

Q1 What conclusions, if any, do you draw in respect of the three short-listed options?

Gatwick is in the wrong place for a major airport, tucked into a corner of the SE.

Access by road and rail is already at a peak. 65 million more passengers will break the camels back.

Why were only Gatwick and Heathrow shortlisted?

Just today the M25 was at a standstill between Jct 6 and Jct 17. An all too common occurrence.

1) Gatwick handled 35,444,206 passengers in 2013 (latest data available)

Official figures released by GAL indicate that passengers arrive at Gatwick by:

Car 38%

Rail 33%

Taxi/Minicab 13%

Bus/Coach 7%

Plane 7%

Hire car 2%

Based on 2013 official figures, that means that currently:

13,468,798 passengers arrive by car

11,696,587 passengers arrive by train

4,607,746 passengers arrive by minicab

2,481,094 passengers arrive by Bus/Coach

2,481,094 passengers arrive by plane

708,884 passengers arrive by hire car

This equates to 21,266,522 road users per annum

That equates to 58,264 road users per day accessing Gatwick at present.

GAL projected passenger numbers for Gatwick with a second runway are 96 million.

On the figures above, with a second Gatwick runway:

36,480,000 passengers would arrive by car

31,680,000 passengers would arrive by train

12,480,000 passengers would arrive by minicab

6,720,000 passengers would arrive by Bus/Coach

6,720,000 passengers would arrive by plane

921,600 passengers would arrive by hire car

That means there would be 56,601,600 road users per annum
a 35,335,978 vehicle increase.

That equates to 155,073 new road users per day trying to access Gatwick
a 96,810 vehicle per day increase.

Stanstead only handled 17,852,393 passengers in 2013 (latest data available), less than half of Gatwick and also with one runway.

Would the Brighton/Gatwick/London rail system cope with a trebling of rail passenger numbers

11,696,587 passengers increasing to 31,680,000 passengers?

2) Gatwick handled 252,833 air transport movements in 2013 (latest data available)

Assuming a 24 hour continuous airport operation (H24):

That means an aircraft movement every 2 minutes (120 seconds).

Assuming an 18 hour airport operation (embargo on flights between 24h00 and 06h00).

That means an aircraft movement every 1 minute 34 seconds (94 seconds).

GAL indicate a Gatwick Airport with two runways would handle 560,000 air transport movements per annum.

Assuming a 24 hour continuous airport operation (H24).

That means an aircraft movement every 55.8 seconds.

Assuming an 18 hour airport operation (embargo on flights between 24h00 and 06h00).

That means an aircraft movement every 42 seconds.

Stanstead only handled 131,365 air transport movements in 2013 (latest data available), less than half of Gatwick and also with one runway.

Stanstead handles 50% less traffic than Gatwick. Both airports only have one runway.

- 4) Gatwick is 30 miles from Kings Cross

Stanstead is 35 miles from Kings Cross.

Both airports are nearly equal in distance to from central London.

- 5) Both airports have road and rail links to London.
- 6) If more capacity is needed, Stanstead has the space and infrastructure in abundance.
Using Stanstead to bring it in line with air transport movements and operations at Gatwick would hugely mitigate traffic grid lock south of the Thames.

SE residents are not aware that absolutely no proposals have been suggested to improve the road infrastructure by GAL, and only a derisory £10 million has been offered by GAL for junction improvements?

£10 million will only pay for a set of traffic lights and a lot of white and yellow lines.

Cost for a dual carriageway/motorway road is approximately £30 million per mile.

Potentially about 50 miles of such roads will be required to improve Gatwick -- cost £1½ billion!
Tax Payers and Rate Payers will foot the bill for this, NOT Gatwick.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Q2 Do you have any suggestions for how the short-listed options could be improved, i.e. their benefits enhanced or negative impacts mitigated?

You have shortlisted the wrong Airports.

Minimise the impact of extending Gatwick, by selecting an airport north of London that is at least accessible more easily than Gatwick.

The Thames airport, Boris Island, would have been the best area for the new runways.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Q3 Do you have any comments on how the Commission has carried out its appraisal?

Badly.

Many issues have been overlooked or not addressed in depth or in detail.

Q4 In your view, are there any relevant factors that have not been fully addressed by the Commission to date?

