Department for Transport

Air Navigation Directions and Air Navigation Guidance

Consultation

November 2025

Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 4DR

This publication is also available on our website at
www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at
www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport

Contents

How to respond

The consultation period began on 26 November 2025 and will run until 26 January 2026. Please ensure that your response reaches us before the closing date. If you would like further copies of this consultation document, it can be found at https://www.gov.uk/dft#consultations or you can contact airspacemodernisation@dft.gov.uk if you need alternative formats (Braille, audio CD, etc.).

Please send consultation responses to: airspacemodernisation@dft.gov.uk

When responding, please state whether you are responding as an individual or representing the views of an organisation. If responding on behalf of a larger organisation, please make it clear who the organisation represents and, where applicable, how the views of members were assembled.

If you have any suggestions of others who may wish to be involved in this process, please contact us.

Freedom of Information

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

If you want information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.

In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

Data Protection

This consultation is seeking your views on proposed changes to the Air Navigation Directions and Air Navigation Guidance.

Your personal data collected through this consultation is processed in line with our online forms, surveys and consultations privacy notice.

Air Navigation Directions and Air Navigation Guidance

Introduction

The UK's aviation sector and supporting industries, such as aerospace, are a vital asset for the UK. They deliver important value for the UK and its citizens through providing travel opportunities, supporting business, and transporting freight. The aviation sector contributes at least £22 billion to GDP (£14 billion from the air transport sector and a further £8 billion from aerospace) each year.

Air transport directly employed nearly 150,000 people and supports up to half a million more jobs across the UK, in aviation and aerospace.

Airspace is a critical part of aviation. The UK's airspace is one of the busiest and most complex in the world, but much of its basic design hasn't changed significantly in 70 years, despite great technological advances.

Since the 1950s commercial flights alone have increased from 200,000 annually to 2.41 million in the year ending March 2024. Each day around 6,000 aircraft and 600,000 people fly in the sky above the UK.

The UK's airspace is divided into three Flight Information Regions (FIRs): London, Scottish and Shanwick Oceanic. London covers England and Wales. Scottish covers Scotland and Northern Ireland. Shanwick Oceanic covers 700,000 square miles over the Northeast Atlantic.

The airspace for which the UK is responsible, is used by a variety of different types of aircraft, all for differing reasons and with different operating requirements. Airspace users include commercial aviation such as airlines, business aviation, Government activities such as the military, search and rescue and the national police air service, as well as recreational flights, training, uncrewed aircraft (i.e. drones) and spaceflight.

Airspace is categorised between controlled and uncontrolled. Activity within controlled airspace is overseen by Air Traffic Control Officers who are responsible for managing and coordinating all air activity within that portion of airspace. Controlled airspace is primarily used by commercial airlines who require segregation from other airspace users for safety

reasons. General Aviation operates largely, but not exclusively, in uncontrolled airspace, alongside a few commercial air transport flights. The military and other state activities also have requirements to use both types of airspace.

UK airspace is a state asset, and the Department of Transport (DfT) is responsible for setting UK policies about its use. The CAA is the UK's independent regulator for civil aviation and responsible for the safety and regulation of its use.8. The UK's Airspace Modernisation Strategy[1] published by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) sets out the ambition and objectives for modernising UK airspace out to 2040. It aims to deliver quicker, cleaner and quieter journeys for those who use airspace and those who are affected by airspace. By modernising our airspace, we can:

- Ensure airspace can accommodate aviation growth
- Reduce carbon emissions per flight
- Better mitigate adverse noise impacts
- Make commercial aviation more efficient and resilient, with fewer delays
- Maintain safety for all users
- Safely integrate the full potential of new aviation technology such as drones

Under provisions within the Transport Act 2000[2], the Secretary of State for Transport directs the CAA to perform a number of functions including approving changes to the design of UK airspace. The detail of the CAA's responsibilities is set out in the Air Navigation Directions 2023 (AND)[3]. The Transport Act 2000 sets out the CAA's duties when carrying out these functions, including taking account of any guidance on environmental objectives given to the CAA by the Secretary of State. The Air Navigation Guidance 2017 (ANG)[4] is that guidance. These are statutory documents issued by the DfT.

The current version of the ANG was published in 2017, following consultation and engagement on creating a framework for balanced decisions on the design and use of airspace.

The ANG 2017 recognised that airspace modernisation was long overdue. It sought to future-proof UK airspace, reduce the need for aircraft stacking before landing at airports and to make journeys faster and more environmentally friendly. It also sought to address some of the least acceptable impacts of aviation on those living near airports, particularly the effects of noise. It recognised that a 'one size fits all' approach would be unworkable, so focused on decisions being informed by the needs of each area, using robust local evidence and improved transparency to try to encourage the aviation industry to improve standards and engage effectively.

[1] https://www.caa.co.uk/our-work/publications/documents/content/cap1711
[2] https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/38
[3] https://www.caa.co.uk/media/lzrl3drs/caa-air-navigation-directions-2023.pdf
[4] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-air-navigation-guidance-2017

However, while the aims of the 2017 policy were and remain the right ones, in practice the picture has been more mixed. Only one major airspace change has been completed while the 2017 ANG has been in force. Although delivery has undoubtedly been delayed by external events, such as the Covid pandemic, airports and airlines have also reported that the CAA processes based on the ANG are confusing, expensive to follow, and time-consuming. The Department has had feedback from community groups and people living close to airports that airspace change remains confusing, the material can be overwhelming, and people sometimes do not feel that they are being meaningfully consulted.

The proposals in this consultation seek to address these challenges. The final decision on the approach to be taken by the updated AND and ANG will be informed by the feedback received to this consultation. Safety remains the overriding priority for airspace design, so this consultation seeks the views on a range of proposals which aim to balance the economic and environmental objectives for airspace. These are set out in new draft AND and ANG which accompany this consultation.

This consultation (and the propositions in the draft revised AND and ANG) proposes a number of policies the Government wants to achieve with UK airspace design which will shape how the CAA undertakes its air navigation functions, notably:

- Clear policy priorities for the CAA when carrying out its airspace functions specifying how overall capacity of airspace, noise impact, carbon emissions and flight efficiency are to be prioritised in UK airspace design.

- Updated, tailored guidance on how to apply environmental obligations to the airspace change process.

- Clarity on our expectations on the engagement and consultation between sponsors and local communities.

- Revisions to the call-in process and criteria where Airspace Change Proposals (ACPs) can be determined by the Secretary of State.

- Policy on the environmental assessments required airspace design decisions that enable Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS) operations.

