North Essex Authorities Joint Strategic (Section 1) Plan Examination

Hearing Statement on behalf of Stebbing Parish Council

Matter 8
**Matter 8 - Hearing Statement**

**Introduction**

1. This Hearing Statement has been produced on behalf of Stebbing Parish Council (SPC) to supplement its earlier representations objecting to the Garden Community being proposed to the West of Braintree (SP10), which could expand across from Braintree District into Uttlesford District, and both directly and indirectly significantly impact upon Stebbing.

2. SPC’s Regulation 19 representations refer in detail to the reasons for its objection to the West of Braintree Garden Community proposals, the key reasons being:

   - The Duty to Co-operate has not been thorough or comply with the Garden City principles;
   - Significant adverse impacts upon the highway network, in particular upon the strategic A120 route which currently suffers from frequent major congestion at Braintree; and
   - It will be unsustainable in overall terms.

3. Whilst Matter 8 includes questions about each of the three proposed settlements, this Hearing Statement solely relates to those questions pertaining to the West of Braintree proposed garden community (policy SP10).

**Q.30) What evidence is there to demonstrate that the West of Braintree proposed garden community is capable of delivering a total of 7,000 to 10,000 dwellings?**

4. There appears to be considerable uncertainty regarding the realistic deliverability of 7,000 to 10,000 dwellings West of Braintree. Apart from unresolved landownership issues (referred to in our Matter 6 hearing statement), the other main reasons for this are articulated in our responses to the further questions listed below. These being:

   - The timescale for prior mineral extraction to occur;
   - Adverse environmental impacts (including heritage, landscape, air and road traffic movements); and
• Uncertainty regarding the inclusion of an Uttlesford element to the proposed new Garden Community;

Q.31) Why were those figures reduced from the earlier figures of 10,000 to 13,000 dwellings which appeared in the Preferred Options plan (June 2016)?

5 We believe that the reduction is likely to have been made in recognition of the results of technical survey data showing the need for greater sized buffers and mitigation than originally envisaged, and also in recognition of the uncertainty over whether the new Garden Community development will cross over into Uttlesford District.

Q.32) Should the West of Braintree proposed garden community be extended to include adjacent land in the Uttlesford District Council area?

6 Any decision to extend the garden community to include adjacent land in Uttlesford District will need to be ultimately taken by Uttlesford District Council and then scrutinised at a separate Local Plan Examination, given that the Uttlesford Local Plan has not been prepared to the same Local Plan Submission timetable as the Braintree, Colchester and Tendring Local Plans.

7 SPC consider that there are strong reasons why, if the West of Braintree Garden Community is eventually approved, it should not be extended into Uttlesford District.

8 With regard to West of Braintree, SD/001 – North Essex Authorities Strategic Section One for Local Plans: Draft Publication (Regulation 19) Draft Sustainability Appraisal (SA): Non-Technical Summary - June 2017 refers on p.202 to the fact that:

“There are limited numbers of existing residential properties in the area of both options GCWB1 and GCWB2, however the small settlement of Blake End exists to the south west of the site and is located adjacent to a junction corresponding to possible access to the broad area from the B1256. It should be noted that assimilation of Blake End is not assumed, in so far as a required belt of surrounding countryside would act as a buffer, however there may be transport implications and perceived loss of amenity in that regard. To the north, both options extend towards Great Saling, however as previously mentioned this would be buffered with countryside to prevent sprawl, and a Registered Park and Garden exists at the boundary extent; the preservation of the setting of which is
likely to ensure that the new Garden Community does not negatively impact residents of the existing settlement further to the north. Specifically in relation to GCWB2, additional considerations would be to the amenity of residents in Stebbing Green and a desire to ensure separation. In isolation this is not considered an insurmountable issue however the presence of Boxted Wood within the area to the immediate east of any required buffer, could limit the suitability of this eastern part of the option. Uncertain to negative impacts are highlighted in this re-assessment in line with a comparable assessment of all Garden Community options”.

9 SD/001 states on p.205 that:

“Options GCWB1 and GCWB2 have been highlighted as currently having uncertain / negative impacts. Both options do not benefit from an existing rail link and in addition links to the A120 and the strategic road network are likely to prove private car use attractive. It is therefore more uncertain whether there will be any benefits to the town centre through bus links only given the proximity and ease of access to Chelmsford and out of town centres such as Freeport. …The opportunity to achieve a development of significant scale with population critical mass may rely on a system with greater connectivity and speed such as a form of rapid transit network. Without this inter-urban/ inter-regional public transport system, the risk exists that the majority of journeys external and internal to the site would likely be car based in this area”.

