

CAA PIR Review Report

| | |
|--|---|
| Airspace Change Proposal Title | Leeds East Aerodrome – Instrument Approach Procedures |
| Airspace Change Proposal Reference | ACP-2016-013 |
| Change Sponsor(s) | Leeds East Aerodrome |
| CAA Decision Date | 15 May 2023 |
| Implementation Date | 10 August 2023 |
| ACP Level | Level 1 – CAP1616 version 4 |
| <p><i>Instructions</i></p> <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"> HAS RESULTED IN THE EXPECTED IMPACTS AND/OR OUTCOMES HAS NOT RESULTED IN THE EXPECTED IMPACTS AND/OR OUTCOMES See Part B.2 POINTS TO NOTE/ISSUE TO HIGHLIGHT See Part B.3 if required | |
| Executive Summary | |
| <p>CAA Decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Post Implementation Review (PIR) report is the final stage (7) of the CAP 1616 process for ACP-2016-013 The objective of the airspace change proposal (ACP) was to offer RNP approaches at Leeds East Aerodrome (LEA) when Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) existed to help reduce landing risks in such marginal weather conditions. The CAA decided that to meet this objective and approve implementation of these RNP procedures, the following conditions had to be met, detailed in decision CAP2389. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to implementation, all the agreed draft Letters of Agreement (LoAs) must be reviewed and accepted by the CAA. Prior to implementation, the Sponsor must ensure that the documentation which refers to agreed procedures for air ground communication service officers (AGCS/Os) and pilots flying the procedures, is aligned with the AGCS phraseology in | |

Chapter 4 of CAP413

- The slot allocation system, as described in the documentation (EGCM/EGCJ LoA), must ensure that there is no possibility of aircraft being booked into EGCM and Sherburn-in Elmet aerodrome (EGCJ) concurrently and be aligned in terms of local procedures with EGCJ concerning visual circuit occupancy.
- Prior to implementation, the Sponsor must provide details, which will need to be accepted, to the CAA on what is meant by 'special handling' of CAT C recoveries and confirm that CAT C approaches will not be carried out for training purposes
- Prior to implementation the Sponsor is to provide the CAA with details, which will need to be accepted, on the out of hours operation (OHOs) for use of the IAPs and the CAA will consider approval of the OHOs
- Should the Sponsor see an increase (2019 figure was 76, so anything above this) in the number of CAT C aircraft types utilising the procedure over the next 5 years, they must review their safety case and inform the CAA of the outcome.
- Prior to implementation the DOC for the Fenton Radio frequency must adequately cover the geographical span of the procedures and align with the Pilot Brief (suitable communication infrastructure to be installed and tested.)
- Prior to implementation, any reference to Leeds East ATC or the provision of an ATS is to be removed from the relevant documentation (LoAs) prior to signature (An AGCS is not ATC).
- Prior to implementation, all the mitigations to the hazards in the safety case are to be accepted by the operating authority and all outstanding controls/mitigations are to be in place.
- Prior to implementation (at least 28 days) evidence of the completion of outstanding controls and mitigations to be supplied to the CAA.
- On completion of the actions required for controls or mitigations, safety hazards are to be reviewed in accordance with the units SMS (CAP760/795) to confirm post mitigation risk.
- Prior to implementation, evidence of the publication of updated procedures and the completion of training for AGCS/Os, must be provided to the CAA ATS Inspector.
- A pilot may not make an initial airborne request for a procedure slot, unless in an emergency (update pilot brief accordingly).
- Following implementation, should the sponsor determine that the risk of a MAC while flying either procedure is heightened due to increased glider activity, then the procedure(s) are to be suspended until such time as the activity is considered not to present a heightened risk.
- The procedures for EGCM should ensure that, in the event of a missed approach, EGCJ is advised by telephone to assist in the management of potential conflicts.
- All periodic post monitoring reports, including performance against SPIs are submitted to the CAA for review.

PIR chronology

- [Decision document \(CAA change approval\)](#) and [Decision log](#) dated 10 May 2023
- Implementation AIRAC 08/2023 on 10 August 2023
- [PIR Report, Annex 1](#) and [Annex 2](#) submitted to CAA by Sponsor on 28 May 2025
- Public Feedback Window opened on 28 May 2025
- Public Feedback Window closed on 25 June 2025
- As this is a CAP725 ACP PIR, there is no PIR information on the Portal, however, the PIR report and Annexes are on the Webpage for the ACP.

PIR conclusion



- The CAA has confirmed that the implemented airspace changes satisfactorily resulted in the expected impacts and outcomes (within acceptable tolerance limits) and the airspace change is confirmed.