Policy Background

The Transport Act 2000 underpins the regulatory framework for airspace change and provides the Secretary of State for Transport with the powers to issue directions and guidance to the CAA to carry out these functions, the details of which are contained in the AND and ANG.

The AND and ANG inform the CAA's detailed Airspace Change Process (CAP1616)[5] for proposing changes to the design of UK airspace. As well as the CAA's decision-making process, CAP1616 sets out the detailed process which must be followed by sponsors. It includes the environmental assessments and consultation with stakeholders required to

[5] https://www.caa.co.uk/our-work/publications/documents/content/cap1616/

provide the CAA with the information necessary to apply the ANG before making its decision. The CAA is separately considering changes to CAP1616, and their consultation is available on the CAA website[6].

The UK airspace modernisation programme is a key national infrastructure programme that aims to increase the efficiency and resilience of UK airspace, and enable new users to safely share the skies, whilst reducing the environmental impact of aviation. It will modernise UK airspace by updating its structural design and improving the systems which we use to manage it through the use of new technology.

The diversity of airspace modernisation and the longevity of the programme requires Government to be dynamic in how policy is developed and applied. It requires the Government and regulation to be at the forefront of technological advances and maximising opportunities for growth, whilst maintaining a high level of safety and ensuring that growth is achieved sustainably. The number of flights at UK airports is largely determined by physical infrastructure, such as runways, and the extent to which that infrastructure can be used (air traffic movements and/or passenger numbers) is determined through the planning system. Airspace modernisation has an important role in ensuring that the activity enabled by this infrastructure is undertaken in a sustainable manner, minimising where possible the noise impacts for communities, and greenhouse gases through more efficient flight paths and trajectories.

More widely, the nature of aviation is changing, driven by economic opportunities from airport expansion and developments in technologies which are shaping how aircraft perform and operate, such as drones.

Feedback from the recent UK Airspace Design Service (UKADS) consultation[7] noted that changes to the CAA's CAP1616 airspace change process would support the effective delivery of key elements of the airspace modernisation programme, and the CAA is separately consulting on potential changes. Because CAP1616 is informed by the AND and ANG, it makes sense to review these at the same time. The ANG and AND must be robust yet flexible to allow the CAA and airspace change sponsors the ability to design, develop and implement new airspace structures. These airspace structures should improve network efficiency, minimise where possible the noise impacts for communities and reduce carbon impacts per flight by maximising flight efficiency. Doing so can support an increase in growth and demand for air travel (and the economic growth it will generate).

The AND and ANG were last revised in 2023 and 2017 respectively. The DfT is looking to revise the content of the documents, which will improve their applicability for users and represent the latest Government policy position towards airspace modernisation. The feedback to this consultation will help inform decisions on these policies. It is anticipated that any changes could come into effect in 2026.

Migration to the new Guidance and implications for Airspace Change Proposals currently in progress

The Government proposes that the new ANG would apply to any new ACP that commences after the date the final revised ANG is published. Where an ACP is already

[6] https://www.caa.co.uk/our-work/publications/documents/content/cap3157/
[7] https://consultations.caa.co.uk/policy-development/ukads-consultation/

underway at the point the new ANG is published, the Government's priority is to avoid causing delay or unnecessary rework. Therefore, where an ACP is already advanced, we would not anticipate sponsors reverting or needing to restart work from an earlier stage under the CAA's proposed revised airspace change process (proposed revised CAP 1616).

In practice, this would mean any existing ACPs that has completed the Stage 2 gateway under the CAA's CAP1616 process (or equivalent in any successor process) should continue applying the guidance set out in ANG 2017. Otherwise ACPs should apply the ANG 2026. Any ACP being sponsored by the UKADS should apply the ANG 2026.

Introduction Questions

Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out in paragraphs above from the consultation document about how this guidance might apply to airspace change proposals (ACPs) that are already underway?

What, if any, other issues in relation to the migration to the new process do you think we should consider?

Policy Proposals

Strategic Prioritisation

The Government recognises the aviation industry as a key contributor to economic growth. Equally, the Government is committed to ensuring the airspace sector grows sustainably and the environmental impact of aviation is mitigated as much as is practicable, in line with Government and international targets. The Government also recognises that there can be times when environmental objectives can be in competition. For example, a flightpath following a straight line can be the most efficient in terms of reducing the amount of carbon emitted by an individual aircraft. This may mean that the aircraft flies over more people, causing them more noise, some of whom could be avoided by adopting a slightly longer flightpath. The ANG has always recognised that sometimes trade-offs are necessary to achieve the best outcome overall, and the proposed revised ANG seeks to give clear Government direction on how such trade-off should be made and how this should be achieved.

The main constraint on the volume of air traffic using UK airports is the operational or infrastructure capacity of airports. A number of UK airports have sought or are expected to seek permission to expand through the planning system.

The planning system provides the approval for the airport to expand (be it an additional terminal building, or runway) and may set operational limitations such as operating times, aircraft movements or passenger numbers.

One of the roles of airspace modernisation is to safely enable the capacity permitted by decisions made as part of the planning system. ACPs are not the means for seeking permission to operate additional flights. The airspace change process is the process for proposing changes to the design of the airspace structure to enable flights to operate within the planning parameters.

The Government has announced plans to change the way that airspace changes will be developed and delivered in the UK. This includes the plan to create a UKADS proposed to be provided by NATS (En Route) PLC (NERL) as announced in June 2025. The UKADS will be responsible for designing a block of UK airspace covering an area where the airspace is managed by more than one airport. The UKADS will sponsor and propose this airspace design as an airspace change proposal to the CAA. In the London TMA region

this would include any change to airspace design required should planning permission be granted for a third runway at Heathrow.

The Government has asked that regulators identify and undertake measures to support economic growth. As the regulator for civil aviation, the CAA identified and committed to several measures to support airspace modernisation [8]including:

- Implementation of the UKADS.
- Reforming the airspace change process, including consulting on changes to CAP1616.
- Enabling additional drone trials to support future policy development.

As part of the overarching framework for UK airspace, the AND and ANG should support the Government's ambition for economic growth. One way that this can be achieved is through the clarity of priorities for the CAA and industry in how the airspace design should balance capacity (or network efficiency), noise impacts, and carbon emissions (or flight efficiency) in the airspace design process. We are consulting on introducing prioritisation to provide that clarity referred to from here on as the 'Airspace Design Priorities'.

