



## CAA Decision Log

Airspace Change Proposal Title	Establishment of the Portland Heliport ATZ
Airspace Change Proposal Reference	ACP-2022-050
Change Sponsor	HeliOps
AIS Submission Target Date	12/4/24
CAA Decision Target Date	29/3/24
<p>In providing a response to each question and/or status, the following colour coding should be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COMPLIANT/NOT APPLICABLE</li> <li>• NOT COMPLIANT/ACTION REQUIRED</li> <li>• ISSUE/CONCERN TO HIGHLIGHT</li> </ul>	
<h3>Executive Summary</h3> <p>Portland became a licensed heliport in October 2023 and linked with that application process a DAP 1916 Statement of Need was submitted to the CAA on 15 July 2022 to establish an ATZ. The rationale for this proposal was to improve the safety of aircraft during the critical stages of flight while operating at Portland Heliport. The CAA have published an <a href="#">Aerodrome Traffic Zones Policy Statement</a> which contains a pre-determined Airspace Change Process for sponsors aiming to establish an ATZ. At the time the Statement of Need was submitted, this categorised the ACP as a Level 2C in accordance with para 3.1 of the CAA Policy Statement. When CAP 1616 v5 became effective on 2 January 2024, it was recategorized as a Level 3 ACP but the process requirements remained as detailed in the Policy Statement.</p> <p>The Change Sponsor has proposed a non-standard ATZ of 2nm radius, from surface to 2000ft AGL with a small segment cut from the circle where the ATZ would otherwise overlap with EG D014; this design was developed through engagement with the MoD. The ATZ will be serviced by an Air-Ground service. Of note, there are two UAS Restricted Areas for prisons within the dimensions of the ATZ.</p> <p>The establishment of the ATZ at Portland Heliport should improve the safety of aircraft operating on and in the vicinity of Portland Heliport with minimal impact to other airspace users. A Letter of Agreement is being developed with Wessex HP &amp; PG club to enable the activity from their 2 launch sites situated within the ATZ to continue and procedures will be established to enable UAS operators to gain access to the associated FRZ. A traffic analysis study over a period of one week in August indicated only a very small number of transponding</p>	

aircraft flew through the boundaries of the ATZ.

Due to the potential safety benefits of establishing an ATZ at Portland Heliport and minimal impact to other airspace users it is recommended that the establishment an ATZ at Portland Heliport is approved.

The sponsor is aiming to implement the change at AIRAC 07/2024 which requires submission to NATS AIS by 12/4/24 and will become effective on 11/7/2024.

PART A – Airspace Change Process – GATEWAYS		
<b>A.1</b>	<b>Airspace Change Portal</b>	
A.1.1	<a href="#">Airspace change proposal public view (caa.co.uk)</a>	
<b>A.2</b>	<b>CAA SharePoint site</b>	
A.2.1	<a href="#">Establishment of Portland Heliport Air Traffic Zone - Project - All Documents (sharepoint.com)</a>	
<b>A.3</b>	<b>Stage 1 DEFINE Gateway</b>	N/A
A.3.1	N/A – ACP follows the CAA Policy Statement which does not include Gateways.	
<b>A.4</b>	<b>Stage 2 DEVELOP AND ASSESS Gateway</b>	N/A
A.4.1	N/A – ACP follows the CAA Policy Statement which does not include Gateways.	
<b>A.5</b>	<b>Stage 3 CONSULT Gateway</b>	N/A
A.5.1	N/A – ACP follows the CAA Policy Statement which does not include Gateways.	
<b>A.6</b>	<b>Chronology</b>	
A.6.1	The Assessment Meeting was conducted on 8/9/22 from whence the sponsor has carried out the process detailed in the <a href="#">CAA Policy Statement for Aerodrome Traffic Zones</a> . There are no Gateways associated with this process but the sponsor maintained contact throughout and requested feedback on their engagement strategy and engagement material in October 2023. In January 2024 the ACP transitioned to a Level 3 ACP as CAP 1616 V5 became effective, however the requirements	

	<p>of the ACP process did not change and they remained in accordance with the Policy Statement requirements. The final submission for the ACP was made to the CAA on 19/1/24. On 21/2/24 the CAA provided some initial feedback about some requirements of the policy statement that had not been fully met, notably regarding information on aviation activity within the vicinity of the proposed ATZ and adjacent airspace. The sponsor submitted version 2 of their submission on 29/2/24, depicting the changes using different colour text. The submission was assessed by CAA Airspace Regulators and presented for a decision on 11/3/24.</p>	
<p><b>A.7</b></p>	<p><b>Are there any additional process requirements of the Civil Aviation Authority (Air Navigation) Directions 2023 (the “Air Navigation Directions”) and/or the Air Navigation Guidance 2017 which apply to this airspace change, and have they been complied with?</b></p>	<p>N</p>
<p>A.7.1</p>		

