CAA Decision Log

Airspace Change Proposal Title	Northern LTMA Region Airspace Change (OFJES, CLN etc)
Airspace Change Proposal Reference	ACP-2025-023
Change Sponsor	NATS
AIS Submission Target Date	12/12/2025
CAA Decision Target Date	05/12/2025

Instructions

In providing a response to each question and/or status, the following colour coding should be used:

- COMPLIANT/NOT APPLICABLE
- NOT COMPLIANT/ACTION REQUIRED
- ISSUE/CONCERN TO HIGHLIGHT

Executive Summary

The sponsor set out the issue or opportunity to be addressed in their Statement of Need; namely, "Luton Airport arrival flow convergence in this region causes congestion and ATC [Air Traffic Control] complexity. This has the potential to affect safety if left unresolved as traffic levels increase. This Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) intends to address the issue before safety is affected. A reduction in congestion and complexity would lead to ATC workload reduction and further improve safety in the region." The desired outcome is to mitigate high controller workload and reduce complexity in the flow convergence area between OXDUF and OFJES.

This ACP followed CAP1616f (for permanent airspace change proposals) and following the assessment meeting it was decided that this would be a scaled level 2 ACP, with scaling applied to engagement and evidence requirements.[1] Limited options were assessed by the sponsor, proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposed change.

This ACP builds upon airspace change implemented in ACP-2018-65 (SAIP AD6). The change sponsor is proposing moving the boundary between Clacton (CLN) CTA11 and CTA 12 (Class C airspace) to the east by approx. 9.1nm to OFJES. This will have the effect of lowering

[1] The scaling requirements are captured in "CAA Scaling Document" located in the "Documents for this Proposal" area for Airspace change proposal - ACP-2025-023

the airspace of that 9.1nm portion of airspace by 2000ft to FL105 (CTA12 base level is FL125 vs. FL105 for CTA 11). This proposed change will provide greater tactical flexibility for controllers, making 2 additional levels available from OFJES to tactically descend traffic to facilitate flow integration of arrival traffic into London Luton (EGGW) from the east, with arrival traffic into EGGW from the south. There are no proposals to amend Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP).

Due to the context of the change (above FL100), the bounded scope of the change proposed (an additional two flight levels made available earlier in the flow integration area to controllers by shifting the CTA11/12 boundary to OFJES), and the low usage statistics of the airspace in scope for change, the impact on other airspace users was minimal. In addition, early engagement with key airspace users (USAFE and MoD) meant that a key challenge – to design a proposal acceptable to these users – was addressed. To ensure the continued resilience and effectiveness of the design in a context of rising traffic levels, Human Factors performance monitoring will be required, and this is indicated in the PIR data requirements.

The recommendation is for the CAA to approve the implementation of the proposed change to airspace design.

Implementation of the revised airspace will be notified through AIRAC cycle 03/2026 and will become effective on 19 March 2026.

PART A – Airspace Change Process – GATEWAYS		
A.1	**Airspace Change Portal**	
A.1.1	*Airspace change proposal public view*	
A.2	**CAA SharePoint site**	
A.2.1	*Northern LTMA Region Airspace Change (OFJES, CLN etc) - Project - All Documents*	
A.3	**Stage 1 DEFINE Gateway**	*28/08/2025*
A.3.1	*Stage 1 Define Gateway August 2025 - First Attempt*	
A.4	**Stage 2 DEVELOP AND ASSESS Gateway**	*28/08/2025*
A.4.1	*Stage 2 Develop & Assess Gateway Aug 2025 - First Attempt*	
A.5	**Stage 3 CONSULT Gateway**	*28/08/2025*

A.5.1	*Stage 3 Consult Gateway Aug 2025 - First Attempt*	
A.6	**Chronology**	
A.6.1	*Statement of Need Submitted: 27/05/2025* *Assessment Meeting Held: 09/07/2025* *Timeline Submitted and Approved: 28/07/2025* *Define, Develop & Assess, and Consult Gateway Submitted: 08/08/2025* *Define, Develop & Assess, and Consult Gateway Held: 28/08/2025* *Final ACP Submission received: 10/10/2025*	
A.7	**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?**	*N/A*
A.7.1	N/A	

