

T +44 1252 451 651
F +44 1252 451 652
E info@askhelios.com
W www.askhelios.com

Independent review of the Civil Aviation Authority's Airspace Change Process

Survey Data

Survey data

The following note contains the raw data from the stakeholder survey conducted as part of the evidence gathering phase of this work. The data is broken down question by question for additional clarity.

To reflect the opinion of different stakeholder groups survey results were classified according to whether the respondent represented the local community surrounding an airport (COM), change sponsors and industry (CSI) and the general aviation community (GA). This breakdown is provided below:

Respondent ID	Helios classification	Organisation name
COM-01	Community	2M
COM-02	Community	a
COM-03	Community	Aircraft Noise Lightwater Campaign Group
COM-04	Community	Balsall Common Village Residents Association
COM-05	Community	Berkswell Parish Council
COM-06	Community	CAGNE
COM-07	Community	Communities Against Increased Aircraft Noise
COM-08	Community	Ealing Aircraft Noise Action Group
COM-09	Community	East Sussex Communities for the Control of Air Noise (ESCCAN)
COM-10	Community	East Sussex County Council
COM-11	Community	Englefield green action group
COM-12	Community	Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign
COM-13	Community	HACAN
COM-14	Community	Iver Parish Council
COM-15	Community	LADACAN
COM-16	Community	London Borough of Hounslow
COM-17	Community	London Luton Airport Consultative Committee
COM-18	Community	London Luton Airport Town & Village Communities Committee
COM-19	Community	Mole Valley District Council
COM-20	Community	Richings Park Residents Association
COM-21	Community	Richmond Heathrow Campaign
COM-22	Community	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
COM-23	Community	Solihull mbc
COM-24	Community	Solihull mbc
COM-25	Community	Stansted Airport Consultative Committee
COM-26	Community	Stanwell Moor Residents Association
COM-27	Community	Teddington Action Group
COM-28	Community	The Hampton-in-Arden Society
COM-29	Community	Tunbridge Wells Aircraft Noise Study Group
COM-30	Community	Which?

Respondent ID	Helios classification	Organisation name
COM-31	Community	N/A
COM-32	Community	N/A
COM-33	Community	N/A
COM-34	Community	N/A
COM-35	Community	N/A
COM-36	Community	N/A
COM-37	Community	N/A
COM-38	Community	N/A
COM-39	Community	N/A
COM-40	Community	N/A
COM-41	Community	N/A
COM-42	Community	N/A
COM-43	Community	N/A
COM-44	Community	N/A
COM-45	Community	N/A
COM-46	Community	N/A
COM-47	Community	N/A
CSI-01	Change sponsor and industry	A&G Jefferson Limited
CSI-02	Change sponsor and industry	Birmingham Airport Limited
CSI-03	Change sponsor and industry	Bristol Airport
CSI-04	Change sponsor and industry	Exeter and Devon Airport Ltd
CSI-05	Change sponsor and industry	Glasgow Prestwick Airport
CSI-06	Change sponsor and industry	Heathrow Airport Limited
CSI-07	Change sponsor and industry	Heathrow Airport Limited
CSI-08	Change sponsor and industry	Humberside International Airport Limited
CSI-09	Change sponsor and industry	London City Airport Ltd
CSI-10	Change sponsor and industry	London Luton Airport
CSI-11	Change sponsor and industry	London Luton Airport
CSI-12	Change sponsor and industry	MoD
CSI-13	Change sponsor and industry	Monarch Airlines
CSI-14	Change sponsor and industry	Navy Command HQ
CSI-15	Change sponsor and industry	Southampton International Airport
CSI-16	Change sponsor and industry	Stansted Airport
CSI-17	Change sponsor and industry	TAG Farnborough Airport Ltd
CSI-18	Change sponsor and industry	UK Flight Safety Committee
CSI-19	Change sponsor and industry	Virgin Atlantic Airways
GA-01	GA	British Gliding Association
GA-02	GA	British Gliding Association
GA-03	GA	British Hang Gliders and Paragliders Association
GA-04	GA	British Microlight Aircraft Association (BMAA)