Current Policy – Altitude Based Priorities

In 2014, the Department first introduced 'Altitude Based Priorities' which was designed to set the altitude below which the impacts of noise, and above which the impacts of carbon emissions, are to be prioritised in airspace design (and reflected in the process to amend airspace design). In the ANG 2017, the Government set revised Altitude Based Priorities. These Altitude Based Priorities set the priorities for UK airspace, to inform how to best design and implement changes to airspace design to meet government aviation ambitions between two environmental impacts of aviation. The priorities are intended solely to inform those responsible for considering and deciding permanent changes to the UK's airspace design. They were designed to ensure that potential noise impacts were prioritised in airspace change decisions up to 7,000 feet above sea level, in line with Government's overall policy on aviation noise, and carbon:

- From the ground to below 4,000 feet, the Government's environmental priority is to limit and, where possible, reduce the total adverse effects of noise on people.
- At or above 4,000 feet to below 7,000 feet, the environmental priority should continue to be minimising the impact of aviation noise, unless the CAA is satisfied that the evidence presented by the change sponsor demonstrates this would disproportionately increase CO2 emissions. The current guidance gives the CAA, as the UK regulator the power to make this judgement.
- In the airspace at or above 7,000 feet, the CAA should prioritise the reduction of aircraft CO2 emissions and the minimising of noise is no longer the priority.

Feedback on current Altitude Based Priorities

[8] CAA commitment to PM request on regulatory reform

Feedback from various stakeholders, including through the 2024 UKADS consultation, stated that the current approach caused confusion and, because of the potential number of different flightpath options that could exist above 4,000 feet, risked being unworkable for some areas. This feedback indicated the need for a set of clear priorities for airspace design, including how noise, carbon and flight efficiency are to be balanced.

Concerns have been raised that the current altitude-based priorities can be complex and require significant time and cost without creating any significant benefit, generating and testing options that are not necessarily viable. Around most airports, flightpaths are relatively fixed up to 4,000ft because one end is anchored to the runway, and this is reflected in standard instrument procedures. There are long and well established process to allow aircraft to be vectored off the standard instrument departure procedures at 4,000ft (or sometimes 3,000ft), to enable a more expeditious flow of traffic. Above 4,000ft, there are theoretically many more options that could be designed in terms of climb and horizontal and vertical alignment, but the ambiguity and lack of specific guidance on how best to prioritise the airspace design between 4,000ft and 7,000ft has often led to airspace designers developing multiple options with little guidance on how to choose between them. This could drive sponsors to develop and model the impact of multiple flight path options to comply with the guidance even if those paths are not ultimately operable. In particular, in and around the London region, the density of flight paths can mean that while in theory an airport might have multiple options for a route, when considered alongside other airports' flight paths the number of viable options can be much smaller.

The current guidance also does not guide the CAA on how to balance noise and carbon emission impacts against other Government priorities (or the other CAA statutory duties in the Transport Act). Additionally, the trade-off between 4,000 feet and 7,000 feet is challenging to assess as the Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) [9]monetises both noise and carbon impacts.

Proposed Policy - Airspace Design Priorities

The Government therefore wants to improve the guidance to remove ambiguity and provide clarity on what airspace design should seek to achieve. It should be noted that in all circumstances, safety is and will remain the top priority.

After safety, the priority would be to design airspace structures which maximise the use of airspace capacity, which is largely set by physical infrastructure on the ground (e.g. runways). As outlined above, airspace design is not the mechanism for determining the number of flights, that will come through processes such as the Planning system- airspace design is about enabling the capacity created through these processes by utilising airspace as efficiently as possible.

We propose simplifying the criteria from three to two categories, with noise prioritised up to 4,000ft and flight efficiency (to reduce carbon emissions) prioritised above that altitude. The aim would be to reduce carbon on a per flight basis. It should also be noted that the implications of this proposed policy might be different in different parts of the country. For example, given the congestion of the airspace in the London TMA region, in practice, there are limited options for sponsors to specifically design flight paths to reduce noise or the population overflown because almost everyone in London is under aircraft flying at 7,000ft

[9] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/transport-analysis-guidance-tag

or below. This is not to say that changes to airspace cannot deliver net improvements to people affected by noise, but in some areas these are more likely to be as a result of faster climbs or descents than moving the lateral location of the flight path. Outside London in less congested airspace, there are likely to be more flight path options so this proposed change of Government policy may have a greater possibility to reduce carbon emissions per flight.

These Airspace Design Priorities are described in more detail below under 'Proposal'.

We would welcome evidence from consultees on the benefits and impacts of implementing the changes proposed below, or alternatively, to inform decisions on what approach should be adopted, as set out in questions 3-6 below and the accompanying questions in the Options Assessment.

Proposal

The Government proposes replacing Altitude-Based-Priorities with a new system called Airspace Design Priorities as follows:

The design of airspace must safely enable the capacity permitted by the planning decisions applicable to each UK airport, so that:

- Where the relevant planning decision places a cap on the number of aircraft movements, the airspace design enable that number of aircraft movements to the extent it is safe to do so.

- Where the relevant planning decision places no cap on the number of aircraft movement, the airspace design must enable the safe maximum number of movements, having regard to the demand for air transport, from the runway.

- Where a planning decision is outstanding, the CAA may use its judgement to allow an airspace design to assume the maximum level of capacity of the planning application.

- Consequently, the CAA should perform its air navigation functions, in particular those concerning decisions which alter airspace design (including the associated processes and procedures), by prioritising outcomes in the following order:

1. First, ensure safety and viability (operational flyability) of the design.

2. Within the possibilities remaining after prioritising 1, enable aviation activity permitted by planning decisions.

3. Within the possibilities remaining after prioritising 1 and 2, minimise change to the areas where aircraft noise is currently experienced from aircraft below 4,000 ft.

4. Within the possibilities after prioritising 1, 2 and 3, minimise adverse noise impacts of aircraft below 4,000 ft.

5. Within the possibilities remaining after prioritising 1, 2, 3 and 4, prioritise flight efficiency where aircraft are at 4,000 ft and above.

Strategic Prioritisation Questions

Do you agree with the proposal to set out Airspace Design Priorities in order to give clarity on the trade-off and respective prioritisation of network efficiency (capacity) / flight efficiency (minimising carbon impacts) and minimising noise impacts?

Do you agree that minimising noise impacts should be prioritised below 4,000ft and efficiency (minimising carbon on a per flight basis) should be prioritised at 4,000ft and above?

Do you think the altitude where these priorities changes should be 4,000ft or another altitude above 4,000ft? If you believe that the altitude at which minimising carbon emissions is prioritised should be set at a different altitude, what do you think it should be? Please explain your answer and provide any supporting evidence.

What, if any, other factors do you think should be considered as part of the strategic priorities and why?

Environmental

Introduction

This section relates to how airspace change sponsors consider guidance on environmental objectives when developing their ACPs.