PART B – Airspace Change Process – STAGE 5			
<b>B.1</b>	<b>Was a Public Evidence Session required for this proposal?</b>		N/A
B.1.1	N/A		
<b>B.2</b>	<b>Were any requests made for this decision to be called-in by the Secretary of State?</b>		N/A
B.2.1	N/A		
<b>B.3</b>	<b>Does the Secretary of State call-in criteria apply to this proposal?</b>		N/A
B.3.1	N/A		
<b>B.4</b>	<b>Has the Secretary of State decided to call-in this proposal?</b> NOTE: if 'Yes' the content of this log concerns the recommendations linked to the 'minded-to' decision that has been presented to the Secretary of State.		N/A
B.4.1	N/A		
<b>B.5</b>	<b>Subject Matter Expert (SME) Regulatory Assessments</b> Individual SME assessments conducted in accordance with the requirements detailed in the <a href="#">CAA Policy Statement for Aerodrome Traffic Zones</a> .		
	<b>ATM Safety</b>	NOT APPLICABLE	<b>Environmental</b>
	<b>Economic Assessment &amp; Statement</b>	NOT APPLICABLE	<b>Instrument Flight Procedure</b>
	<b>Engagement / Consultation</b>	NOT APPLICABLE	<b>Operational</b>
B.5.1	<i>Is there any other information outside of the regulatory assessments above which should be brought to the attention of the decision maker (e.g. outstanding Letters of Agreement)?</i> HG & PG LoA outstanding.		

	<p><b>E&amp;C Regulator</b> - The change sponsor has undertaken engagement with operators of adjacent aerodromes and any aviation organisations within the vicinity of the proposed ATZ, as required by the CAA Policy Statement for Aerodrome Traffic Zones. It is proposing a non-standard ATZ as a result of engagement with DAATM and will need to produce a signed LoA to evidence that the engagement with Wessex HP &amp; PG club has been satisfactorily concluded.</p> <p>The change sponsor initially referred to the 8-week engagement period as being 'agreed by the CAA', but was asked to provide a rationale for the engagement period, as determined by the sponsor. The submission has been updated to state 'The length of the ACP engagement period was deemed proportionate by the CAA, and in-line with a Level 3 ACP and the establishment of an ATZ policy statement, compared to a higher graded ACP level. This was principally due to a limited number of available options when a) establishing an ATZ, and b) options for ATZ lateral limits'. While perhaps not ideal, given the emphasis on the CAA deeming it proportionate rather than the sponsor's own justification, it does reflect previous written advice given to the sponsor and is therefore accepted.</p> <p>To note, the change sponsor has stated in its submission that it has engaged with NATMAC, and 'requested that information was forwarded to their members'. However, it did this by emailing the NATMAC secretariat contact address, not by contacting NATMAC members directly, and the email was not further distributed by the NATMAC secretariat. As a result the engagement material was not received by NATMAC members. However, the CAA Policy Statement for Aerodrome Traffic Zones does not require engagement with NATMAC members, so it is not considered as an issue that needs to be corrected or requires further engagement.</p>		
<b>B.6</b>	<b>Other Relevant Documents (title and hyperlinks to be inserted)</b>		
<a href="#">Policy Statement Checklist</a>			
<b>B.7</b>	<p><b>Has the relevant legal and policy framework to the airspace change process been taken into account, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Air Navigation Directions;</li> <li>• the Airspace Modernisation Strategy;</li> <li>• section 70 of the Transport Act 2000;</li> <li>• the Air Navigation Guidance 2017; and</li> <li>• CAP 1616 and associated publications?</li> </ul>	Y	

