

Farnborough Airspace Consultation Response  
PO Box 584  
Hounslow  
TW3 9QP

**Please use your own words as  
multiple copy and paste responses  
get set aside.**

Dear Sirs,

A. The primary reason given for the additional controlled airspace is cost saving for the users of Farnborough. No corresponding calculation is provided of the in-efficiencies imposed on other airspace users. The calculation has no balance, and that questions the whole proposal. One could say that if carbon dioxide savings are the justification, then airline seats are much more efficient!

B. The safety reasons given are questionable. Ordinarily Class D is used as the minimum necessary to give access to the Class A above. In this case the proposal is to avoid Class A and -provide a 'private' Farnborough corridor past Southampton underneath Class A. Some customers fulminate at being held for five minutes, apparently.

This represents a major change in airspace policy, and I am surprised that the CAA has allowed it to get so far.

C. On the North East corner, leaving 500ft of London CTR on top of 2000ft of Farnborough CTR is a pointless complication.

D. On the North West, creating 500ft of Class D (CTA1) under the LTMA is a trivialising and unnecessary complication.

E. The explanation for CTA4 does not stand up. A small piece of low level airspace at 1500ft adjacent to one at 4500ft?

F. CTA2 has an un-necessarily low base. Compare to Southampton where the base at 7nm final is 2000ft.

G. By far the biggest issue is that this proposal in its current form puts a plug in the corridor between the London and Gatwick CTRs. It is reasonable to expect Farnborough aircraft to arrive and depart over FOS. The Southern side of CTR1 is un-necessarily far from Farnborough and at an un-necessary angle. It does not need to extend any further South than the Guildford VRP, and CTA3 needs to come into line accordingly. It is noted that the pot belly to the South is inconsistent with the 3 miles to the boundary on the North side

H. CTA3 is un-necessarily low and can safely start at 2000ft. Given that the LTMA starts at 2500ft, the justification for CTA3 looks slim.

I. No dimensions are given for the RMZ, so it is presumed to be from SFC to 2500ft. That stops all non-radio aircraft from using the London – Gatwick corridor. If CTA3 is questionable, then the RMZ is entirely unjustified.

J. CTAs 5, 6, 7, 9 & 10 are all predicated on the idea of Farnborough traffic making low arrivals with late turns onto final, to be justified as "economy". While I am sure that the fine young people flying the Mustangs would rejoice, it is not appropriate either for safety or the other users of the airspace. A 1000ft layer of Class D stuck to the underside of the LTMA all the way out to sea is a silly and un-necessary complication. The LTMA structure already in place should be entirely sufficient. (If it works for Southampton and Gatwick, then surely it works for Farnborough? Come on guys, how would you get from CTA9 to CTA11 while remaining in Class D?)