10 SD/001 then comments on p.226 that:

“The smaller option GCWB1 is considered the most sustainable option in West of Braintree due an increased likelihood of negative impacts associated with nature conservation and heritage assets to the western boundary of option GCWB2. Both options will need to address the presence of heritage assets throughout the area, particularly in the north associated with the Conservation Area of Great Saling which contains a range of listed buildings including grade II as well as the Registered Park and Garden of Saling Grove, and seek enhancements at
the masterplanning stage. It is also recommended that a buffer separation will likely be needed to be developed through masterplanning to minimise certain impacts on existing communities, specifically in relation to residents in Stebbing Green and Blake End. The masterplans should be subject to community engagement”.

11 The Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates that the West of Braintree Garden Community proposal possesses significant sustainability weaknesses, particularly in relation to transport, retail and the environmental impacts. It is evident from reading the Appraisal that these weaknesses and impacts would be significantly worse should the Garden Community be expanded into Uttlesford District.

Q.33) If so, what arrangements have been made for joint working between Braintree and Uttlesford District Councils to deliver the proposed garden community?

12 It is not apparent what precise joint working arrangements would be put in place between Braintree and Uttlesford District Councils, should the Garden Community be expanded into the latter district in order to bring about delivery. Nor is it evident what the likely timescales be for the delivery of any Uttlesford element of the West of Braintree Garden Community.

Q.34) What are the implications of any requirement for prior mineral extraction on the timescale for development at the West of Braintree proposed garden community?

13 Whilst the designation of the site as a mineral safeguarding area does not preclude development at the site from occurring, there are significant time implications associated with the extraction of minerals prior to that section of the Garden Community development being able to commence.

14 Any mineral extraction is likely to take at least 15 years from the start of operation. Depending upon market prices, extraction could take sometime longer.

15 We note that Tarmac submitted a full planning application in February 2017 (ESS/19/17/BTE) in respect of land at Rayne Quarry, Broadfield Farm, Dunmow Road, Rayne CM77 6SA which proposes the following:

‘A new sand and gravel quarry at Broadfield farm, to the west of Rayne, near Braintree, comprising the phased extraction of some 3.66 million
tonnes of sand and gravel; the installation of processing plant and ancillary buildings and infrastructure; the construction of a quarry access onto the B1256; the construction of a permanent screening landform; the construction of temporary screen mounds in defined locations around the perimeter of the quarry; the phased restoration of the extraction area using indigenous soils; overburden and clay from within the application site to a land use mixture of arable agriculture, lowland acid grassland, lowland meadow, woodland, lake and reedbeds; and public access via proposed public rights of way.’

16 We assume that the planning application (which is currently the subject of public consultation) will be determined sometime in 2018. It is quite apparent that the works involved, and the mineral extraction activity itself, will occur over a very lengthy time period.

17 We note that the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan was adopted by Essex County Council on Tuesday 11 July 2017. The Plan is now part of the development plan in Essex, and waste planning decisions must be taken in line with the Plan, subject to other material considerations.

Q.35) What are the implications of the West of Braintree proposed garden community for the future of Saling airfield (Andrewsfield)?

18 The creation of a new Garden Community of up to 10,000 dwellings nearby is likely to cause significant harm to the Airfield (a flying club with approximately 300 members). The continuation of current levels of operational activity at the Airfield would be likely to generate significant levels of complaints from the future residents of the Garden Community, and exert strong pressure for the curtailment or closure of flying activity at the airfield.

Q.36) How have any impacts from flight paths to and from Stansted airport on the West of Braintree proposed garden community been considered?

19 At present, a no fly zone for flights leaving/arriving at Stansted Airport operates over the Andrewsfield Airfield site. The Andrewsfield Aerodrome Traffic Zone covers a 2 nautical mile radius of the centre of runway 09/27, up to a height of 2,000 feet (see Appendix 1 – Letter of Agreement between NATS and Andrewsfield Aerodrome). However, should Andrewsfield Airfield cease to be operational, this would be likely to
be removed. In which case the operators of Stansted Airport would be free to utilise this flightpath – to the detriment of the residents of both the existing and new Garden communities.

Q.37) Should policy SP10 refer to the need for an all-directions junction between the A120 and B1256/B1417?