Respondent ID	Helios classification	Organisation name
GA-05	GA	British Parachute Association
GA-06	GA	GA Alliance, also Light Aircraft Association
GA-07	GA	Haringtons UK Ltd
GA-08	GA	Helicopter Club of Great Britain
GA-09	GA	Light Aircraft Association
GA-10	GA	Light Aircraft Association
GA-11	GA	N/A
GA-12	GA	N/A
GA-13	GA	N/A

Please rank the following themes in order of greatest concern to you (1 = greatest concern, 7 = least concern).

Respondent ID	Government policy and guidance: The appropriateness and clarity of the Governments intentions and objectives set out within legislation, directions and guidance. Also, the role of the Secretary of State for Transport in the airspace change process.	The airspace change process: The overall structure and scope of the airspace change process as defined by the CAA in CAP 725.	CAA guidance: The clarity of CAP 724 and CAP 725, such that all stakeholders have the same understanding. Also, clarity as to which requirements are mandatory, those which would reasonably be expected to be completed and those which are optional.	Engagement and consultation: The inclusion in the process of stakeholders at an appropriate time and in a meaningful way.	Trust: The ability for all stakeholders to trust and respect each other in the way the process is conducted, the openness of communications, the transparency of the process and the balanced assessment and evaluation of decision criteria.	Decision making: The clarity and appropriateness of the criteria used and the trade-offs applied between criteria by the CAA when evaluating and making the decision on whether to approve or reject an airspace change proposal.	Role of the CAA: The scope, clarity and awareness of the CAA's role within the current airspace change process.
COM-01	7	5	4	2	1	6	3
COM-02	2	6	4	7	1	3	5
COM-03	1	3	2	4	6	7	5
COM-04	5	6	4	2	3	7	1
COM-05	6	7	3	1	4	2	5
COM-06	2	7	1	6	4	5	3
COM-07	2	1	3	6	7	4	5
COM-08	7	1	5	2	4	3	6
COM-09	5	2	1	7	6	4	3
COM-10	2	6	7	1	4	3	5
COM-11	2	3	6	4	1	5	7
COM-12	1	5	4	7	2	6	3
COM-13	3	2	4	1	7	6	5

COM-14	6	4	5	1	2	3	7
COM-15	6	7	2	1	4	3	5
COM-16	1	7	2	3	4	6	5
COM-17	4	6	5	1	2	3	7
COM-18	7	5	4	2	3	1	6
COM-19	7	4	2	1	3	5	6
COM-20	5	6	4	3	2	1	7
COM-21	1	5	2	4	6	3	7
COM-22	7	2	1	3	6	5	4
COM-23	2	4	6	1	7	3	5
COM-24	7	2	3	1	4	6	5
COM-25	4	6	5	2	1	3	7
COM-26	2	7	4	1	6	5	3
COM-27	7	3	6	5	1	4	2
COM-28	6	7	5	1	2	3	4
COM-29	6	5	7	3	1	4	2
COM-30	3	6	5	4	2	1	7
COM-31	1	5	4	7	2	6	3
COM-32	4	5	7	1	2	3	6
COM-33	1	5	7	2	3	4	6
COM-34	4	5	1	3	7	2	6
COM-35	1	7	3	6	4	5	2
COM-36	3	7	5	2	1	4	6
COM-37	7	5	6	1	4	3	2
COM-38	4	5	7	3	2	1	6
COM-39	1	2	4	5	7	6	3
COM-40	3	4	1	5	7	6	2
COM-41	1	6	7	2	4	3	5
COM-42	7	1	6	2	3	4	5
COM-43	2	4	6	3	7	1	5
COM-44	6	5	3	2	1	7	4

