

[Your address]

[Date]

[MP's name]

Address

Postcode]

Dear [MP's Name]

Subject: Aviation Navigation Directions and Air Navigation Guidance consultation for 2026

I am writing to you, as my MP, to ask you to write to the Aviation Minister and the Secretary of State for Transport, to object to proposed changes in the Aviation Navigation Guidance 2026.

1. Start Again

To date, the airspace change process through the Civil Aviation Authority CAP1616 consultation process at Gatwick Airport has been of poor quality. We ask that it should start again from scratch, to ensure transparency about what is proposed in the airport's desire for growth at any price to those on the ground.

2. Environmental studies

Environmental studies include noise impact, so we strongly request that you support such studies, as well as those researching the impact of light pollution on nature and those seeking sleep.

3. Noise must be a priority below 7,000ft

The proposal is to remove the importance of noise between 4,000ft and 7,000ft. Noise has a significant impact on communities (and me) at this height, so the wellbeing of communities exposed to such aviation noise should not be ignored by policy. Ignoring noise provides aviation with greater growth, allowing planes to turn away from departure noise preferential routes (NPRs) with steeper, noisier climbs, potentially over people's homes.

The Department for Transport has already advised ministers that there will be no compensation for loss of house value with airspace change. It is fundamentally wrong that government proposes to pitch the hypothetical and unquantified reduction in carbon over noise impact on communities.

Of course, saving CO2 is important, but it should not be allowed to remove residents' voices from the ramifications on them of airspace change.

4. Noise Preferential Routes on Departures must remain

For many years, Noise Preferential Routes have dictated the departure routes where planes fly. Their importance is as relevant today as when they were introduced. Their proposed removal should be stopped, as it will mean, again, more vectoring over residents from 4,000ft and above. This will increase noise for communities and affect their wellbeing.

NPRs also provide the option of dispersal within a set corridor using new technology.

5. Airspace Trials

We urge you to agree that these should only run for 6 months, and not 3 years as proposed. Residents should not be used as guineapigs, to suffer the blight of house devaluation and decline in wellbeing, all for an aviation experiment.

Overall, the Civil Aviation Authority has a vested interest in aviation, which gives it too much power. I therefore strongly ask you to object to the proposals to give the CAA more powers over airspace change, which would reduce the community voice further by seeking to engage with local authorities. These bodies often have a vested interest and lack an understanding of the ramifications of airspace change to all communities on the ground.

6. Air Quality

It should be noted that the consultation comments that emissions from aircraft above 1,000ft are unlikely to have a significant impact on local air quality. This seems not to be substantiated with evidence (ultrafine particles from landing aircraft).

If I can provide you with any more information on this matter, or further evidence on the current impact of aircraft noise and the weakening of the Civil Aviation Authority consultation process (CAP1616), please do let me know, or contact CAGNE at cagnegatwick@gmail.com.

Thank you for your time and for acting on this important issue by writing and asking questions of the Ministers in charge of aviation and the Department for Transport.

Yours sincerely,

[Your Name]