20 With regard to the A120/B1256 East Junction Improvements, the AECOM North Essex Garden Communities West of Braintree Concept Framework (EB/012) infers that new junction arrangements will be required only when demand exceeds capacity (p.38). Part of the reasoning behind this appears to be an acceptance that the West of Braintree Garden Community will be overly car dependent in terms of traffic movements. SPC does not concur with the suggestion that it would be appropriate to wait until the local road network cannot cope before considering the provision of an important and necessary road access.

“Well planned road access will always be required but not at the detriment of encouraging residents and employees from using others forms of transport. The access arrangements between the site, the B1256 and the A120 will have to ‘work hard’ to ensure that when new infrastructure is provided it considers ease of travel in relation to other modes. This means new junction arrangements should be considered and only triggered when demand exceeds capacity, with provision built into the initial design for bus priority measures”.

21 The Movement and Access Study (EB014) raises further doubts concerning the delivery of an important infrastructure element for the West of Braintree site (p.117):

“A direct link from the A120 / B1256 eastern junction to the Garden Community would help spread traffic impacts. The full junction improvement can only be delivered once the 15 years of mineral extraction is complete. Depending on the extraction undertaken and restoration proposed this may or may not be possible at this location. Should an eastern access point be available then a junction arrangement such as the following could be implemented:
Traffic signal Control crossroads between the B1256, B1417 and Eastern Entry boulevard with bus priority for left turning movements.

Dualling of structure across the A120 (this could be delivered earlier with just a bus lane provided on one of the lanes as suggested in the interim)

Consideration should be given to access arrangements for the Tarmac Quarry site and whether a junction for that could be repurposed for the Garden Community at a later date.

The ‘assumptions’ which follow underneath on the same page of the study raise further questions regarding the overall cost and deliverability of the proposed scheme.

“Full junction could only be potentially delivered following completion of mineral extraction and dependent on the nature of the restoration. Merge / diverge requirements needs analysis of future A120 flows and balance of demand between an eastern and western access junction (subject to development location). Cost from RJ Internal review (27/02/17) – does not include any costs for Eastern Boulevard into Garden Community. Based on assumption that new structure is built offline. £12.4M out turn costs for A12 J28 (2010) also provides another proxy for similar consideration”.
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Appendix 1
Letter of Agreement

Between

NATS (En Route) PLC ("NATS")

And

Andrewsfield Aerodrome

Version 4.0

Effective Date: 01/08/2017
Expiry Date: 31/07/2019

NATS - PRIVATE
LETTER OF AGREEMENT

between

NATS (En Route) PLC ("NATS")
4000 Parkway, Whiteley, Fareham, Hampshire PO15 7FL

Airspace operated by

London Control (Swanwick) ("NATS Unit")
Swanwick Centre, Sopwith Way, Swanwick, Hampshire, SO31 7AY

and

Andrewsfield Aerodrome ("Airspace User")
Andrewsfield Aviation, Saling Airfield, Stebbing, Great Dunmow, Essex CM6 3TH

Together referred to as "the Parties".

Effective Date: 01/08/2017
Valid until: 31/07/2019

1 GENERAL

1.1 The purpose of this Letter of Agreement is to define the co-ordination procedures to be applied between NATS and the Airspace User, to permit the Airspace User operating as General Air Traffic to fly within the airspace as set out within Annex A to this Agreement.

1.2 The signatories to this Agreement are accountable for ensuring that the obligations set out by the Procedures in this Agreement are met in full.

1.3 This Agreement shall start on the Effective Date and shall end exactly two years thereafter. No prior notice of the end date shall be given by NATS.

1.4 Where segregated airspace in controlled airspace is required for the purposes of compliance with EU 923/2012 Standardised Rules of the Air, (SERA), the Civil Aviation Authority has authorised NATS to create and operate such airspace in accordance with this Letter of Agreement.
2 DESCRIPTION OF AIRSPACE

2.1 The Andrewsfield Aerodrome Traffic Zone (ATZ) is a circle of radius 2nm, centred on runway 09/27 (N515342 E0002657), up to height 2000ft aal and lies partly within the Stansted CTR/CTA/TMZ.

2.2 The Andrewsfield Local Flying Area (LFA) has the same lateral limits as the Andrewsfield ATZ but with a vertical limit of altitude 1500ft amsl and lies partly within the Stansted CTR and TMZ.

3 PROCEDURES

3.1 The procedures to be applied between NATS and the Airspace User as applicable, are detailed in the Annexes to this Letter of Agreement:

Annex A: Procedures
Annex B: Telephone Communications
Annex C: Abbreviations and Definitions
Annex D: Checklist

4 OPERATIONAL STATUS

4.1 All parties shall keep each other advised of any changes to operational facilities or any other matters which may affect the procedures specified in this Letter of Agreement.