Aviation is responsible for around 3% of global carbon emissions. The Government is committed to delivering greener transport and supporting its missions to kickstart economic growth and to make Britain a clean energy superpower. We are committed to meeting our climate obligations and will set out detail on plans for meeting legislated carbon budgets later this year, including for aviation.

The Government set out its environmental priorities in the ANG, which explains how these priorities sit against other aims and objectives of Government policy for aviation, including how airports operational needs must be met. The Government priority is to maintain a high standard of safety and this is reflected in the CAA's statutory duties in the Transport Act 2000. Subject to that overriding priority the Government expects the CAA to balance other statutory factors when carrying out its air navigation functions in an environmentally sustainable manner by taking account of statutory guidance issued under s.70(2)(d) of the Transport Act 2000.

The guidance aims to ensure airspace change sponsors and designers have a clear, detailed understanding of the scope of environmental matters that individual airspace change proposals must address.

Environmental Assessments Requirements

The airspace change process is subject to environmental assessments to determine the effect of the change proposal on overflown areas. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) sit under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

The HRA is a legal process designed to protect European sites of ecological importance in the UK from potentially harmful development or activities. The screening stage of the HRA determines if a plan or project is likely to have significant effect on a European site, and if it is determined to do so the competent authority is required to do an appropriate assessment.

A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is a statutory process used to evaluate the likely significant environmental effects of certain plans and programmes before they are adopted. It ensures that environmental considerations are integrated early in the decision-making process.

Current Process

To meet these legal obligations the CAA requires an HRA for all ACPs before a decision to approve the ACP can be made by the CAA. Additionally, some ACPs are currently part of clusters of ACPs where each cluster requires an overarching masterplan. Each masterplan currently requires an HRA under the HRA Regulations and requires an SEA under the SEA Regulations because the masterplan is considered a "plan or programme".

Consequently, as part of its CAP 1616 process the CAA currently requires individual sponsors to provide an explicit consideration of biodiversity, including an HRA.

The Government's guidance[10] states that sponsors should manage environmental assessments in a proportionate way to capture any environmental impacts and avoid duplication with other processes. This approach should support consistency across the airspace change and planning process and reduce unnecessary work.

It should be noted that the impact of aviation activity on habitats, biodiversity, national parks and sites of special scientific interest should mainly be determined by the planning decisions that enable the airport to be built, and the conditions placed on their operations.

The proposal

The Government does not intend to weaken the protections given to our rarest and most vulnerable sites and species. There have however been some concerns expressed that undertaking screening assessments is unduly burdensome and duplicates work required for other processes.

The Government is seeking evidence on the impacts to airspace change sponsors of undertaking environmental assessments in relation to airspace changes that are specifically required by non-aviation legislation (e.g. HRA). In particular, the Government would welcome views on the costs and benefits of these processes, their complexity, whether additional guidance in relation to ACPs might be helpful, and whether such guidance should be included in the ANG. The feedback from this consultation will help the Government to determine if any additional guidance would be beneficial and, if necessary, inform further work.

Environmental Assessment Requirement Questions

[10] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/habitats-regulations-assessments-protecting-a-european-site

Have you undertaken a specific environmental assessment, in relation to an airspace change, that was required by non-aviation specific legislation in relation to an airspace change? If yes, please state what assessment.

What was your experience of the specific environmental assessment?

What, if anything, were the costs and benefits of doing the specific environmental assessment?

In carrying out the specific environmental assessment was sufficient guidance available?

Overall was the guidance helpful or not? Please explain why.

Would, in your view, further guidance in relation to how such requirements might be applied to airspace change be helpful?

In your view what content should the further guidance include?

Noise Preferential Routes

In the UK, there are different mechanisms for managing noise at airports. Most airports have historically been responsible for their own noise controls, either on a voluntarily basis or more often as conditions attached to a planning permission.

For airports in England and Wales, the Secretary of State may set noise controls for the purposes of avoiding, limiting or mitigating the impacts of noise; Scottish and Northern Ireland Ministers are able to do so in relation to airports in their respective territories. The Government has designated Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted for noise control purposes since 1971, under s.80 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982: the Secretary of State's powers regarding noise control at these airports are set out in sections 78-79 of that Act. Controls set at the designated airports are similar to those in place at many other airports: they include Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs). Over the years a number of other airports have established NPRs. Some of these were set voluntarily by the airport, whilst others were created following local planning (Section 106) agreements with local authorities, as has been undertaken, for example, at Luton and Manchester airports.

NPRs are noise controls set through fixed flight paths designed to minimise noise over populated or noise sensitive areas and give some certainty about where aircraft can be expected to be heard. They determine the location of departure routes at the three designated airports. NPRs were designed at a time when navigation was less precise, by plotting lines on maps, based around established ground infrastructure, which aircraft should try to follow after taking off and in most cases up to 4,000 feet.

To help assess track-keeping performance of the airport, there is a 1.5km swathe at each side of the NPR at each designated airport, creating a 3km-wide corridor. This corridor means local communities have assurance on where departing aircraft should be expected to be seen or heard, and that there is a mechanism to determine those who do not comply and fly off track from the 1.5km swathe. Airports monitor track-keeping against their routes, and publish data for transparency.

NPRs were designed intended to minimise noise for local communities, but the way that they were designed and changes to the technology of aircraft means that some NPRs are difficult to adhere to and are arguably no longer performing the function they were created for, meaning that they do not always have the desired effect of limiting where noise might be expected. The worst example is the Heathrow “Compton” NPR, which has a 180 degree turn and where fewer than 50% of aircraft are able to keep within the NPR swathe. Most other NPRs at the designated airports have a track keeping performance of c95-99%.

In addition, since the NPRs were put in place, some communities have grown significantly over the years, so the specific location of some NPRs may no longer meet the objectives they were designed for. Furthermore, improved track-keeping can mean that a 1.5km swathe is no longer necessary in all cases and could be narrowed.

Currently, the ownership and enforcement of NPRs at the designated airports sits with the Government, due to the Secretary of State’s powers under the Civil Aviation Act 1982 noted above. The Government believes that tools for ongoing noise management should take into account both technological advances and local circumstances, whilst ensuring that aircraft can make best use of the airspace. The Government wants to ensure that the Government-managed NPRs do not act as a barrier to the redesign of airspace where improvements can be made to departure routes which reflect modern navigational capabilities and can deliver better noise outcomes. As above, NPRs can be set by Government, on a voluntary basis by airports and by local planning conditions under Section 106 (of the Town and Country Panning Act). Therefore, de-notifying the NPRs at the three designated airports will avoid duplication with the airspace change process (which determine flight procedures), whilst we consider existing compliance and transparency deliverables can be met by our proposal below.

