

From: Martin Cope
To: [Airspace Modernisation](#)
Subject: [External] Airspace Modernisation
Date: 12 January 2026 23:39:44

Dear Airspace Modernisation

My details are

Martin Cope

Dear Airspace Modernisation.

In response to:

CAA consultation: Airspace modernisation: Consultation on the requirements for a UK Airspace Coordination Service and associated guidance
Closing date: 12/01/2026
<https://consultations.caa.co.uk/policy-development/draft-ukacsrequirements/>

Q1

CAGNE, as not sure what lessons have been learned, because the CAA continues to produce complex documents for consultation leaving most of the public unable to participate effectively.

Q2

'The masterplan and PEX have been deemed to cause confusion and frustration, due to their lack of detailed information at early stages. Instead, public consultations will be conducted later in the process by airspace change sponsors under the CAP 1616 process.'

We question how this can be party to CAP1616 airspace change when the Gatwick masterplan was predominantly about new runways. We do not believe that the 'airport desires' for the future can be included in CAP1616 that purely relates to airspace change. The concerns brought by the Gatwick masterplan was the plan for a 3-runway airport and the blight it would, and did, cause. The frustration related to how an airport could submit such plans when aviation is increasing global warming and emissions need to reduce.

Q3

'Agile'

- active response is to be welcomed if it is in a balanced-approach fashion, with transparency and engagement throughout with all parties and not just aviation.

'Monitoring' - is a concern if not acted upon when issues are found.

'Cluster requiring coordination' - we accept that two bodies need to actively work together, but not if it is to the detriment of the residents on the ground or the planet, with increases in noise and emissions. We again question how 'coordination process will be streamlined to align better with the

CAP 1616 process' without community engagement at an earlier stage of CAP1616. CAGNE does not support the removal of SEA regulations, as these cover noise impacts and CO2. This needs to be included in all aspects of the process to allow for a balanced approach. The environmental impact is not something to be 'bolted on at the end', as put forward.

The removal of the PEX will reduce opportunities for early public input, so is not welcomed. The removal of the masterplan and associated documentation may impact the availability of detailed information for stakeholders; this needs to be addressed, perhaps in a different format such as included in a decarbonising plan (decade of change) whereby environmental impacts can be seen alongside, in detail. We do not see this as part of CAP1616, unless it is specifically about airspace change, as with the Gatwick masterplan for growth from the main runway (Gatwick Master Plan 2018)

Thanks

Martin