

ACP-2024-039 – Doncaster Sheffield Airport Re-establishment of Controlled Airspace & Procedures

Stage 2 ‘Develop and Assess’ Gateway Outcome – 30/04/2026

[STATEMENT]

As part of Stage2 ‘Develop and Assess’ of the CAP 1616 airspace change process, the UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) has completed a Stage 2 Gateway Assessment of the City of Doncaster Council airspace change proposal (ACP) – ACP-2024-039 – Doncaster Sheffield Airport Re-establishment of Controlled Airspace & Procedures.

In accordance with CAP 1616, in order for the CAA to sign-off the Stage 2 Gateway, the requirements of Stage 2 as set out in CAP 1616 must be met.

At the Gateway assessment for this proposal, the CAA concluded that the following requirements were not met.

Technical:

1. Appendix B Design Principle Evaluation – on page 6 the sponsor has titled and described Option 1 as their baseline. As detailed throughout the document the baseline is the current-day scenario. This error must be corrected to avoid confusion. (CAP1616f:3.11)
2. Design Options & Design Principle Evaluation Submission Document – In para 5.4.2 the sponsor explains why Option 1 was discontinued. The sponsor gives the correct reason but quotes the incorrect DP (DP3). The sponsor must correct this to avoid confusion and maintain consistency. (CAP1616f:3.35)
3. The methodology in Appendix B when assessing safety outside CAS in DP1. The approach to evaluation text refers to a safety risk materialising inside CAS not outside CAS. This must be reviewed. (CAP1616f:3.32)
4. The methodology for assessing DP2 must be reviewed and assessed independently of DP6. (CAP1616f:3.32)
5. The approach to evaluation text in DP3 is different in both the Design Options & Design Principle Evaluation Submission Document and Appendix B Design Principle Evaluation, this must be reviewed. (CAP1616f:3.32)
6. The sponsor must review the methodology for DP3 to ensure that the options can be assessed against it. (CAP1616f:3.32)
7. When describing the methodology for DP4, the approach to evaluation in the Design Options & Design Principle Evaluation Submission Document and Appendix B Design Principle Evaluation ends on a comma inside open brackets indicating that text is missing, this must be reviewed. (CAP1616f:3.32)
8. When describing the methodology for DP6, the RAG criteria in both the Design Options & Design Principle Evaluation Submission Document and Appendix B Design Principle Evaluation ‘All CTA classifications lower than Class D’ is in both the ‘Meets’ criteria and ‘Does not Meet’ criteria. This must be reviewed. (CAP1616f:3.32)
9. The sponsor must address the requirements above then re-evaluate how their options have responded to the design principles. (CAP1616f:3.35)
10. Design Options & Design Principle Evaluation Submission Document – ‘The extended analysis showed there were more filed Airprox involving RHADS movements in the 3 years prior to establishing controlled airspace than in the following 15 years.’ The data provided does not show this trend. The sponsor must review this claim.

Environmental:

11. The sponsor must review the approach taken to evaluating design options against mandatory DP3, which resulted in no evaluation being undertaken, and carry out an appropriate qualitative evaluation of the options against DP3. For openness and transparency, the sponsor must update stakeholders of any changes made to the DPE. (CAP1616f, para. 3.35)
12. Consideration must be given to the environmental impacts (if any) arising from indirect consequential changes to the traffic patterns of other airspace users. (CAP1616f, para. 3.61)

Economic:

13. Under Section 4.4.37 (Infrastructure Costs – Methodology) and 4.4.38 (Airport/Air Navigation Service Provider – Operational Costs and Deployment Costs). The sponsor should remove the following text in this and related sections of the appraisal. “This assessment will not provide any basis for selecting a preferred or best-performing option and such costs are excluded from the IOA”. The relevant difference in the appraisal is against the baseline, not against the other options. Sponsor may choose to indicate the costs are the same in the conclusion about options to take forward to consultation.
14. In the appraisal in Section 5.2 and Section 5.3, text in sections like local air quality which indicate there is no difference between the options at shortlist should be moved into the conclusion on options to take forward to consultation. The appraisal tables should only compare each option against the baseline.

The CAA has informed the change sponsor of this decision. In line with CAP 1616, the change sponsor is now able to reconsider its submission before resubmitting it for further review by the CAA at a future Gateway.

It is important to note that whether an ACP passes a gateway successfully or not does not predetermine the CAA’s later final decision on whether to approve the airspace change proposal. This decision is not an explicit or implicit comment on the merits or otherwise of this ACP. This will come at the decision-making stage (Stage 5 - DECIDE).

[END STATEMENT]