Who is going to pay for Gatwick expansion?

Only a derisory £10 million has been offered by GAL for road junction improvements.

Road infrastructure improvement cost estimated £1.5 billion.

GAL is quoted as saying it will pay for a new hospital; that £46.5 million fund is to be spread across the whole SE for improvements, not just locally to Gatwick. How much does a hospital cost to build? Where will it go?

About 40,000 new houses would be needed, equivalent to a new town the size of Crawley. Where will they go?

286 business premises would be demolished if the second runway went ahead. Where will these businesses go? There is no where locally!

GAL states Gatwick will be sold in 2019. So will a new runway ever be built, or is this all a game to make Gatwick a better proposition to new foreign owners? Sell with planning permission that will put the Airport price up!

The new airport boundary would be only 100 meters from the residential areas of Crawley and far too close to the centre of Crawley town less than 2 miles.

The new runway threshold will be only 500 meters from homes some of which are being built now, in 2015!

Where will the water supply come from required for Gatwick and mass housing?

Where will all the waste go from the mass housing and Gatwick's 96m passengers?

Hugely increased pollution risk from the run-off of the de-icing and anti-icing chemicals used by the airlines and the airport to treat aircraft, runways and taxiways.

What about longer opening hours for flights in and out of Gatwick? The Head of the Association of European Airlines (AEA) said at a recent conference that, "he understands the social concerns, but the AEA believes that for Europe's Airports to stand a chance of competing with global airports, 24 hour operations are a must if Europe's airports want to maintain their position in the world."

With Manston closed, freighter and overnight parcel delivery companies are looking to Gatwick for space to continue their operations. Ever more flights, but now H24!

New Flight paths added to the 'old' flight paths will destroy the tranquillity over areas that have not been flown over before in West Sussex and surrounding Counties.

The increase in the number of flights per year goes from 250,000 to 560,000.

Three times as many people as at present would be significantly affected by aircraft noise in the SE area.

Q5 Do you wish to comment on how the Commission has appraised specific topics (as defined by the Commission's 16 appraisal modules), including methodology and results?

Strategic fit

Strategically Gatwick is a white elephant.

The large, major international airlines have for years done their very best to get their operations away from Gatwick and relocate them, at considerable cost to themselves, to Heathrow.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Local economy impacts

GAL states Gatwick will be sold in 2018/19. Is the expansion talk to make Gatwick a better proposition for new foreign owners?

Selling with 'Planning Permission'. We all know how that works in the housing market.

GAL has not paid any corporation tax for 3 years. They have no intention of starting to plough money into the local communities.

They just want to walk away from Gatwick with a fat profit.

EasyJet (Gatwick's present largest user), has already said it would consider pulling out of Gatwick if the second runway plan goes ahead.

The Business case for a second runway at Gatwick has already been rejected by British Airways.

The economic benefits of a new Gatwick runway as calculated by your Commission are half those for Heathrow.

The Commission already recognises that Gatwick brings in far less than Heathrow due to cheap flights being 'King'.

Business air travel is on the decline due to technology.

Despite what expansion proponents might say, the business community is not unanimously in favour of building new runways.

There is very little unemployment throughout the region with 6,723 vacancies currently within a 10 mile radius of Gatwick.

There is currently only 1-3% unemployment in the area, but 286 business premises would be

demolished if the second runway went ahead.

There will be little opportunity for high skill apprenticeships and youth employment (other than seasonal low paid employment) due to the nature of the airlines, handling agents and airport business plans.

Only minor aircraft servicing is undertaken at Gatwick, while all the in depth maintenance is done abroad.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Noise

With both runways planned to be handling arrivals and departures, there could be no scheme to provide respite from noise and pollution by alternating the use of the runways, as at Heathrow.

New Flight paths added to the 'old' flight paths will destroy the tranquillity in areas where aircraft have not flown over before in West Sussex and surrounding Counties.

Three times as many people as at present would be significantly affected by aircraft noise.

The increase in the number of flights per year goes from 250,000 to 560,000.

People adjacent to an expanded airport and new flight paths are going to be seriously affected by noise and pollution.

These flight paths and increased air traffic will cause intense disturbance, distress and anger.