5 REVISIONS

5.1 Any revision to the Letter of Agreement, excluding the Appendix and Annexes, requires the mutual written consent of the Letter of Agreement signatories or the successor to their position/roles.

5.2 Any revision to the Annexes of the Letter of Agreement requires the mutual written consent of the designated representatives of the signatories.

5.3 Any revision to the lateral and vertical extent of the segregated airspace described in paragraphs 2.1 & 2.2 above, additionally requires approval by the CAA (Safety and Airspace Regulation Group).

6 DEVIATIONS

6.1 When necessary the appropriate Operational Supervisor(s) and responsible representative of the Airspace User may introduce, by mutual agreement, temporary modifications to the procedures laid down in the Annexes to the Letter of Agreement for a specific time period within the existing term of this Letter of Agreement. Any temporary change which would have the effect of increasing the lateral and/or vertical extent of the segregated airspace requires prior approval by the CAA (Safety and Airspace Regulation Group).

6.2 Instances may arise where incidental deviations from the procedures specified in the Annexes to this Letter of Agreement may become necessary. Under these circumstances air traffic controllers are expected to exercise their best judgement to ensure the safety and efficiency of air traffic.

7 CANCELLATION

7.1 Cancellation of this Letter of Agreement by one of the Signatories (or their successors) is possible at any time. Every effort will be given to provide at least one month notice of such cancellation.
however this Agreement may be terminated by any party on immediate notice on safety grounds as necessary.

8 INTERPRETATION AND SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

8.1 Should any doubt or diverging views arise regarding the interpretation of any provision of the present Letter of Agreement or in case of dispute regarding its application, the parties shall endeavour to reach a solution acceptable to them all.

8.2 Should no agreement be reached, each of the parties shall refer such dispute to the CAA for determination.

9 REQUESTING A RENEWAL OF THE LETTER OF AGREEMENT

9.1 Access to the Airspace is granted to the Airspace User by NATS as the designated authority responsible for the airspace detailed in this Agreement, on the terms set out in this Letter of Agreement. It is the responsibility of the Airspace User to seek NATS’ agreement to any renewal or replacement of this Letter of Agreement.

9.2 Where the Airspace User wishes to enter into a renewal or replacement Letter of Agreement with NATS for access to the Airspace then the Airspace User will send a written request to do so to the NATS Unit no later than three 3 months prior to the end date of this Letter of Agreement.

9.3 NATS will endeavour to agree a renewal or replacement of this Letter of Agreement where requested to do so but this cannot be guaranteed.

9.4 A review of the Letter of Agreement may be requested by any of the Signatories and at any time during the validity period.

SIGNED

[Signature]

Name: Pete Dawson
Position/Role: GM, LTC Swanwick
Unit: London Control (Swanwick)
NATS (En Route) PLC
DATE: 19.7.17

SIGNED

[Signature]

Name: Mike Rowland
Position/Role: Airfield Manager
Organisation: Andrewsfield Aerodrome
DATE: 15.8.17
APPENDIX

EXPLANATORY NOTE FOR SEGREGATED AIRSPACE ARRANGEMENTS (as applicable)

Effective: 01/08/2017

App.1 This Letter of Agreement allows the aircraft operated by the Airspace User specified in paragraph 1 of the Letter of Agreement, which in accordance with SERA.6001 and Appendix 4 would be prohibited or restricted to fly in the airspace specified in paragraph 2 of the Letter of Agreement, to instead fly in accordance with the rules as specified in the Annexes to this Letter of Agreement during periods of segregated operations.

App.2 For flight in Class A and Class C airspace, the Visual Meteorological Conditions to be complied with are those at SERA.5001 VMC visibility and distance from cloud minima Table S5-1:

1. At and above 10,000ft AMSL:
   a. Flight visibility: 8 km
   b. Distance from cloud: 1,500m horizontally, 1,000ft vertically

2. Below 10,000ft AMSL and above 3,000ft AMSL, or above 1,000ft above terrain, whichever is the higher:
   a. Flight visibility: 8 km
   b. Distance from cloud: 1,500m horizontally, 1,000ft vertically

