

Objective

Brief members on the Airspace Change Proposals from Brize Norton and “London Oxford” (aka Kidlington !)

Agenda

- 1. Current Airspace and Planned Airspace Changes***
- 2. Impact on soaring community***
- 3. Options for response & challenges***
- 4. Next steps***

Time Line

Framework
Briefing

11/9/14

Consultation

15/12/17 – 22/3/18

Collate &
analyse,
decide final
proposal

Publish
consultation
response
Document

Submit ACP
to CAA

CAA
Regulatory
Decision

Current Status

- ❖ Briefing held at Aston Down on 7th Feb 2015
 - ❖ Brize Norton only
 - ❖ BGGC and AD not consulted on Oxford ACP
- ❖ Document issued by Brize Norton & Oxford on 15th Dec 2017 under “old” ACP process
 - ❖ CAA Guidance is that such proposals should “demonstrate that they have the new process in mind and take it into account even though the new process is not required”
 - ❖ No joint document or charts issued – despite CAA request to do so at initial briefings
- ❖ New CAA Airspace change process comes into force 1st Jan 2018
- ❖ BGA considering strategy for response
- ❖ CAA will review all correspondence received during the process to look closely at concerns raised and actions taken to cater for these – so it is vital that as many people as possible respond in detail and in writing.

Discussion – What can we do?

➤ Challenge the Regulator (CAA)

- Air Transport Act Requirements – CAA Statutory obligation
- CAA guidance on taking account of the requirements in the new process
- Follow up on CAA requested actions in minutes of briefings (eg single ACP)
- Challenge the assumptions
 - E.g. necessity & design or procedural approaches, quoted air-miss incidents, predicted traffic volumes

➤ Traditional Approach

- Assess impact on gliding and other GA activity
- Stress inconvenience & challenge safety implications (choke points)
- Use economic impact arguments for GA and gliding

➤ Alternative “Benefit vs Cost” approach

- Focus on impact on Brize/Oxford assuming all current traffic will wish the new airspace
- Calculate required ATC resources, frequencies, and equipment (1 Controller = 15 flights/hour)
- Suggest alternate lower-cost options (eg raised base, limited hours, activation by NOTAM)

➤ Engage the Public

- PR campaign to areas affected by increased noise / pollution
- General public, not aviation community – emphasise environmental aspects

Which approach(s) to take

Approach	Substantive Factors	Likely Response	Track Record of Success
Challenge the Process	CAA Minutes, Air Transport Act, documented process. Brize Norton actual flights and hours of operation (not applicable to Oxford)	CAA have limited powers, Brize can easily claim military necessity	May act as delaying tactic and obtain some modification to proposal
Traditional Approach	Gliding flight data (ladder) and FAS estimates	Safety & military necessity	Nil
Benefit vs Cost Approach	Comparison with other Class D handling high volumes Gliding and GA flight data and implied crossing rates.	May raise issues around electronic conspicuity Brize Norton likely to be budget constrained	Unknown
Public Relations	Mostly emotional arguments, can be linked to Benefit vs Cost arguments	Depends on level of visibility and support achieved	Some success in delaying Farnborough

The Cost Benefit Approach

➤ ALARP

- Regulatory commitment to “Providing a service”
- Allows for Safety vs Cost balance
- Focus on cost of service provision may force requestors to assess what they really require
- Can still challenge the assumptions
 - E.g. necessity & design or procedural approaches, quoted air-miss incidents, predicted traffic volumes

➤ What data do we need?

- Assess average and peak traffic volumes (transits/hour), weekend and mid week, daytime
- Provide realistic examples of ATC resource needed to handle glider & GA traffic
- Reference FASVIG register of critical VFR areas and low-cost Electronic Conspicuity projects

➤ What would we ask for?

- CAA to apply conditions on Brize and Oxford to demonstrate budget and funding for sufficient resources, frequencies , “clutch” controller implementation ertc
- Ask for funding for conspicuity devices
- Ask change sponsors to raise critical base levels or reduce hours of operation (eg weekends) to reduce their costs. “4D Airspace”

➤ Implications

- Commits us to more active use of ATC and radio
- May require us to install conspicuity devices

What Next

➤ Actions for Members

1. Read and understand the ACP documents
2. Be ready to respond in your own terms once BGA guidance is out
3. Gather your own historical data
4. Consider engaging other, non-gliding, stakeholders if you have contacts (eg local govt, notable residence)

➤ Contacts

- londonoxfordairportconsultation@ospreycl.co.uk
- rafbrizenortonairportconsultation@ospreycl.co.uk
- airspace.policy@caa.co.uk

Discussion

Questions

Ideas

Volunteers