COM-45	2	7	6	1	4	3	5
COM-46	4	5	6	3	1	2	7
COM-47	1	2	6	7	5	3	4
CSI-01	1	7	2	5	3	4	6
CSI-02	5	3	4	6	7	1	2
CSI-03	6	1	7	2	5	4	3
CSI-04	4	1	3	7	6	2	5
CSI-05	7	1	2	4	5	3	6
CSI-06	3	6	5	1	2	4	7
CSI-07	2	6	4	3	1	5	7
CSI-08	3	6	5	4	1	2	7
CSI-09	4	3	6	1	2	5	7
CSI-10	3	7	6	5	4	1	2
CSI-11	1	3	6	2	5	4	7
CSI-12	5	6	4	2	1	3	7
CSI-13	2	7	4	3	1	5	6
CSI-14	2	5	6	1	3	7	4
CSI-15	1	5	4	3	6	7	2
CSI-16	1	3	4	5	6	2	7
CSI-17	1	4	3	6	7	5	2
CSI-18	5	2	4	6	3	1	7
CSI-19	1	6	7	4	5	3	2
GA-01	4	5	7	2	6	1	3
GA-02	2	3	1	5	7	6	4
GA-03	4	7	5	3	1	2	6
GA-04	7	6	5	4	2	1	3
GA-05	1	2	5	4	7	6	3
GA-06	7	1	6	2	4	3	5
GA-07	5	3	4	6	1	7	2
GA-08	7	1	3	6	5	4	2
GA-09	7	4	6	2	3	1	5

GA-10	7	3	5	1	4	2	6
GA-11	7	5	6	4	1	2	3
GA-12	1	3	4	7	6	5	2
GA-13	4	7	6	2	1	3	5

Please rank your greatest concerns with Government policy and guidance. (1 = greatest concern). You must make at least one choice but will not be able to make more than two choices.

Respondent ID	If this theme does not interest you, please select option 1 here.	The Government has not given sufficient backing to the implementation of the Future Airspace Strategy, nor stated its economic value and importance to the UK.	The role of the Secretary of State for Transport is inappropriate or ill-defined in relation to airspace changes.	Government policy and guidance is insufficient to allow the CAA and airspace change stakeholders and sponsors to fully understand the Government's objectives.	The aviation noise policy (based around the 57dB LAeq metric) does not adequately reflect the actual perception of communities to the disturbance caused by aircraft, particularly following the introduction of Performance Based Navigation which concentrates aircraft on narrow routes.	Other (Please specify in comment box).
COM-01					1	2
COM-02	1	2				
COM-03			2		1	
COM-04					1	
COM-05	1					
COM-06						1
COM-07					1	2
COM-08				2	1	
COM-09				2	1	
COM-10						
COM-11					1	
COM-12				2	1	

COM-13		2	1	
COM-14		2	1	
COM-15		2	1	
COM-16	2		1	
COM-17		2	1	
COM-18			1	
COM-19			1	
COM-20		2	1	
COM-21		1	2	
COM-22			2	1
COM-23			1	
COM-24	1			
COM-25		2	1	
COM-26			1	
COM-27		2	1	
COM-28		2	1	
COM-29	1			
COM-30	2		1	
COM-31		2	1	
COM-32			1	
COM-33			2	1
COM-34			1	2
COM-35			1	2
COM-36			1	
COM-37			1	
COM-38			1	2
COM-39				
COM-40			1	2
COM-41			1	
COM-42		2	1	
COM-43		2	1	

P2106D004

COM-44		2	1	
COM-45			1	2
COM-46			1	2
COM-47		2	1	
CSI-01	1	2		
CSI-02	2		1	
CSI-03	1		2	
CSI-04		2	1	
CSI-05	1			
CSI-06	2	1		
CSI-07	1	2		
CSI-08		2		1
CSI-09	1	2		
CSI-10	1	2		
CSI-11			1	
CSI-12				1
CSI-13	1	2		
CSI-14				1
CSI-15	1		2	
CSI-16	1	2		
CSI-17		1		
CSI-18	1	2		
CSI-19	1	2		
GA-01	2	1		
GA-02	1			
GA-03		1		
GA-04	1			
GA-05		1		2
GA-06	1			
GA-07	1			
GA-08	1			

P2106D004

GA-09							1
GA-10							1
GA-11	1						
GA-12			1				
GA-13						1	

Please rank your greatest concerns with the Airspace Change Process. (1 = greatest concern). You must make at least one choice but will not be able to make more than two choices.