App.3 For flight in Class D airspace below 10,000ft AMSL and above 3,000ft AMSL, or above 1,000ft above terrain, whichever is the higher, the Visual Meteorological Conditions to be complied with are those at SERA.5001 VMC visibility and distance from cloud minima Table S5-1:

   a. Flight visibility: 5 km
   b. Distance from cloud: 1,500m horizontally, 1,000ft vertically

App.4 For flight in Class D airspace at and below 3,000ft, the Visual Meteorological Conditions and constraints to be complied with are those set out by ORS4 General Exemption E4312 No 1195:

   a. Clear of cloud, with the surface in sight and:
      i. if the aircraft is not a helicopter, in a flight visibility of at least 5km; or
      ii. if the aircraft is a helicopter, in a flight visibility of at least 1,500m;
   b. By day only;
   c. At a speed which, according to its airspeed indicator, is 140knots or less, to give adequate opportunity to observe other traffic and any obstacles in time to avoid a collision;


App.6 The requirements of Commission Regulation (EC) 2150/2005 with respect to the segregation of the activity defined in this Letter of Agreement are deemed to be satisfied as follows:

   Article 4 Strategic airspace management (level 1):
   1a. CAP740
   1b-e. LoA review process
1f. CAP740, LoA, AIP
1g. LoA
1h-k. not applicable
1l. Competent Authority
1m. LoA process
1n. LoA/ACN processes, ANSP/airspace user

Article 5 Pre-tactical airspace management (level 2):
   a. AMC (as necessary), AAA AR (through ACN process), LoA/MoU activation process

Article 6 Tactical airspace management (level 3):
   1-3. LoA/ACN process
   4. Not applicable

Article 7 Safety Assessment:
   APSA. Supporting procedures applicable to the Letter of Agreement published in MATS Part 2
ANNEX A
PROCEDURES

Effective: 01/08/2017

A.1 Description of Airspace

The Andrewsfield Aerodrome Traffic Zone (ATZ) is a circle of radius 2nm, centred on runway 09/27 (N51°53′42″ E00°02′57″), up to height 2000ft aal and lies partly within the Stansted CTR/CTA/TMZ.

The Andrewsfield Local Flying Area (LFA) has the same lateral limits as the Andrewsfield ATZ but with a vertical limit of altitude 1500ft amsl and lies partly within the Stansted CTR and TMZ.

The airspace outlined in blue is called the western segment, the airspace outlined in red is called the eastern segment and the airspace outlined in green is called the northern (TMZ) segment.

A.2 Map of the Airspace

A.3 Procedures

A.3.1 Introduction

Andrewsfield aerodrome is situated on the eastern boundary of the Stansted CTR.

A portion of the Andrewsfield ATZ lies within the Stansted CTA/CTR/TMZ and this requires that the procedures and flight patterns specified in this Agreement are strictly adhered to.

Effective: 01/08/2017
The purpose of this Agreement is to define the specific procedures and flight patterns for Andrewsfield aircraft that will permit the safe movement of aircraft under the control of London Terminal Control (Swanwick) whilst at the same time allowing Andrewsfield to operate independently within the limits specified in this Agreement.

The Civil Aviation Authority hereby requests NATS to create and operate an area of segregated airspace in Class D airspace for the purposes of access to such airspace by aircraft operating inbound and outbound from Andrewsfield aerodrome and agrees to NATS operating the segregated airspace in accordance with this Letter of Agreement.

A.3.2 Andrewsfield Responsibilities and Procedures

The aerodrome management at Andrewsfield is responsible for ensuring that pilots operating to/from Andrewsfield are made aware of the procedures and flight patterns specified in this Agreement.

The aerodrome management is responsible for obtaining an exemption from the relevant VFR minima from the CAA Directorate of Airspace Policy which will allow them to operate within the western and the eastern segments in accordance with the conditions as specified within this Agreement. The revised VFR minima are as follows:

- Clear of cloud, in sight of the surface and in a flight visibility of 3km.

The hours of operation are:

- Winter: 0830 - 2100hrs and by arrangement
- Summer: 0900 - 2000hrs and by arrangement

The aerodrome management will notify TC GS Airports, on 02380 401106 if they have agreed to operations outside the notified hours.

At all other times, pilots will contact Essex Radar on 120.625 MHz for permission to enter Stansted CAS, including the LFA.

Andrewsfield is promulgated in the UK AIP at AD 2-EGSL-1-1 as being PPR only. Pilots of aircraft intending to visit Andrewsfield must telephone 01371 856744 or fax 01371 856500 before departure and be briefed on the procedures specified in this Agreement. A further briefing must be given before their departure from Andrewsfield.