<p><b>B.8</b></p>	<p><b>CAA consideration of whether the proposal is in accordance with the Airspace Modernisation Strategy (Air Navigation Directions, direction 5(1)).</b></p> <p><u>NOTE:</u> the left column captures RAG status only and the right column captures the rationale – full details will be contained within the SME Regulatory Assessments. Reference should be made to the AMS characteristics (<a href="#">CAP 1616f</a>, 6.61). For more information on the AMS strategic objectives, see <i>Airspace Modernisation Strategy 2023-2040 Part 1: Strategic Objectives and Enablers</i> (<a href="#">CAP 1711</a>).</p>
<p>Safety</p>	<p>The establishment of an ATZ will improve the safety of aircraft operating on and in the vicinity of Portland Heliport.</p>
<p>Integration of diverse airspace users</p>	<p>Access to an ATZ is enabled through Regulation 11 of the Rules of the Air Regulations 2015. Procedures for UAS to access the FRZ must be established by the operator of Portland Heliport (see conditions at C.2.1).</p>
<p>Simplification of airspace system</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Environmental sustainability</p>	<p>On the basis of the rationale and supporting evidence submitted by the change sponsor regarding the minimal volume of in-scope aircraft that are likely to be consequentially affected, the environmental impacts caused as a result of this ACP are expected to be negligible. Mitigation measures, such as established communication procedures and Letter of Agreement with the Wessex HG&amp;PG Club, proposed by the change sponsor further minimise any such impacts.</p>
<p><b>B.9</b></p>	<p><b>CAA consideration of factors material to our decision whether to approve the change (section 70, Transport Act 2000).</b></p> <p><u>NOTE:</u> the left column captures RAG status only and the right column captures a summary of the rationale – full details will be contained within the SME Regulatory Assessments. Reference should be made to the Section 70 characteristics (<a href="#">CAP 1616f</a>, 6.80).</p>
<p>Maintain a high standard of safety in the provision of air traffic services section 70(1)(a)</p>	<p>The establishment of an ATZ will improve the safety of aircraft operating on and in the vicinity of Portland Heliport.</p>
<p>Secure the most efficient use of</p>	<p>The change sponsor conducted a study spanning one week in August 2023 (considering summer</p>

<p>airspace consistent with the safe operation of aircraft and the expeditious flow of air traffic section 70(2)(a)</p>	<p>time peak for GA activity) to determine the volume of traffic below 3000 ft. in the vicinity of Portland Heliport. The outcome of this study suggests that only two aircraft entered the proposed ATZ volume without arriving at/departing from the heliport while other flights remained well clear of the proposed airspace or were authorised heliport operations. The establishment of the ATZ/FRZ is not expected to have an impact on current-day heliport operations and authorised activity. The impact of the proposal on the most efficient use of airspace and the expeditious flow of air traffic is therefore considered to be minimal.</p> <p>Further, the airspace around the heliport is predominantly Class G, with no restrictions on which aircraft can operate within it, what route they must take, and what equipment they must carry. Any consequential impacts on flight patterns/behaviours therefore cannot be predicted with any further certainty.</p> <p>The most efficient use of airspace and the expeditious flow of air traffic through the ATZ can be maintained through provision of an Air/Ground service.</p>
<p>Satisfy requirements of operators and owners of all classes of aircraft section 70(2)(b)</p>	<p>The sponsor identified key airspace users in the vicinity of the heliport. These are Hang/Para Gliding Club Aviation, operating on the northern and southern part and south-eastern part of the peninsula, general aviation (GA) activity, unmanned aerial systems (UAS), and military activity utilising Portland for refuelling and/or flying training activities. The establishment of the ATZ/FRZ is not expected to have an impact on current-day heliport operations and authorised activity. The FRZ will be active at all times and so its introduction around the aerodrome suggests that all UAS operations will be obligated to notify and obtain approval from the heliport operator. Unauthorised UAS activity will be required to operate outside of the ATZ/FRZ, likely to the north of the ATZ/FRZ. Non-radio aircraft, such as those from the Hang/Para Gliding Club Aviation, or other GA aircraft, who could previously access the airspace proposed within the ATZ volume, will now need to request access to the ATZ prior to commencing the flight, and if not granted, will need to re-route to the north or fly over the ATZ (above 2000 ft) during its activation hours.</p> <p>The sponsor states that a Letter of Agreement (LOA) will be established with Wessex HG&amp;PG Club for continued activity within the established ATZ. Outside of the notified opening hours of the ATZ, including when amended by NOTAM, entry requirements under Regulation 11 will not apply. The activation hours of the ATZ (0900-1600 on Monday to Thursday and 0900-1200 on Friday) during the weekdays are also not as busy times for GA, further minimising the likelihood of impact.</p> <p>The change sponsor's research into Wide Street HLS concluded that it was inactive. The CAA were able to establish communications with the operator of Wide Street HLS who confirmed that they were aware of the proposal to establish the ATZ and did not envisage any impact to their operations.</p>

