

Title:

Mr

Forename:

keith

Surname:

reynolds

Representing:

Organisation

Organisation (if applicable):

damyns hall aerodrome

Email:

What do you want Ofcom to keep confidential?:

Keep nothing confidential

If you want part of your response kept confidential, which parts?:

Ofcom may publish a response summary:

Yes

I confirm that I have read the declaration:

Yes

Ofcom should only publish this response after the consultation has ended:

You may publish my response on receipt

Additional comments:

Your proposals are simply a stealth tax. Many airfields will simply operate without radio seriously compromising safety. You mad to consider this tax on radio,s. Lifes will be put at risk and possibly lost due to this action. Radio operations should be free not charged for.

Question 1: Do you consider that our proposed fee rates for licences in the aeronautical VHF frequencies are appropriate?:

NO

Question 2: In devising our revised proposals, have we identified all of the aeronautical uses of VHF communications frequencies which require a distinct approach to fee setting, as set out in tables 5 and 6?:

NO. Radio operations should be free. What about safety?

Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal not to charge any fees for Fire assignments?:

No fees at all.

Question 4: Do you agree with our proposal to set a £75 fee for licences in any of the sporting frequencies?:

No. Radio is a safety aid and should not be charged for. Your actions are totally dangerous and will only harm the safety of the skies. You must reconsider.

Question 5: Do you agree with our proposal to set an annual fee of £19,800 per ACARS or VDL assignment, with no variation related to the number of transmitters?:

Completely unacceptable. This is a stealth tax and has no basis in making the skies safer.

Question 6: Do you consider that our proposed approach to phasing in fees for use of the aeronautical VHF communications channels are appropriate? If there are particular reasons why you consider that any user or group of users would need longer phasing-in periods, please provide any supporting evidence for us to consider. Specifically, do you have any evidence for us to consider that would support either of Options 1 and 2 for the highest proposed fee in this sector?:

Do you have any evidence that the skies will be a safer place when numerous radio stations close down due to your stealth tax fees? SAFETY FIRST!!!

Question 7: Do you have any further quantified information to contribute to the analysis of financial impacts of the proposed fees on particular spectrum users, as set out in Annex 5? We would like to publish all responses, but will respect the confidentiality of any material which is clearly marked as such.:

Question 8: Do you consider that our assessment of the impacts of our proposals has taken full account of relevant factors? If you consider that there is additional evidence that would indicate particular impacts we should take into account, we would be grateful if you could provide this.:

HOW CAN THE CLOSURE OF RADIO STATIONS ACROSS THE LAND BE A SAFE MEASURE. THIS IS PURLY AN EXERCISE IN GENERATING INCOME FOR YOURSELVES AND OFFERS NOTHING FOR SAFE SKIES.YOUR MAD EVEN TO CONSIDER THSES PROPOSALS