Respondent ID	If this theme does not interest you, please select option 1 here.	The CAA is unable to sponsor airspace changes that are in the public interest and has to find / wait for a third party to do it.	There is no appeal mechanism in the ACP process other than judicial review.	The costs associated with an airspace change and the risk of not gaining approval can deter sponsors from proposing changes.	Sponsors are not minimising the size of controlled airspace sought.	The Post Implementation Review (conducted after implementation of an airspace change) does not adequately consider all impacts or engage with all stakeholders.	Other (Please specify in comment box).
COM-01		1					
COM-02		1	2				
COM-03		1	2				
COM-04			1				
COM-05	1						
COM-06			1				
COM-07			2				1
COM-08			2			1	
COM-09		1				2	
COM-10							
COM-11			2				1
COM-12		1				2	

COM-13		1		2
COM-14		2		1
COM-15		2	1	
COM-16	1			
COM-17		1		
COM-18		1		2
COM-19		2		1
COM-20		2		1
COM-21		2	1	
COM-22		1		
COM-23		1	2	
COM-24				
COM-25		2		1
COM-26	1			
COM-27		1		2
COM-28		2	1	
COM-29	1			
COM-30		1		2
COM-31		1		2
COM-32		1		
COM-33		2		1
COM-34		2	1	
COM-35		1		2
COM-36				1
COM-37				1
COM-38				1
COM-39				
COM-40		1		2
COM-41		2		1
COM-42		2		1
COM-43		2		1

P2106D004

COM-44			1	
COM-45	1			
COM-46				1
COM-47		2	1	
CSI-01			1	2
CSI-02				1
CSI-03	2		1	
CSI-04	2		1	
CSI-05			1	2
CSI-06		2	1	
CSI-07				1
CSI-08			1	2
CSI-09	1			2
CSI-10	1		2	
CSI-11			1	
CSI-12	1		2	
CSI-13	1			
CSI-14	1			2
CSI-15			1	2
CSI-16			1	2
CSI-17			1	
CSI-18		2		1
CSI-19	1		2	
GA-01		2		1
GA-02				2
GA-03		1		2
GA-04		2		1
GA-05				2
GA-06				1
GA-07	1			2
GA-08		2		1

GA-09		2	1
GA-10			1
GA-11		1	
GA-12	2	1	
GA-13	2	1	

Please rank your greatest concerns with CAA guidance. (1 = greatest concern). You must make at least one choice but will not be able to make more than two choices.

Respondent ID	If this theme does not interest you, please select option 1 here.	The language within CAP 725 is too passive, allowing sponsors too much freedom to choose what they do.	There is a lack of clarity of the interpretation for key words and phrases such as “effective use of airspace”, “significant detrimental impact” and “mitigate such impact to the maximum extent”.	There is too much ambiguity, so that what a sponsor must do and should do are not adequately defined.	The process is biased in favour of the sponsor and does not consider the needs of other stakeholders sufficiently.	The CAA does not ensure sponsors adequately follow the guidance.	The requirements on when community consultation must be undertaken are not clear enough.	If community consultation is appropriate there is no guidance on the geographical area where it should be focussed.	Other (Please specify in comment box).
COM-01			2						1
COM-02					2			1	
COM-03		1	2						
COM-04		1			2				
COM-05	1								