<p>Take account of the interests of any other person (other than an operator or owner of an aircraft) in relation to the use of any particular airspace or the use of airspace generally section 70(2)(c)</p>	<p>The ATZ does not change the classification or use of the airspace therefor the impact to stakeholders on the ground and adjacent aviation operators should be minimal.</p>
<p>Take into account the Secretary of State's guidance relating to spaceflight activities section 70(2)(ca)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Take into account the Secretary of State's guidance on environmental objectives section 70(2)(d)</p>	<p>Considering that there will be no change on current heliport operations and authorised activity, the minimal number of in-scope aircraft that are likely to be consequentially affected by the ACP and the mitigation measures proposed by the change sponsor, the CAA agrees that the introduction of ATZ and FRZ will have a negligible environmental impact.</p>
<p>Facilitate the integrated operation of air traffic services provided by or on behalf of the armed forces of the Crown and other air traffic services section 70(2)(e)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Take account of the interests of national security section 70(2)(f)</p>	<p>DAATM were engaged with during the ACP process and no considerations for national security were raised.</p>
<p>Take account of any international obligations notified to the CAA by the Secretary of State</p>	<p>No such international obligations have been notified to the CAA under section 70(2)(g) of Transport Act 2000.</p>



section 70(2)(g)		
<b>B.10</b>	<p><b>Are there any other associated publications relevant to the proposal and, if so, have the requirements of those publications been met?</b></p> <p><u>NOTE:</u> associated publications include Airspace Policy Statements listed <a href="#">here</a>.</p>	Y
B.10.1	The ACP was progressed using the process detailed in the <a href="#">CAA Policy Statement for Aerodrome Traffic Zones</a> . The application complies with the requirements listed in this policy.	
<b>B.11</b>	<p><b>Conclusions in respect of requirement to ensure that the amount of controlled airspace is the minimum required to maintain a high standard of air safety and, subject to overriding national security or defence requirements, that the needs of all airspace users is reflected on an equitable basis.</b></p> <p><u>NOTE:</u> this section only applies if the CAA is classifying or amending the classification of UK airspace.</p>	
B.11.1	N/A.	

PART C – Stage 5 Recommendation			
<b>C.1</b>	<b>Taking the above information into account, what is your recommendation to the decision-maker for this proposal?</b>		
C.1.1	The decision maker is recommended to approve this ACP. Taking into account the information presented in the submission and the factors analysed above, it has been concluded that the establishment of an ATZ at Portland Heliport should enhance the safety of aircraft operating in and in the vicinity of the ATZ. Portland Heliport have established an A/G service to enable other aircraft to safely enter the ATZ and procedures will be in place to ensure fair and equitable access to other airspace users. The change sponsor has met all the of the requirements of the <a href="#">CAA Policy Statement for Aerodrome Traffic Zones</a> .		
<b>C.2</b>	<b>Are there any Recommendations and/or Conditions for the change sponsor to address prior to implementation (if approved)?</b>		Y
C.2.1	Provide the CAA with a signed copy of the LoA between Portland Heliport and the Wessex HG & PG club. Provide the CAA with evidence that procedures have been established to ensure that UAS operators have a mechanism to request access to the FRZ in a fair and equitable way.		
<b>C.3</b>	<b>Are there any specific requirements in terms of the data to be collected by the change sponsor for the Post Implementation Review (if approved)?</b>		Y
C.3.1	The CAA consider it proportionate to conduct a PIR for this ACP as detailed in the <a href="#">PIR Scaled Data Request Form</a> .		
<b>C.4</b>	<b>Are any other consents and approvals needed in order to permit the intended operation (title and hyperlinks to be inserted)?</b>		
<b>C.5</b>	<b>Are there any other comments/observations for the decision maker?</b>		N
C.5.1	N/A		
<b>C.6</b>	<b>Regulator's Signature</b>		

Technical Regulator / Account Manager	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	8/3/24
---------------------------------------	------------	------------	--------

PART D – Draft Regulatory Decision – Comment (for Level 1 Airspace Change Proposal’s only)		
<b>D.1</b>	<b>Was a Draft Regulatory Decision published for this proposal?</b>	N/A
N/A		
<b>D.2</b>	<b>Was any feedback received in relation to the Draft Regulatory Decision?</b>	N/A
N/A		
<b>D.3</b>	<b>Has the Draft Regulatory Decision been amended in light of feedback received?</b>	N/A
N/A		

PART E – Final Regulatory Decision – Comment/Approval [Delete signatory rows below dependent on Decision Maker]			
<b>Airspace Regulation Principal comments and recommendation:</b>			
Airspace Regulation Principal	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	11/3/24
<b>Manager Airspace Regulation comments and recommendation/regulatory decision:</b> <i>If the decision-maker is Head AAA or Group Director SARG, delete 'regulatory decision'.</i>			
Manager Airspace Regulation	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Head AAA comments and recommendation/regulatory decision:</b> <i>If the decision-maker is Group Director SARG, delete 'regulatory decision'.</i>			
Head AAA	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Group Director SARG comments and regulatory decision:</b> N/A			
Group Director SARG	N/A	N/A	N/A