The proposal

We are proposing to modernise the mechanism for transparency and compliance with departure routes at the three designated airports. The Government is seeking to strengthen the CAA’s ability to direct airports to make this information available to the public in a transparent and timely way.

We propose to direct the CAA to guide airports to publish track-keeping information.

The existing NPRs at the three designated airports would be de-notified. De-notification will not have any impact on local residents as any change would still be required to go through the CAA’s airspace change process.

NPRs in place on a non-statutory voluntary basis, or as a result of a Section 106 agreement related to a planning application, would not be affected by this proposal.

Noise Preferential Routes Questions

Do you think that NPRs are an effective measure of noise control, taking into account the modern navigational capacities of aircraft? If not please explain why.

Are you currently affected by an NPR at a designated airport? If so, does it have a positive or negative effect?

What comments, if any, do you have about the effectiveness of the existing NPR?

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to de-notify the NPRs? Please explain your reasoning for your response.

Do you agree or disagree that airports should be required to publish track-keeping information? Please explain your reasoning for your response and if you feel there should be additional conditions.

New Users

Introduction

The design, use and implementation of UK airspace has primarily been based upon the use of conventional fixed wing aircraft and helicopters. Whilst conventional aircraft such as airlines, private jets, light aircraft and helicopters occupy most of UK airspace, recent advances in technology and innovative new aircraft types mean that the airspace design processes must be prepared for the introduction and integration of new users. Innovative aircraft types such as drones and advanced air mobility, known also as Electric Vertical Take Off and Landing (eVTOL) could generate up to £5.7 billion in annual revenue in 2050 in the highest growth scenario , whilst contributing to significant efficiency savings across healthcare and other public services. Innovative new aircraft types can play a pivotal role in improving public services through use in law enforcement activities, deliveries of healthcare supplies, and logistics of commercial goods and services.

To realise these benefits, the Government's ambition is that all airspace users are fully integrated, by sharing the skies in a safe, coordinated and efficient manner, as set out in the Airspace Modernisation Strategy and the UK's Future of Flight programme policy objectives. The policies outlined below are designed to help support this transition and, in particular, trial operations which can generate evidence to inform longer term policy development and decisions.

Airspace trials and temporary changes to structures

An airspace trial can play a vital role in supporting the development and integration of new airspace users into UK airspace through testing of innovative airspace design, technology or air traffic control operational procedures. One purpose of trials is to collect data to support CAA and Government policy making to support the development of appropriate regulatory frameworks. This will include helping inform statutory guidance for the CAA on the impact of noise and visual intrusion from drone activity should have on future airspace change decisions.

The introduction of new aircraft systems and their integration into UK airspace is extremely challenging and complex, and the scale of technical change not experienced in recent years. Whilst the CAA has the discretion to extend trials from 6 months to 3 years by exception, it is becoming more common for trials to require the full 3 years to gather all the necessary data and evidence and meet the objectives of the trial. Curtailing activity after 6 months creates an administrative burden for the CAA and operator through processing multiple ACPs, and risks stifling research and development and potentially the timely introduction of new aircraft systems and technologies.

Similarly, temporary airspace changes are currently routinely permitted for up to 90 days. This limit currently provides little flexibility for operators in the event of weather delays, and increases the need for regulatory compliance and therefore cost.

The proposal

We propose providing greater clarity in the AND on the permitted length of airspace trials and temporary structures. The Directions would explicitly state that the CAA has the discretion to permit airspace trials routinely for a period of up to 3 years, and permit temporary changes to airspace structures for up to 180 days.

This would reduce the cost to the operator and CAA, and the uncertainty of sponsors who would otherwise face having to undergo additional airspace change proposals, leading to additional delays and costs. Less pressure would also be placed upon the CAA to review and approve multiple ACPs during a set time period, increasing flexibility, productivity and avoiding sponsors needing to apply for permanent airspace changes, which can have a long-term impact on other airspace users such as General Aviation including emergency services. Noise complaints during a trial or temporary airspace change should be monitored by the sponsor and reported to the CAA.

Airspace Trials and Temporary Changes to Structures Questions

Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to extend the permitted duration of airspace trials to 3 years? If you disagree, please explain why.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to extend the permitted duration of temporary changes to airspace structures for up to 180 days? If you disagree, please explain why.

In your view what other factors, if any, should be considered when deciding on extending the permitted durations of routine airspace trials and temporary structures?

Environmental assessments for UAS BVLOS airspace users.

The current ANG, which underpins the CAA's Airspace Change Process (CAP1616), was last updated in 2017. Its guidance for the application of environmental assessments was largely based upon conventional aircraft, such as commercial airliners, light aircraft and helicopters, where sufficient data and evidence exists to assess the impact of potential airspace changes. As a result, current policy and the application of environmental assessments are not applicable for new users including drones, advanced air mobility and spaceflight. The effect is that the CAA and operators are required to undertake comprehensive environmental assessments based upon guidance and policy which is not applicable for UAS aircraft types. This can come at significant cost and time is being spent undertaking assessments which are not appropriate, and because of a lack of relevant data, can provide spurious results and risk delaying the implementation of the very operations and trials that would help generate data for future policy development.

The Proposal

The Government's objective is to support trial operations which can help build the evidence base to support the delivery and assessment of long-term operations of new technologies. We propose guiding the CAA that it is not required to take into account the

impacts on the environment when considering airspace change proposals for an airspace trial which has been submitted for the purpose of enabling UAS flights to support policy development and learning or a temporary airspace change to facilitate Government policy to enable new users in order to promote economic growth . This also includes any request for a temporary airspace change for the same purpose. Noise complaints during such a trial or temporary airspace change should be required to be monitored by the sponsor, and reported to the CAA. Noise attitude surveys should be undertaken as a condition of sufficient trials to build an evidence base to enable future Government policy to be developed to support this activity whilst taking into account its impacts on all stakeholders.

Environmental Assessments for UAS BVLOS Airspace Users Question

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to give the CAA to flexibility to disregard the impacts on the environment when considering airspace change proposals for an airspace trial. This would only apply in respect of ACPs submitted for the purposes of enabling UAS flights to support policy development for UAS BVLOS trials? If you disagree, please explain why.

Engagement and Decision Making in the Airspace Design Process

Introduction

This section relates to the call-in process for airspace changes, and guidance on expectations for how airspace change sponsors should engage and consult with stakeholders on proposed changes to airspace which may affect them.