COM-06					1
COM-07	1	2			
COM-08		1		2	
COM-09		1	2		
COM-10					
COM-11		1			
COM-12		1	2		
COM-13				1	2
COM-14				1	2
COM-15		1	2		
COM-16				1	2
COM-17	1				
COM-18	1	2			
COM-19				1	2
COM-20				2	1
COM-21		1		2	
COM-22	2	1			
COM-23	1				
COM-24					
COM-25		2		1	
COM-26		1			
COM-27		1	2		
COM-28		1	2		
COM-29			1		2
COM-30	1				
COM-31		1	2		
COM-32	1				
COM-33	2			1	
COM-34	2			1	
COM-35	1				2
COM-36		1			

COM-37	1	2		
COM-38	1		2	
COM-39				
COM-40		1		2
COM-41		1	2	
COM-42			2	1
COM-43		1	2	
COM-44		1	2	
COM-45		2	1	
COM-46	1			2
COM-47	1		2	
CSI-01	1		2	
CSI-02			2	1
CSI-03	1			
CSI-04		1	2	
CSI-05	1			
CSI-06				1
CSI-07	1			
CSI-08	2			1
CSI-09			1	2
CSI-10		2		1
CSI-11			1	
CSI-12	1			
CSI-13	1			
CSI-14	1			
CSI-15	2			1
CSI-16		1		2
CSI-17	1			
CSI-18	2	1		
CSI-19			2	1
GA-01		1	2	

P2106D004

GA-02		1	
GA-03			1
GA-04		1	
GA-05	2	1	
GA-06		1	
GA-07	2	1	
GA-08	2	1	
GA-09		1	
GA-10		1	
GA-11		1	
GA-12	2	1	
GA-13		1	2

Please rank your greatest concerns with engagement and consultation. (1 = greatest concern). You must make at least one choice but will not be able to make more than two choices.

Respondent ID	If this theme does not interest you, please select option 1 here.	The sponsor should not conduct the consultation.	The consultation commences too late in the process.	There are not enough stakeholders included in the consultation (i.e. its scope is insufficient).	Sponsors do not adequately identify options and explain which is the preferred option.	The consultation requirements are too onerous and costly.	There is no structure as to how consultees are identified.	The consultation material is too technical (i.e. not in plain language).	The consultation material is not sufficiently detailed.	The consultation material is too detailed.	The consultation material is not accessible (i.e. consultees do not know where to find it).	The timescale for consultations is too short.	The timescale for consultations is too long.	The format of consultation responses is limited, reducing consultees' ability to respond appropriately.	Other (Please enter in comment box).
COM-01	1						2								
COM-02									1						
COM-03	1		2												
COM-04							1						2		
COM-05		2			1										
COM-06	1				2										
COM-07	1		2												
COM-08	2		1												
COM-09	1								2						

GA-06	1			
GA-07	1			2
GA-08	1			2
GA-09				1
GA-10				1
GA-11	1			
GA-12		2		1
GA-13	1		2	

Please rank your greatest concerns with trust in the aviation community. (1 = greatest concern). You must make at least one choice but will not be able to make more than two choices.

Respondent ID	If this theme does not interest you, please select option 1 here.	The process is not transparent, e.g. the change request submitted to the CAA and the CAA's evaluation of it is not published.	Sponsors cannot be trusted to do what is right and reasonable in relation to airspace change because their motives are commercial.	Some consultees only want to stop any change occurring that would disadvantage themselves.	I believe that the CAA's relationship with sponsors is too close for me to have confidence in their independence.	I believe that the CAA's independence could be compromised because it is in its interest to approve airspace changes that assist with the delivery of the Future Airspace Strategy.	The lack of consultees' access to the CAA (even though sponsors have access) reduces trust in the independence of the CAA.	The CAA has a conflict of interest in both providing noise analysis through its Environmental Research and Consultancy Department and in reviewing the environmental impact of an airspace change.	Other (Please enter in comment box).