PART B – Airspace Change Process – STAGE 5				
B.1	**Was a Public Evidence Session required for this proposal?**			*N*
B.2	**Were any requests made for this decision to be called-in by the Secretary of State?**			*N*
B.3	**Does the Secretary of State call-in criteria apply to this proposal?**			*N/A*
B.4	**Has the Secretary of State decided to call-in this proposal?** 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.5	**Subject Matter Expert (SME) Regulatory Assessments** NOTE: this captures RAG status only – full details contained within each of assessment (hyperlinks inserted below)			
ATM Safety		*COMPLETE*	**Environmental**	*COMPLETE*
Economic Assessment & Statement		*COMPLETE*	**Instrument Flight Procedure**	*NOT APPLICABLE*
Engagement / Consultation		*COMPLETE*	**Operational**	*COMPLETE*
B.5.1	*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)?*			
B.6	**Other Relevant Documents (title and hyperlinks to be inserted)**			
B.7	**Has the relevant legal and policy framework to the airspace change process been taken into account, including:**			*Y*

	• **the Air Navigation Directions;** • **the Airspace Modernisation Strategy;** • **section 70 of the Transport Act 2000;** • **the Air Navigation Guidance 2017; and** • **CAP 1616 and associated publications?**	
B.8	**CAA consideration of whether the proposal is in accordance with the Airspace Modernisation Strategy (Air Navigation Directions, direction 5(1)).** NOTE: 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 (CAP 1616f, 6.61). For more information on the AMS strategic objectives, see *Airspace Modernisation Strategy 2023-2040 Part 1: Strategic Objectives and Enablers* (CAP 1711).	
Safety	This Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) was submitted in order to address a specific ATC complexity in the flow convergence area for arrivals into Luton (EGGW) from the east and the south in the vicinity of OFJES. The constraints of the current airspace structure results in flight levels becoming available late in the flow integration area for arrivals from the east. The objective of this proposal is to reduce ATC workload and complexity to address a potential future safety risk. It therefore maintains, and aims to improve the UK's high levels of aviation safety.	
Integration of diverse airspace users	The proposed airspace will be Class C, which is the optimised airspace classification for this location/level in that it affords the necessary protection to IFR traffic inbound to EGGW while still providing access for VFR traffic. Indeed, the BGA and AOPA responses welcome the use of class C (Stage 4 Engagement Feedback and Response Document, 7.1.1 (BGA) and 7.2.1 (AOPA). That said, based on the data, the CAA agrees with the sponsor that it is unlikely that GA would require transit through, or access to, this airspace; however, in accordance with the classification, a VFR transit request could be made. The sponsor clarifies that, "in accordance with the classification, should any pilot request transit of the airspace, the controller would consider the request in context of the current traffic situation, the nature of the request itself, and the performance of the type of aircraft involved" (para 2.1.8, Stage 5 CAA-requested clarifications ACP-2025-023).	