The Government's view is that most airspace change decisions are best taken by the CAA as the independent regulator due to their complex and technical nature. However, there may still be some occasions where the decision should ultimately be taken by the Secretary of State.

The Government also believes that consultation by a sponsor with those affected by an airspace change remains essential. Considerable consultation is currently carried out as part of airspace change processes, but there has been feedback that sometimes this causes confusion - particularly where people are affected by airspace changes being developed by multiple sponsors. This consultation should be undertaken to inform airspace design, and before final choices on that design are made by the sponsor.

Call-In – current policy

The call-in process was introduced to provide Ministerial oversight and accountability of CAA decisions with regards to changes to airspace. As outlined within the current AND (2023), any individual can request the Secretary of State to call in a decision on an airspace change where it meets one or more of the following conditions:

- It is of strategic national importance.
- It could have a significant positive or negative impact on the economic growth of the UK.

- It could both lead to a change in noise distribution, resulting in a net increase of 10,000 or more people exposed to levels of at least 54 dB LAeq 16h and have an identified adverse impact on health and quality of life.

The Government is considering whether this process still has value and whether changes might make it function better.

The proposal

The Government's view is that it is important that the CAA, as the UK's aviation regulator, is empowered to, and should be afforded the autonomy to, make these decisions in most cases.

Where these decisions are strategically important, it is right that the Secretary of State has the option to review and intervene where necessary, and we propose to retain the ability to call in such ACPs.

Such an intervention should be balanced and proportionate and should not risk undermining the CAA decision making process. The criteria for what kinds of airspace change can be called in should be clearly defined, and apply only to the most strategically important changes. The Government believes that consideration of whether to call in an ACP should be undertaken as quickly as possible and subject to clear time frames. A faster and clearer process should help minimise programme delays, avoid additional costs for sponsors, and reduce uncertainty for local communities.

As such, the Government proposes to:

- Retain the call-in process for ACPs.
- Simplify the call-in criteria so that only ACPs of strategic national importance are eligible for call in.
- Implement a time limit of 3 months, extendable by a further 3 months if necessary, for the Secretary of State to decide whether to call in an ACP.
- For the Secretary of State to make a final decision within 3 months of the date the CAA has provided its opinion on the proposal, or as soon as practical thereafter.
- Define 'strategically important' and update the current call-in guidance for CAA.

Where the Secretary of State does decide to call in an ACP, they would have the option to approve the proposal, decline the proposal or approve the proposal with conditions or modifications.

Call-In Process Questions

Conceptually do you agree or disagree that the Secretary of State should retain the ability to 'call in' an airspace change? If you disagree, please explain why.

Do you agree or disagree with the criteria proposed for the Secretary of State to call in an airspace change?

What, if anything, do you think should be different in the criteria including why?

Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to create time limits in relation to requests to call in an airspace change? If you disagree, please explain why.

Other options considered

In addition to the proposal above, the Government has considered the following options:

- Do nothing- leave the call in process as it is today.
- Remove the call in option completely.

Airspace Design Options – current policy

Airspace can be designed to support either single or multiple routes. From a noise perspective, a single route typically results in fewer people being affected overall. However, this concentration may lead to higher noise exposure for those directly under the flight path, increasing the potential for negative impacts. Conversely, dispersing aircraft across multiple routes can reduce peak noise levels but may affect a larger number of residents, so there are costs and benefits to both approaches.

The ANG 2017 generally encourages airspace design that concentrates aircraft tracks in single routes, rather than dispersing them over multiple routes. However, the decision to design airspace with either single or multiple flight routes should be guided by the operational characteristics of airports and individual flight patterns. The impacts of airspace changes can differ significantly from one location to another based on local characteristics of the area.

Proposed Policy

Designs may include single or multiple routes. Each has both costs and benefits for affected parties and stakeholders. Some stakeholders prefer the impact of flights from airports to be distributed over a wider area. Advancements in technology such as Performance Based Navigation mean that aircraft can fly more accurately and predictably, both laterally and vertically. Multiple routes can provide operational flexibility, and to some extent spread the impact between communities. The Government has taken these considerations into account when developing the Airspace Design Priorities above.

The choice between single and multiple flight routes should be made on a case-specific basis guided by local conditions and the best design option for the operational needs of the airport. The CAA must require that any airspace design developed and proposed by a sponsor aligns with the Airspace Design Priorities in the ANG. Noting that the opportunity for multiple routes will vary (depending on the circumstances of each volume of airspace, such as the relative congestion of the surrounding airspace, the proximity of other airports and the operational needs of the airport), it is for airspace change sponsors to consider whether single or multiple routes best achieve those Airspace Design Priorities.

This would not affect the ability of airports to carry out other measures to manage the impacts of their operations, such as the alternation of runways to create respite.

The Proposal

The Government proposes to give airspace change sponsors flexibility over the approach they choose to designing routes that reflect the proposed Airspace Design Priorities and planning requirements, in the context of their local circumstances. Any route design must align with the Government's policy priorities for airspace. Any design proposals concerning single or multiple routes should be explained clearly and transparently by the sponsor in their proposal. Those affected by an airspace change would continue to be consulted on that change before final decisions are made.

The Government also intends to better define the CAA's role in requiring sponsors to explaining their choice of single or multiple routes in their designs and how these deliver the Airspace Design Priorities.

Airspace Design Question

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to provide greater flexibility to the CAA and airspace change sponsors on how to best consider locally appropriate flight designs which offer flexibility and respite? Please explain your reasoning for your response.

Consultation Process and use of 3rd Parties

Current guidance for sponsors in the ANG 2017 provides flexibility to scale engagement and consultation in relation to local circumstances in the airspace change process. Sponsors can propose the methods they consider the most effective method suitable for those potentially affected by an airspace change.

The ANG 2017 specifies consultation should include local authorities, other organisations and individuals who may represent the interests of people living in the neighbourhood of the aerodrome who are likely to be affected by the proposed change below 7,000 feet.

At stages 2-3 of the current CAP1616, CAA asks change sponsors to engage with representatives, including local authorities and groups instead of individuals. At the consultation stage, change sponsors consult directly with individuals alongside other impacted stakeholders. CAP1616 states that the change sponsor must produce a consultation strategy that considers whether individual properties need to be contacted, or that sets out other reasonable methods of reaching communities. Sponsors are asked to consider alternative methods such as using local media, social media, local authority communications or advertising. CAP1616 and the guidance is not prescriptive about using specific conduits to carry out engagement.

The Government is considering whether there would be benefit in the ANG being updated to include specific reference to consultation with individuals and/or their representatives via local authorities. Local authorities may be better positioned to help raise awareness of the consultation and help manage local input and reflect specific local circumstances. The aim

would be that those potentially affected by a change could understand what is in/out of scope of the consultation, and have the opportunity to feed in their views.