All aircraft departing to the west from the new runway are using two new flight paths, one over Warnham and North Horsham and one turning sharp left to fly over the new estate of Kilnwood Vale and the eastern side of Horsham.

Since these two flight paths would need to take all aircraft taking off to the west from the new runway, Horsham will at busy times of day experience up to one plane a minute over either the north or the east of the town.

Serious health issues arise from constant aircraft noise and emissions.

It is shown that aircraft noise can cause misery, for adults and children, as well as disrupt children's learning.

Sleep deprivations from night flights, (Gatwick charge no landing fees at night) is a particular concern, which affects well being and the working day.

What about longer opening hours for flights in and out of Gatwick?

The Head of the Association of European Airlines (AEA) said at a recent conference that, "he understands the social concerns, but the AEA believes that for Europe's Airports to stand a chance of competing with global airports, 24 hour operations are a must."
Ever more flights at Gatwick, but now H24!

'Missed approaches' are performed by aircraft that for one reason or another are unable to land. Missed approaches occur between one and three times every 1,000 flights. As the missed approach procedure at Gatwick is to turn directly over Crawley while climbing, the potential for a major disaster is being increased many times over.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Biodiversity

Environmental damage is not just about the space the runway will occupy, it is about the knock on effect to the rural areas we enjoy at present. It is about changing Sussex and the surrounding Counties forever.

Nearly 200 acres of woodland will be lost locally, including 40 acres of ancient woodland. That is just for the airport.

What will be lost when 40,000 houses are built?

Will the SE Councils and residents really want to inflict this environmental destruction on the beautiful country side?

Will the SE Councils and residents really want to concrete over much of the green lands and villages that surround Gatwick to provide affordable housing for inward migration workers?

There is a hugely increased pollution risk from the run-off of the de-icing and anti-icing chemicals used by the airlines and the airport to treat aircraft, runways and taxiways.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Water and flood risk

Gatwick was flooded last year and there was serious disruption as a result.

The problem of local flooding would be increased by run-off and the poor handling of river and flood prevention by the EA.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Quality of life

Serious health issues arise from constant aircraft noise and emissions.

It is shown that aircraft noise can cause misery, for adults and children, as well as disrupt children's learning.

Sleep deprivations from night flights, (Gatwick charge no landing fees at night) is a particular concern, which affects well being and the working day.

What about longer opening hours for flights in and out of Gatwick?

The Head of the Association of European Airlines (AEA) said at a recent conference that, "he understands the social concerns, but the AEA believes that for Europe's Airports to stand a chance of competing with global airports, 24 hour operations are a must."

Ever more flights at Gatwick, but now H24!

A second runway would mean around 136,000 extra road journeys a day in the vicinity of Gatwick, Crawley, Horsham, East Grinstead and the surrounding area.

Traffic congestion would have an adverse impact on local and rural businesses.

What about parents trying to get kids to school while the local roads around Crawley, Horsham and East Grinstead Gatwick are clogged?

The 'new' airport boundary would be only 100 meters from the residential area of Crawley and the new runway threshold only 500 meters from homes that are now being built in 2015!

New Flight paths added to the 'old' flight paths will destroy the tranquillity in areas where aircraft have not flown over before in West Sussex and surrounding Counties.

Three times as many people as at present would be significantly affected by aircraft noise.

The increase in the number of flights per year goes from 250,000 to 560,000.

People adjacent to an expanded airport and new flight paths are going to be seriously affected by noise and pollution.

These flight paths and increased air traffic will cause intense disturbance, distress and anger.

All aircraft departing to the west from the new runway are using two new flight paths, one over Warnham and North Horsham and one turning sharp left to fly over the new estate of Kilnwood Vale and the eastern side of Horsham.

Since these two flight paths would need to take all aircraft taking off to the west from the new runway, Horsham will at busy times of day experience up to one plane a minute over either the

north or the east of the town.

Serious health issues arise from constant aircraft noise and emissions.

It is shown that aircraft noise can cause misery, for adults and children, as well as disrupt children's learning.

Sleep deprivations from night flights, (Gatwick charge no landing fees at night) is a particular concern, which affects well being and the working day.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Cost and commercial viability

The large, major international airlines have for years done their very best to get their operations away from Gatwick and relocate them, at considerable cost to themselves, to Heathrow.