Post implementation review data that the CAA has considered in reaching its PIR conclusions

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| A.1 | Safety Data | |
| A.1.1 | <p><i>All the data that has been presented and has been endorsed by further investigation by the CAA ATS Inspector, has shown that there has been no adverse effect on the operation of the new procedures implemented in Class G airspace. There have been no safety attributed incidents or issues raised by unit based or other airspace users, both powered and gliders, including both MAC or CFIT related concerns.</i></p> <p><i>An updated ANO Article 183(b) exemption was initially required and subsequently approved, to ensure continuous status for the RNP approaches. The CAA ATS Inspector informed LEA that a process was required to be in place to ensure that a request to ATS Northern regional office is triggered ahead of any future expiry date.</i></p> | |
| A.2 | Service provision/resource | |
| A.2.1 | <i>The resource in place at the unit has adequately managed the operation of the new airspace design, although some administrative, non-operational tasks are occasionally delayed during busy weekends.</i> | |
| A.3 | Utilisation of continuous climb operations and continuous descent operations | |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| A.3.1 | <i>There are no CCO or CDO procedures associated with this airspace change.</i> | |
| A.4 | Infringements because of the change | |
| A.4.1 | <i>There are no associated CAS elements to this airspace change. However, as LEA is relatively close to CAS structures serving Leeds Bradford airport, the new procedures have been designed to ensure that they are safely and satisfactorily deconflicted from all established and recognised traffic patterns for other established units. Although there was an uncoordinated infringement of the LBA CTA-1 recorded for 19 May 24, this was because of questionable time management by the pilot instructor rather than the introduction of the new RNAV procedures at Leeds East aerodrome.</i> | |
| A.5 | Traffic figures (air transport movements) | |
| A.5.1 | <i>The traffic figures for the period covered by this report show that due to the consequential legacy impact of COVID, the anticipated figures were not fully realised. Although the annual figures for the 23/24 period were 7.25% up on the same 12-month period for 22/23, they were down by 4.77% of the predicted total of 9142 total movements. However, this is considered as being within tolerance.</i> | |
| A.6 | Traffic dispersion comparisons | |
| A.6.1 | <i>The new RNAV procedures that are established outside of controlled airspace are being operated as expected and within acceptable tolerance limits.</i> | |
| A.7 | Operational Feedback | |
| A.7.1 | <i>There are no unforeseen or unintended operational impacts other than the realisation that the pilot brief for all airspace users was overly long and initially, seemingly too complex. This has been rewritten and is considered a satisfactory document.</i> | |
| A.8 | Denied access | |
| A.8.1 | <i>There are no reported incidents of denied access.</i> | |
| A.9 | Utilisation of standard instrument departures/standard instrument arrivals/instrument flight procedures | |
| A.9.1 | <i>From 10th August 2023 to 10th August 2024, there were 8706 movements recorded for LEA, with 151 RNP slots issued for the new RNP procedures. This figure of only 1.73% of total movements is considered as being low, even when there were an</i> | |

| | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| | <i>additional 102 Training Slots issued and conducted in VMC under VFR. Another factor that needs to be considered, is that Sherburn in Elmet airfield has similar RNP procedures that were implemented in the same region and their slots have to be coordinated and deconflicted from those at LEA, therefore establishing and observing a safe and equitable airspace sharing arrangement.</i> | |
| A.10 | Letters of agreement | |
| A.10.1 | <i>The six operational and one dormant (Doncaster airport) LOAs were well received and satisfy the operating requirements of the associated airspace users. The sponsor wrote to these stakeholders in May 2025 and all except Doncaster (dormant) replied and indicated that the procedures were not having any detrimental impact on their own activities.</i> | |
| A.11 | Environmental factors | |
| A.11.1 | <i>As there is no evidence to suggest that there has been any change to traffic patterns at other airports as a result of the introduction of new procedures at LEA, it is considered that there has been no detrimental environmental impact. In addition, the perceived economic downturn has resulted in the traffic figures being less than those anticipated in the original ACP submission.</i> | |
| A.12 | International obligations | |
| A.5.1 | <i>There are no international obligations associated with this airspace change</i> | |
| A.13 | Ministry of Defence operations | |
| A.13.1 | <i>Royal Air Force Leeming operates both Hawk and Tutor type aircraft and whenever an RNP slot is allocated for LEA, the information is coordinated with the Leeming duty operational controller. This procedure has ensured that both unit's activities have existed harmoniously and without incident.</i> | |
| A.14 | Stakeholder feedback | |
| A.14.1 | <i>Although there were no unintended outcomes highlighted by any other airspace user other than the issue with the technical and long pilot brief, during the CAA 28-day public Feedback period a local council representative commented on a fundamental issue relating to the LPA (local planning authority), which, inexorably, was directly related to a concern that pre-dated this airspace change and was therefore considered as not relevant to this deliverable. Encouragingly, a local pilot commented that the new procedures were a positive step forward.</i> | |

| PART B – CAA Confirmation of the Airspace Change Proposal | | | |
|---|---|---|------------|
| B.1 | Taking the above information into account, has the airspace change resulted in the expected impacts and outcomes? | | YES |
| B.1.1 | Although this PIR has indicated that impacts are as expected for the ACP, the Leeds East Aerodrome SMS for safety compliance must ensure that the ANO Article 183(b) exemption is included in the document control processes. | | YES |
| B.5 | Regulator's Signature | | |
| Technical Regulator |  |  | 24/11/2025 |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|------------|-----------|
| B.5 | Airspace Regulation Principal - PIR approver: On 3 rd December 2025, I had a brief from the technical regulator regarding this PIR. I concur that this ACP has met its objectives as approved and the airspace change is confirmed. | | | |
| Airspace Regulation Principal | [REDACTED] | | [REDACTED] | 3/12/2025 |
| | | | | |