The Proposal

As such, the Government is considering whether bodies such as local authorities or industry bodies could have a specific role as a conduit in the consultation process.

The Government proposes that the ANG 2026 should offer clearer guidance to promote a balanced and proportionate approach to consultation to aid sponsors in carrying out necessary engagement with stakeholders.

Consultation Process and use of 3rd Parties Questions

What, if any, are your views on the proposal to allow the use organisations, such as local authorities, as a conduit for the consultation process on behalf of an airspace change sponsor?

Do you agree or disagree with our proposed guidance on engaging and consulting with local communities and others affected by a potential airspace change? Please explain your reasoning for your response and if you feel there should be additional conditions.

Further opportunities for change

As outlined within the introduction, updating the AND and ANG affords a significant opportunity to improve how Airspace Modernisation activity is delivered for the wider benefit of the UK economy, whilst doing so in a sustainable manner.

The DfT has overall responsibility for setting the strategic direction and policy for UK airspace and it is important that we continue to understand how these policies are delivered in the operational environment. As such it is important that we fairly consider any feedback on these policies.

In particular, the Government would welcome views on areas where processes or policies could be simplified or streamlined with the aim of delivering airspace changes faster.

Further opportunities for change Questions

What, if any, other issues do you think we should consider for the revised ANG?

What, if any, evidence, data or analysis can you provide that addresses the questions raised in the accompanying Options Assessment (OA)

What, if any, other general comments do you wish to share?

Glossary

AAM – Advanced Air Mobility

A new concept of sustainable air transportation designed to transport people and goods (also known as eVTOL and urban air mobility where intended for use in built-up areas).

ACP – Airspace Change Proposal

A proposal (usually from an airport or air navigation service provider and in the future the UK Airspace Design Service) to change the design of UK airspace.

Airspace Design

The structures of airspace and flight procedures within it.

Airspace Design Priorities

The Airspace Design Priorities, sets out the Government's priorities for airspace redesign, explaining how environmental objectives sit alongside other aims and objectives of Government policy for aviation.

Airspace Management

A planning function with the primary objective of maximising the utilisation of available airspace.

Airspace Users

All persons or organisations who make use of the United Kingdom’s airspace to conduct or support an aerial activity, whether by operating within it, managing its use, or influencing its accessibility.

AMS – Airspace Modernisation Strategy

The UK CAA's coordinated strategy and plan for the use of UK airspace up to 2040, including modernisation. It is based on four strategic objectives: Safety, Integration, Simplification and Environment.

AMSL – Above Mean Sea Level

A unit of measurement (usually in feet) for elevation or altitude, indicating the vertical distance of a location relative to a historical average of the ocean's surface.

AND – Air Navigation Directions

The Civil Aviation Authority (Air Navigation) Directions 2023. In these Directions the Secretary of State gives the UK CAA its functions in relation to air navigation.

ANG – Air Navigation Guidance

The Air Navigation Guidance 2017 provides guidance to the CAA on its environmental objectives when carrying out its air navigation functions.

ANSP – Air Navigation Service Provider

An organisation which operates the technical system, infrastructure, procedures and rules of an air navigation service system, which may include air traffic control.

ATC – Air Traffic Control

The service provided by controllers to prevent collisions between aircraft and to expedite and maintain an orderly flow of air traffic.

ATS – Air Traffic Services

The various flight information services, alerting services, air traffic advisory services and ATC services (area, approach and aerodrome control services).

BVLOS – Beyond Visual Line of Sight

Beyond Visual Line of Sight refers to an unmanned aerial system (UAS) operating beyond the sightline of its operator.

CAA – Civil Aviation Authority

The statutory body which oversees and regulates all aspects of civil aviation in the United Kingdom.

CAP 1616 – Airspace Change Process

The staged process which an airspace change sponsor follows to submit a proposed change in airspace design to the UK CAA for a decision.

CAT – Commercial Air Transport

Any aircraft operation involving the transport of passengers, cargo or mail for remuneration or hire.

Controlled Airspace

Airspace of defined dimensions within which air traffic control service is provided in accordance with the airspace classification.

dB – Decibel of Noise

A decibel is a logarithmic unit describing sound level or changes of sound level.

DCO – Development Consent Order

A Development Consent Order is the formal permission required to build a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project in the UK, such as large energy or transport developments.

DfT – Department for Transport

The Government department that leads on UK aviation, and the author of the AND and ANG.

En Route

That part of the flight from the end of the take-off and initial climb phase to the commencement of the approach and landing phase.

eVTOL – Electric Vertical Take-Off and Landing

Also known as advanced air mobility or aerial taxis. Still in development, eVTOL aircraft are powered by electricity and take off and land vertically, allowing more efficient and sustainable ways to travel, particularly in an urban environment.

FIRs – Flight Information Regions

UK airspace consists of three Flight Information Regions: the London FIR for England and Wales, the Scottish FIR for Scotland and Northern Ireland, and the Shanwick Oceanic FIR over the North Atlantic.

GA – General Aviation

All civil aircraft, which encompasses a wide range of aviation activity from paragliders, microlights, gliders and balloons to corporate business jets, including aerial survey, flying training and all sport and leisure flying.

Holding Stacks

A fixed circling pattern in which aircraft fly whilst they wait to land. When airports are busy, there can be a build-up of aeroplanes waiting to land.

HRA – Habitats Regulations Assessment

A Habitats Regulations Assessment is the assessment required by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to test whether a plan or project proposal could significantly harm the designated features of a European site (such as a Special Area of Conservation).

ICAO – International Civil Aviation Organisation

The international aviation body established by the 1944 Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation.

LAeq

LAeq represents the average noise level over a specified time period.

MoD – Ministry of Defence

The Ministry of Defence protects the security, independence and interests of the UK at home and abroad. Its aim is to ensure that the armed forces have the training, equipment and support necessary for their work, and that they keep within budget.

NATS Holdings Ltd

The largest air navigation service provider in the UK, formerly National Air Traffic Services. They provide en route services under licence from the CAA, and commercial air traffic services at 14 UK airports.

Navigation Services

The facilities and services that provide aircraft with positioning and timing information.

NERL – NATS (En Route) PLC

Subsidiary of NATS Holdings Ltd and the sole provider of air traffic control services for aircraft flying en route in UK airspace.

Noise Contours

These are lines or circles on a map showing where equal levels of noise are experienced.

Noise Respite

The principle of noise respite is to provide planned and defined periods of perceptible noise relief to people living directly under a flight path.