The maximum circuit level will be height 700ft aal (altitude 986ft amsl). Circuit direction on runway 09/27 is normally right-hand however; circuit flying may take place to the north and south of the aerodrome.

Andrewsfield may permit aircraft to operate up to altitude 1500ft amsl within the western segment and northern (TMZ) segment.

Andrewsfield may permit aircraft to operate up to altitude 2000ft amsl within the eastern segment. Andrewsfield may permit aircraft to operate without a pressure altitude reporting transponder within the northern (TMZ) segment.

Andrewsfield may request inbound aircraft and aircraft operating within the aerodrome traffic pattern and in radio contact with Andrewsfield air/ground radio operator to squawk conspicuity code A7010 with altitude reporting mode selected (if fitted).

Pilots of radio equipped aircraft departing Andrewsfield and wishing to transit Stansted CAS, shall remain in the Andrewsfield circuit until two-way communication has been established with Essex
Radar on frequency 120.625 MHz and a transit clearance has been issued. All other departures/arrivals to/from Andrewsfield must remain outside of CAS. Pilots of radio equipped aircraft departing Andrewsfield and wishing to transit Stansted TMZ but without a pressure altitude reporting transponder shall remain in the Andrewsfield circuit until two-way communication has been established with Farnborough Radar on frequency 132.800 MHz during their hours of operation or from Essex Radar on frequency 120.625 MHz, at other times, and permission to access the TMZ has been granted.

A.3.3 London Terminal Control (Swanwick) Responsibilities and Procedures

London Terminal Control (Swanwick) controllers will be made aware of, and will comply with the procedures specified in this Agreement.

At all times when London Terminal Control (Swanwick) is aware that Andrewsfield is active, TC Stansted will not permit any IFR or SVFR aircraft under their control to overfly the western segment and northern (TMZ) segment of the designated airspace below altitude 2000ft amsl or overfly the eastern segment of the designated airspace below altitude 2500ft amsl.

In addition, whenever London Terminal Control (Swanwick) is aware that Andrewsfield is active, TC Stansted shall notify relevant VFR aircraft under their control accordingly.

TC Stansted shall permit the pilot of an aircraft that intends to either land at Andrewsfield or fly within the western or eastern segments to leave the frequency in sufficient time to obtain permission to enter the relevant airspace.

At all times when London Terminal Control (Swanwick) is aware that Andrewsfield is active, TC Stansted will assume all primary only returns and non-altitude reporting secondary returns within the northern (TMZ) segment to be operating beneath controlled airspace.

A.3.4 Variation of Procedures

Nothing in these procedures prevents a controller or pilot from using his/her discretion to achieve safety of operations provided that steps are taken to rectify the situation as soon as possible. Any pilot finding it necessary to exercise such discretion shall when possible, contact Essex Radar on 120.625 or contact TC Group Supervisor Airports immediately after landing to explain the circumstances. Such circumstances may be additionally reported via a Mandatory Occurrence Report.

A.4 Aircraft Equipment
Not applicable

A.5 Radio Failure
Not applicable

A.6 Emergencies
Not applicable
# ANNEX B

## TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS

**Effective:** 01/08/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC Watch Supervisor</td>
<td>02380 401100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC GS (Airports)</td>
<td>02380 401106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrewsfield Aerodrome</td>
<td>01371 856744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX C

### ACRONYMS AND DEFINITIONS

**Effective:** 01/08/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAA AR</td>
<td>Airspace, Air Traffic Management &amp; Aerodromes, Airspace Regulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| GAT     | General Air Traffic  
All flights conducted in accordance with the rules and procedures of ICAO and/or the national civil aviation regulations and legislation.  
*Note. GAT can include military flights for which ICAO rules and procedures satisfy entirely their operational requirements.* |
| IFR     | IFR means the symbol used to designate the instrument flight rules |
| OAT     | Operational Air Traffic  
All flights which do not comply with the provisions stated for GAT and for which rules and procedures have been specified by appropriate authorities.  
*Note. OAT can include civil flights such as test-flights, which require some deviation from ICAO rules to satisfy their operational requirements.* |
| VFR     | VFR means the symbol used to designate the visual flight rules |
ANNEX D
CHECKLIST

Effective: 01/08/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Part</td>
<td>01/08/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix (if applicable)</td>
<td>01/08/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex A</td>
<td>01/08/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex B</td>
<td>01/08/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex C</td>
<td>01/08/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex D</td>
<td>01/08/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>