COM-01	1					2	
COM-02					1		
COM-03		1			2		
COM-04	1						
COM-05	1						
COM-06		1		2			
COM-07		1			2		
COM-08						1	2
COM-09	1	2					
COM-10							
COM-11		1			2		
COM-12	1	2					
COM-13		2			1		
COM-14					1		2
COM-15				2			1
COM-16							
COM-17	1		2				
COM-18				1		2	
COM-19					1	2	
COM-20				1	2		
COM-21		1			2		
COM-22					1		
COM-23			1				
COM-24							
COM-25						2	1
COM-26	1						
COM-27		1					2
COM-28		1	2				
COM-29		1		2			
COM-30		1		2			
COM-31							

COM-32	1		2
COM-33		1	2
COM-34	1		2
COM-35		2	1
COM-36	1		2
COM-37		2	1
COM-38	2	1	
COM-39			
COM-40		1	2
COM-41		1	2
COM-42	2		1
COM-43	1	2	
COM-44	1	2	
COM-45	1		2
COM-46	1	2	
COM-47	1		2
CSI-01	1	2	
CSI-02		1	
CSI-03		2	1
CSI-04		1	
CSI-05		1	
CSI-06		1	
CSI-07			1
CSI-08	2		1
CSI-09	1		
CSI-10		1	
CSI-11		1	
CSI-12	1	2	
CSI-13		1	
CSI-14	1		2
CSI-15	1		

CSI-16		1	2	
CSI-17			1	
CSI-18	1	2		
CSI-19			1	2
GA-01		1	2	
GA-02	1	2		
GA-03	1	2		
GA-04	2	1		
GA-05	1	2		
GA-06		2	1	
GA-07		1	2	
GA-08	2	1		
GA-09	1	2		
GA-10	1			
GA-11	1	2		
GA-12	2	1		
GA-13		1	2	

Please rank your greatest concerns with decision making in the Airspace Change Process. (1 = greatest concern). You must make at least one choice but will not be able to make more than two choices.

Respondent ID	If this theme does not interest you, please select option 1 here.	The CAA does not adequately set out the policy or criteria it considers when evaluating an airspace change, e.g. how is noise impact balanced against additional airspace capacity?	The criteria considered are fundamentally wrong, e.g. noise is currently the primary environmental factor over land up to 4,000ft but this altitude is too low.	The consultation document and the decision letter do not provide sufficient objective evidence and evaluation to justify the decision.	The noise impact is not adequately assessed by the range of noise metrics given in CAP 725.	The Government has not directed the CAA to specifically consider the economic impact of an airspace change when considering its merits.	Other (Please enter in comment box).
COM-01			1		2		
COM-02					1		
COM-03					1	2	
COM-04					1		
COM-05		1	2				
COM-06							1
COM-07			1		2		
COM-08				2	1		
COM-09			1		2		
COM-10							
COM-11				2	1		
COM-12			1		2		
COM-13			1		2		
COM-14			2		1		

COM-15	2		1	
COM-16				
COM-17	1		2	
COM-18	1	2		
COM-19	1			
COM-20		2	1	
COM-21			1	2
COM-22		1		
COM-23		1		
COM-24				
COM-25	2		1	
COM-26			1	
COM-27	1		2	
COM-28		1	2	
COM-29	2	1		
COM-30	2	1		
COM-31				
COM-32	1		2	
COM-33	2		1	
COM-34	2		1	
COM-35			1	2
COM-36		2	1	
COM-37	2		1	
COM-38				1
COM-39				
COM-40	2	1		
COM-41	1	2		
COM-42		1	2	
COM-43			2	1
COM-44		2	1	
COM-45		1	2	

COM-46	2		1	
COM-47		1	2	
CSI-01			1	2
CSI-02				1
CSI-03			1	
CSI-04				1
CSI-05	1			
CSI-06		1		
CSI-07	1			
CSI-08	1			2
CSI-09	1			
CSI-10				1
CSI-11	1			
CSI-12				1
CSI-13	2			1
CSI-14	1			
CSI-15	1			
CSI-16	1	2		
CSI-17				1
CSI-18	1		2	
CSI-19				1
GA-01				1
GA-02			1	
GA-03			1	
GA-04			2	1
GA-05	1		2	
GA-06	1			
GA-07		2	1	
GA-08	1			2
GA-09			2	1
GA-10				1