Simplification of airspace system	The amount of CAS, and the airspace classification (Class C) is assessed to be the minimum required to maintain a high standard of air safety and is therefore assessed to be in accord with the AMS. The proposal builds on the SAIP AD6 design. There are no changes to IFPs in this proposal. The design amends two blocks of airspace (CLN CTA 11 and CTA 12) by moving the boundary of CTA11/12 east towards OFJES (approx. 9.1nm). This has the effect of lowering the equivalent base of CAS in this area from FL125 to FL105. This proposal is assessed to be a simple and effective method of providing two additional flight levels earlier in the flow integration area which can be used tactically by controllers to improve traffic integration from the east and south and is the least complex airspace design to satisfy the objectives for this ACP.
Environmental sustainability	The AMS environmental sustainability strategic objective states that: "environmental sustainability will be an overarching principle applied through all airspace modernisation activities. Airspace modernisation should deliver the Government's key environmental objectives with respect to air navigation as set out in the Air Navigation Guidance." The ANG 2017 sets out the Government's environmental objectives with respect to air navigation. These environmental objectives are 'designed to minimise the environmental impact of aviation within the context of supporting a strong and sustainable aviation sector'. The objectives are, to: • limit and, where possible, reduce the number of people in the UK significantly affected by adverse impacts from aircraft noise; • ensure that the aviation sector makes a significant and cost-effective contribution towards reducing global emissions; and • minimise local air quality emissions and in particular ensure that the UK complies with its international obligations on air quality. The airspace change is to lower the base level of an existing CTA above FL100. Consequently, there are no anticipated impacts in terms of noise, local air quality, tranquillity or biodiversity. The change sponsor has provided a qualitative assessment and supporting evidence to demonstrate that impacts on greenhouse gas emissions will be nil/negligible and, on this basis, it can be concluded that the proposal aligns with the Airspace Modernisation Strategy's strategic objective on environmental sustainability.
B.9	**CAA consideration of factors material to our decision whether to approve the change (section 70, Transport Act 2000).** NOTE: 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 (CAP 1616f,

	6.80).
Maintain a high standard of safety in the provision of air traffic services section 70(1)(a)	As stated in Section B8, this Airspace Change Proposal (ACP) was submitted in order to address a specific ATC complexity in the flow convergence area for arrivals into Luton (EGGW) from the east and the south in the vicinity of OFJES. The constraints of the current airspace structure results in flight levels becoming available late in the flow integration area for arrivals from the east. The objective of this airspace change proposal is to reduce ATC workload and complexity to address a potential future safety risk, noting that traffic levels, and thus complexity, have increased in recent years. It therefore specifically aims to maintain a high standard of safety in the provision of air traffic services.
Secure the most efficient use of airspace consistent with the safe operation of aircraft and the expeditious flow of air traffic section 70(2)(a)	The additional volume of controlled airspace and airspace classification are appropriate to meet the task and are consistent with the requirements outlined in the Sponsors' Statement of Need. From the evidence presented, the volume of airspace is appropriate to the objectives of the proposed change i.e. to reduce complexity and ATC workload in the EGGW flow integration area between OXDUF and OFJES. Airspace analysis demonstrates very low usage of the Class G airspace which is proposed to become Class C. The classification (Class C) is no higher than necessary for operations intending to use the airspace and is assessed to be the least complex airspace design appropriate for the intended utilisation.
Satisfy requirements of operators and owners of all classes of aircraft section 70(2)(b)	No changes to IFPs are proposed so the requirements for operators remain unchanged. Feedback from operators indicated that the proposal would have a minor benefit as it would improve vectoring efficiency and flexibility. At the same time the proposed new CAS volumes and the selected classification provide safe access to suitably equipped General Aviation traffic and the minimum new volumes of CAS being proposed are all above FL100.
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)	Noting that the objective of this ACP is to maintain a high standard of safety, this ACP aims to mitigate and reduce future third-party safety risk. This proposal is sponsored by NERL and therefore meets the needs of the relevant Air Traffic Controllers (ATC). The proposal also meets the requirements of ATCs in the surrounding airspace.
Take into account the Secretary	Not relevant to this airspace change proposal.

