for your email and I'm sorry that you missed the engagement sessions.

Hopefully I can answer your questions below (please forgive the red text, it just stands out better):

As context, there is considerable comment locally on the increase in planes flying over Baildon, especially in the morning before and after 7am. I regularly hear them myself. This is surprising to me as the previous proposed changes which included plans for take off over Baildon, were, I understood scrapped, and this current exercise is the re-run of that consultation.

Nothing that we are engaging on at the moment has in any way changed the routes that aircraft currently fly. These are the same routes that have been in place since roughly 1994. There are an increased number of movements but they're not flying any different routes. As for the previous ACP, I wasn't part of that project but I can assure you that the current ACP is an entirely different process and not a rerun of the previous ACP.

Of course, we would be very happy to host a stakeholder event here in Baildon if you could be persuaded to do that? But I am not optimistic ...

The current stage that we're at is a little too targeted for an individual hosted stakeholder event as we limited each group to two members. If it would help however, I'd be happy to have a Teams call with a couple of representative on Monday afternoon ahead of your council meeting if that would help? I'm available between 1300 and 1530?

I note your last comment and worry that the previous ACP may have cause an element of cynicism of LBA? All I can say is that this ACP has started from fresh, with no predetermined ideas. Hopefully if you'll allow, I'd like to perhaps change that view? I've personally been an Air Traffic Controller at LBA for the last 14 years and know our airspace and procedures well.

I wonder if you are able to let me have a couple of paragraphs which focus on the potential impact on Baildon from the proposed

changes – which I can circulate to councillors, or perhaps you have an alternative idea as to how we can get to grips with this complex issue?

Please refer to the point above regarding a Teams call? If not suitable I can do my best to put something together for you.

Hopefully the above helps to start moving things forward from your perspective and I look forward to your thoughts.

Sent: 25 July 2022 14:26

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: RE: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

I had hoped to accept your offer of a Teams meeting today, but ,as often happens just before a Council meeting, things are very hectic.

If you could let us have a short statement I could share tonight please, and then perhaps your offer could stand for sometime next week, ahead of the closing date for comments.

I will ask councillors tonight who might be able to join us.

Thank you for your assistance

From: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Sent: 25 July 2022 15:27

Subject: RE: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

I think the easiest way of addressing the current stage is not to think of it as Baildon specifically but more a case of whether the general swathes meet the original design principles. The aim being general stakeholder engagement.

For example, one of the options for the north easterly departures would require a significant amount of new airspace. This would not necessarily meet the requirements of DP5, where the requirement is to have the minimum required amount of controlled airspace.

Once we have the responses to this stage, the options are whittled down before further stakeholder engagement. This is followed but our preferred options being designed, with the wider general public consulted.

I'm still happy to have a Teams call but I'd ask that it's limited to two people, therefore sticking to the same numbers for all stakeholders.

I can do next Tuesday after 1300, next Thursday morning before 1200 and to suit next Friday.

Sent: 03 August 2022 20:33

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: RE: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

Good evening

Apologies again for the slow response.

Please can I suggest this Friday, 5th August, at 10.30 or 11am please?
My colleague (copied in) may be able to join us, I hope so but depends on his work commitments.

I hope that following our discussion I /We may feel confident enough to make a response to the consultation ahead of the 12th August deadline

I look forward to “meeting” you on Friday

On 4 Aug 2022, at 17:05, Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk> wrote:

Yes that's fine with me. Shall we say 1030?

I'm struggling to send a Teams invite, do you have the ability to send one? If not, I'll look for alternatives in the morning.

Sent: Thursday, August 4, 2022 6:33 PM

To: Airspace Change <acp@lba.co.uk>

Subject: Re: LBA ACP Stage 2A Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Questionnaire

Thank you.

I now have three teams invitations so I can foresee problems as we may choose different ones to log in to.

Shall we agree on the first one ...?