

CAA CAP 1616 Options Appraisal Assessment (Phase III Final)

Title of Airspace Change Proposal:	Clash Gour Wind Farm		
Change Sponsor:	Clash Gour Holding Ltd		
ACP Project Ref Number:	ACP-2021-046		
Case study commencement date:	25/07/2024	Case study report as at:	27/05/2025

Account Manager: [REDACTED]		Airspace Regulator (Engagement & Consultation): [REDACTED]		IFP: N/A		OGC: TBC	
Airspace Regulator (Technical): [REDACTED]		Airspace Regulator (Environmental): [REDACTED]		Airspace Regulator (Economist): [REDACTED]		ATM (Inspector ATS Ops): [REDACTED]	

Instructions

To aid the SARG project leader's efficient project management, please highlight the "status" cell for each question using one of the four colours to illustrate if it is:

Resolved - GREEN

Not Resolved – AMBER

Not Compliant – RED

Not Applicable - GREY

Guidance

The broad principle of economic impact analysis is **proportionality**; is the level of analysis involved proportionate to the likely impact from that ACP. There are three broad levels of economic analysis; qualitative discussion, quantified through metrics, and monetised in £ terms. The more significant the impact, the greater should be the effort by sponsors to quantify and monetise the impact.

1. Background – Identifying the Do Nothing (DN) /Do Minimum (DM) scenarios					Status
1.1	Are the outcomes of DN/DM scenarios clearly outlined in the proposal?				☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
1.1.1	Has the change sponsor produced an Options Appraisal (Phase III - Final) which consists of the Full appraisal with any refinements or changes made as a result of the Stage 3 formal consultation with stakeholders? [E24]	Yes, the sponsor has included a Final Options Appraisal as part of their ACP submission, which can be found in Appendix 3. As the sponsor has made no changes to their preferred option since the previous stage, the Final Options Appraisal is very similar to the Full Options Appraisal submitted at Stage 3.			☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
2. Impacts of the proposed airspace change					Status
2.1	Are there direct impacts on the following?				☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
2.1.1	<i>Examples of costs considered (please add costs that have been discussed, and any reasonable costs that the Airspace Regulator (Technical) feels have NOT been addressed)</i>				
2.1.2	Airport/ANSPs	Not Applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
	- Infrastructure		X		
	- Operation		X		
	- Deployment		X		
2.1.3	- Other(s)		X		
	Commercial Airlines/General Aviation	Not Applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
	- Training	X			
	- Economic impact from increased effective capacity		X		

	- Fuel burn		X		
	- Other(s)	X			
2.1.4	General Aviation	Not Applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
	- Access		X		
	- Economic impact from increased effective capacity		X		
2.1.5	Military	Not Applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
			X		
2.1.6	Wider Society, i.e., wider economic benefits, capacity resilience	Not Applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
	- Noise		X		
	- Air quality		X		
	- Greenhouse gas		X		
	- Capacity/resilience		X		
2.1.7	Other (provide details)	Not Applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
		X			
2.2	Are there direct beneficial impacts on air traffic control / management systems? Provide details.				
2.3	Where impacts have been monetised, what is the overall value (expressed in net present value (NPV)) of the project? N/A - The sponsor has not quantified the impacts of this ACP.				
2.4	Are the direct impacts on air traffic management analysed accurately and proportionately? Yes, the sponsor focussed on the significant potential hazards that might occur to MoD and other aviation stakeholders and these were explained in detail. Potential cost impacts were analysed from an airport and ANSP perspective as well				

	as the qualitative discussion provided for wider society and local communities.	
--	---	--

3. Changes in air traffic movements / projections				Status	
3.1	If the proposed airspace change has an impact on the following factors, have they been addressed in the proposal?			☒ ☐ ☐ ☐	
		Not applicable	Qualitative	Quantified / Monetised	
3.1.1	Number of aircraft movements		X		
3.1.2	Number of air passengers / cargo	X			
3.1.3	Type of aircraft movements (i.e., fleet mix)		X		
3.1.4	Distance travelled		X		
3.1.5	Operational complexities for users of airspace		X		
3.1.6	Flight time savings / Delays	X			
3.1.7	Other impacts	X			
3.1.8	Comments:				
3.2				☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	
3.3	Has the sponsor developed an assessment of the following environmental aspects?				
		Not applicable	Qualitative	Quantified	Monetised
3.3.1	Noise		X		

3.3.2	Operational diagrams		X		
3.3.3	Overflight		X		
3.3.4	CO2 emissions		X		
3.3.5	Local air quality	X			
3.3.6	Tranquillity		X		
3.3.7	Biodiversity		X		
3.4	What is the monetised impact (i.e., Net Present Value (NPV)) of 3.3? (Provide comments) N/A - The sponsor has not quantified the environmental impacts of this ACP.				

4. Economic Indicators of the ACP		Status
4.1	What are the qualitative / strategic impacts described in the ACP? The sponsor has set out the strategic impacts of this ACP, including contributing towards UK and Scottish net zero targets. This ACP helps achieve this by mitigating against potential radar clutter caused by the wind farm. Qualitative impacts include a small increase in noise and greenhouse gas emissions, a small reduction in GA access and minor deployment, infrastructure and operational costs.	
4.2	What is the overall monetised and non-monetised (quantified) impact of the proposed airspace change? N/A - The sponsor has not quantified the impacts of this ACP.	
4.3	What is the Net Present Value of the proposed options? Has the sponsor used this information to progress/discount options? Has the sponsor provided the benefits-costs ratio (BCR) of the proposed options and used it to support the choice of the preferred options? [E44] N/A	
4.3.1	If the preferred option does not have the highest NPV or BCR, then has the sponsor justified the reasons to progress this option? [B50 and E23] N/A	
4.4	Have the sponsors provided reasonable justification for the proportionality of analysis above? Yes, the sponsor has sufficiently justified why it would be disproportionate for them to provide quantified impacts, due to this unique nature of this ACP.	☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

5. Other aspects	
5.1	N/A

6. Summary of the Final Options Appraisal & Conclusions		
6.1	The sponsor has provided a qualitative Final Options Appraisal setting out the impacts of their proposed option, 7(E). The sponsor has justified why it would be disproportionate for them to carry out a quantitative analysis for this ACP and this has been viewed as sufficient by the CAA. Therefore, the sponsor provided the qualitative discussion of the costs and benefits of all the proposed options by providing the comparison against the do-nothing option for all the impact listed in CAP1616f 3.40. The sponsor has also established a reasonable baseline scenario. The sponsor also sufficiently justified why it would be disproportionate for them to conduct traffic forecast and a CBA analysis as detailed in the sections above. Taking into account the scope of this project, all rationales provided in sponsor's submission are concluded to be reasonable and therefore the CAA approves the economic assessment provided.	
Outstanding issues?		
Serial	Issue	Action required
1		
2		

CAA Final Options Appraisal Completed by	Name	Signature	Date
Airspace Regulator (Economist)			30/07/2024
Airspace Regulator (Environmental)			27/05/2025