of State's guidance relating to spaceflight activities section 70(2)(ca)	
Take into account the Secretary of State's guidance on environmental objectives section 70(2)(d)	The airspace change is a scaled Level 2 ACP with no anticipated impact in terms of noise, local air quality, tranquillity or biodiversity. The change sponsor has provided a qualitative assessment and supporting evidence to demonstrate that greenhouse gas emission impacts will be nil/negligible. Based on the evidence provided by the change sponsor, the ACP is assessed as meeting the Secretary of State's guidance on environmental objectives, section 70(2)(d).
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)	The CAA is satisfied that the impacts of the revised airspace associated with this ACP will not impede the operational requirements of the MoD. The nature and scope of the airspace change does not alter any material characteristics which are listed in CAP1616f 6.80. There is a minor impact on access due to the lowering of the base of CAS from FL125 to FL105. However, the bounded scope of this expansion (moving the boundary east by approx. 9.1nm to facilitate the lowered base) means that the impact on access is limited. Moreover, airspace analysis demonstrates low usage of the airspace in scope for change.
Take account of the interests of national security section 70(2)(f)	The CAA is satisfied that the proposal has no impact on national security. Early engagement with the MoD and USAFE informed the development of the final preferred option. Early design options were discounted due to feedback from MoD and USAFE that this would have a major adverse impact on their training and tactical freedom. The final preferred option was assessed to only have a minor impact on operations and training by USAFE and MoD. This feedback is evidenced from the airspace analysis conducted by the sponsor, which demonstrated low usage of the Class G airspace proposed to become Class C.
Take account of any international obligations notified to the CAA by the Secretary of State section 70(2)(g)	No such international obligations have been notified to the CAA under section 70(2)(g) of Transport Act 2000.

B.10	**Are there any other associated publications relevant to the proposal and, if so, have the requirements**	*N/A*

	of those publications been met? NOTE: associated publications include Airspace Policy Statements listed here.	
B.10.1	There are no associated publications, including Airspace Policy Statements relevant to the proposal.	
B.11	**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.** NOTE: this section only applies if the CAA is classifying or amending the classification of UK airspace.	
B.11.1	An expansion of Class C airspace is proposed, with the boundary between CTA11/CTA 12 moving east by approx. 9.1nm and the base lowering to FL105 from FL125, to provide two additional flight levels to aid flow integration. An alternative option, which proposed a lower base of CAS, was discounted due to the impact on other airspace users – principally USAFE. From the evidence presented, the amount of CAS, and the airspace classification (Class C) is assessed to be the minimum required to maintain a high standard of air safety.	

PART C – Stage 5 Recommendation		
C.1	**Taking the above information into account, what is your recommendation to the decision-maker for this proposal?**	
C.1.1	Approved with conditions	
C.2	**Are there any Recommendations and/or Conditions for the change sponsor to address prior to implementation (if approved)?**	*Y*
C.2.1	**Condition 1**: An APSA must be completed prior to implementation. **Condition 2**: ATC Instructions, which include the proposed ATC mitigation procedures, charts, etc must be submitted at least 30 working days prior to the planned implementation of the change. These documents are subject to review and may not be implemented until the unit receives formal confirmation from the CAA that the review is complete and accepted. **Condition 3**: Planned Briefing activities and associated content are notified to the CAA at least 30 working days prior to the planned implementation of the change. The briefing of the requisite staff must be completed prior to implementation.	
C.3	**Are there any specific requirements in terms of the data to be collected by the change sponsor for the Post Implementation Review (if approved)?**	*Y*
C.3.1	Human Performance monitoring on controller performance post implementation will be required at Stage 7 (Post Implementation Review) as this is the most effective methodology to provide assurance that the design continues to deliver the desired effect set against the context of traffic returning to pre-COVID levels.	
C.4	**Are any other consents and approvals needed in order to permit the intended operation (title and hyperlinks to be inserted)?**	
C.5	**Are there any other comments/observations for the decision maker?**	*N*

C.5.1	The CAA has not directly received any external correspondence in relation to the change sponsor's ACP.		
C.6	**Regulator's Signature**		
Technical Regulator	[redacted]	[redacted]	19/11/25

PART E – Final Regulatory Decision – Comment/Approval			
Manager Airspace Regulation comments and recommendation/regulatory decision: Noting the improved safety benefit alongside the expected minimal impact to other airspace users, subject to the conditions noted above this ACP is approved.			
Manager Airspace Regulation	[redacted]	[redacted]	*8/12/2025*