NPRs – Noise Preferential Routes

NPRs set the overall framework within which the flightpaths at a number of airports, including Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted, were originally designed to mitigate noise.

PBN – Performance Based Navigation

A concept developed by ICAO that moves aviation away from the traditional use of aircraft navigating by ground-based beacons to a system more reliant on airborne technologies, utilising area navigation and global navigation satellite systems.

PPR – Planned and Permanent Redistribution

Air traffic control operational procedure changes that give rise to a planned and permanent redistribution of air traffic.

Relief

This is when multiple routes are designed and operated far enough apart to offer a perceptible reduction in noise for communities.

Route Network

The network of specified routes for channelling the flow of general air traffic as necessary for the provision of ATC services.

Routing

The chosen itinerary to be followed by an aircraft during its operation.

SEA – Strategic Environmental Assessment

A Strategic Environmental Assessment is a systematic process set out in the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, which must be carried out during the preparation of local plans and spatial development strategies.

SofS/SoS – Secretary of State

The Secretary of State for Transport oversees the policies and priorities to deliver the Government's transport agenda.

Sponsor

An organisation that proposes, or sponsors, a change to the airspace design in accordance with the UK CAA’s CAP 1616 airspace change process.

SIDs – Standard Instrument Departure routes

These are the established departure routes which are published in the AIP and which should be flown by aircraft when departing airports which have SIDs.

STARs – Standard Terminal Arrival Routes

These are the established arrival routes for aircraft which are published in the AIP. They end at holding stacks.

Swathe

A specific area and volume of airspace in which controllers are vectoring aircraft or, as in the case of NPRs, in which track keeping of aircraft is being monitored.

TAG – Transport Appraisal Guidance

This is the structured process for evaluating potential transport interventions by assessing their costs, benefits, and wider impacts.

TMA – Terminal Manoeuvring Area

A control area normally established at the confluence of ATS routes in the vicinity of one or more major aerodromes.

Transport Act 2000

The legislative framework created to establish the framework for modernising and integrating transport systems, introducing measures such as local transport plans and strategies.

UAS – Unmanned Aerial Systems

Also commonly known as a drone, an aircraft system without a pilot on board which is controlled and operated from a remote location.

UKADS – UK Airspace Design Service

A proposed single entity to propose, design and deliver a holistic and modernised UK airspace.

Vectoring

This is where an air traffic controller directs the pilot of an aircraft to fly a specific compass heading which can be off the normal airspace route structure.

What will happen next

A summary of responses, including the next steps, will be published within three months of the consultation closing on https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/airspace-modernisation. Paper copies will be available on request.

If you have questions about this consultation, please contact: airspacemodernisation@dft.gov.uk

Further background information can be found at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/airspace-modernisation

Annex A: Full list of consultation questions

Question 1

Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out in paragraphs above from the consultation document about how this guidance might apply to airspace change proposals (ACPs) that are already underway?

Question 2

What, if any, other issues in relation to the migration to the new process do you think we should consider?

Question 3

Do you agree with the proposal to set out Airspace Design Priorities in order to give clarity on the trade-off and respective prioritisation of network efficiency (capacity) / flight efficiency (minimising carbon impacts) and minimising noise impacts?

Question 4

Do you agree that minimising noise impacts should be prioritised below 4,000ft and efficiency (minimising carbon on a per flight basis) should be prioritised at 4,000ft and above?

Question 5

Do you think the altitude where these priorities changes should be 4,000ft or another altitude above 4,000ft? If you believe that the altitude at which minimising carbon emissions is prioritised should be set at a different altitude, what do you think it should be? Please explain your answer and provide any supporting evidence.

Question 6

What, if any, other factors do you think should be considered as part of the strategic priorities and why?

Question 7

Have you undertaken a specific environmental assessment, in relation to an airspace change, that was required by non-aviation specific legislation in relation to an airspace change? If yes, please state what assessment.

Question 8

What was your experience of the specific environmental assessment?

Question 9

What, if anything, were the costs and benefits of doing the specific environmental assessment?

Question 10

In carrying out the specific environmental assessment was sufficient guidance available?

Question 11

Overall was the guidance helpful or not? Please explain why.

Question 12

Would, in your view, further guidance in relation to how such requirements might be applied to airspace change be helpful?

Question 13

In your view what content should the further guidance include?

Question 14

Do you think that NPRs are an effective measure of noise control, taking into account the modern navigational capacities of aircraft? If not please explain why.

Question 15

Are you currently affected by an NPR at a designated airport? If so, does it have a positive or negative effect?

Question 16

What comments, if any, do you have about the effectiveness of the existing NPR?

Question 17

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to de-notify the NPRs? Please explain your reasoning for your response.

Question 18

Do you agree or disagree that airports should be required to publish track-keeping information? Please explain your reasoning for your response and if you feel there should be additional conditions.

Question 19

Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to extend the permitted duration of airspace trials to 3 years? If you disagree, please explain why.

Question 20

Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to extend the permitted duration of temporary changes to airspace structures for up to 180 days? If you disagree, please explain why.

Question 21

In your view what other factors, if any, should be considered when deciding on extending the permitted durations of routine airspace trials and temporary structures?

Question 22

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to give the CAA to flexibility to disregard the impacts on the environment when considering airspace change proposals for an airspace trial. This would only apply in respect of ACPs submitted for the purposes of enabling UAS flights to support policy development for UAS BVLOS trials? If you disagree, please explain why.

Question 23

Conceptually do you agree or disagree that the Secretary of State should retain the ability to ‘call in’ an airspace change? If you disagree, please explain why.

Question 24

Do you agree or disagree with the criteria proposed for the Secretary of State to call in an airspace change?

Question 25

What, if anything, do you think should be different in the criteria including why?

Question 26

Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to create time limits in relation to requests to call in an airspace change? If you disagree, please explain why.

Question 27

Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to provide greater flexibility to the CAA and airspace change sponsors on how to best consider locally appropriate flight designs which offer flexibility and respite? Please explain your reasoning for your response.

Question 28

What, if any, are your views on the proposal to allow the use organisations, such as local authorities, as a conduit for the consultation process on behalf of an airspace change sponsor?

Question 29

Do you agree or disagree with our proposed guidance on engaging and consulting with local communities and others affected by a potential airspace change? Please explain your reasoning for your response and if you feel there should be additional conditions.

Question 30

What, if any, other issues do you think we should consider for the revised ANG?

Question 31

What, if any, evidence, data or analysis can you provide that addresses the questions raised in the accompanying Options Assessment (OA)

Question 32

What, if any, other general comments do you wish to share?