EasyJet (Gatwick's present largest user), has already said it would consider pulling out of Gatwick if the second runway plan goes ahead.

Low cost airlines do not need an airport as large as Heathrow.

The Business case for a second runway at Gatwick has already been rejected by British Airways.

The economic benefits of a new Gatwick runway as calculated by your Commission are half those for Heathrow.

The Commission already recognises that Gatwick brings in far less than Heathrow due to cheap flights being 'King'

There is very little unemployment throughout the region with 6,723 vacancies currently within a 10 mile radius of Gatwick.

There is currently only 1-3% unemployment in the area

286 business premises would be demolished if the second runway went ahead.

There will be little opportunity for high skill apprenticeships and youth employment (other than seasonal low paid employment) due to the nature of the airlines, handling agents and airport business plans.

Only minor aircraft servicing is undertaken at Gatwick, while all the in depth maintenance is done abroad.

Traffic congestion would have an adverse impact on local and rural businesses.

Increases in charges per passenger to pay for expansion would be unpopular with the public and would lessen the commercial viability of Gatwick in relation to other airports. Higher airport charges would make raising finance difficult. If aviation was then to be subject to fuel tax and VAT, even allowing for air passenger duty, the business cases for Gatwick would collapse.

The Business case for a second runway at Gatwick has already been rejected by British Airways.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Operational risk

The present terminals are on the 'wrong', north side of the existing runway, while the new runway would be to the south of the present runway. It is therefore proposed that the runways would operate in 'independent mixed mode', with each runway handling both arriving and departing aircraft. Aircraft using the new southern runway would use a new terminal between the runways, and would mainly use flight paths to and from the south. Aircraft using the existing runway would use the two existing terminals and would mainly follow flight paths to and from the north of that runway. This will not suit the low cost airlines operations. Consider a flight coming in from say Spain/France/Italy and going to the new southern terminal. This aircraft is then scheduled to operate a flight to Scandinavia /Northern Ireland/Scotland. Operational efficiency will be reduced and fuel burn costs increased as the aircraft moves from one side of the airport to the other, a slow, safety critical process. EasyJet (Gatwick's present largest user) has already said it would consider pulling out of Gatwick if the second runway plan goes ahead.

With both runways handling arrivals and departures, there could be no scheme to provide respite by alternating the use of the runways, as at Heathrow.

The proposed runway separation of 1,045m is only just greater than the minimum of 1,035m allowed for mixed mode operations by international safety regulations. Thus there would be frequent occasions when two aircraft approaching Gatwick would be side-by-side and only one kilometer apart for the final twelve to fifteen miles. This separation requires accurate navigation and might not be practicable in strong winds. This will reduce the resilience of Gatwick to bad weather delays.

The chances are therefore much greater for 'missed approaches' to be performed by aircraft that for one reason or another are unable to land. These 'missed approach procedures' have many

times in recent years ended in disaster (six large passenger aircraft have crashed with the loss of all on board in the last 20 years). The Go-around Safety Forum held by the Flight Safety Foundation, Eurocontrol and the European Regional Airlines Association in Brussels last year heard that one in ten go-around reports recorded a potential hazardous go-around outcome. Go-around's occur between one and three times every 1,000 flights.

As the go-around procedure at Gatwick is to turn over Crawley while climbing, the potential for a major disaster is being increased over two fold.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Economy impacts

What will Gatwick (tucked away in the SE) expansion do for the UK north-south divide? The employment benefits of any airport expansion should be for the country as a whole and not just the SE?

Communities may naively believe that economically a second runway would be beneficial to the SE, but If Gatwick is chosen, then the massive infrastructure costs will have to be borne by all neighbourhoods and the surrounding Counties.

That is something many residents will not currently realise and probably not be willing to bear.

The economic benefits of a new Gatwick runway as calculated by your Commission are half those for Heathrow.

The Commission already recognises that Gatwick brings in far less than Heathrow due to cheap flights being 'King'.

Business air travel is on the decline due to technology.

286 business premises would be demolished if the second runway went ahead.

Where will they go? Out of the region? Crawley is full up already.

Cost for a dual carriageway/motorway road is approximately £30 million per mile.

Potentially about 50 miles of such roads will be required -- cost £1½ billion!

Tax Payers and Rate Payers will foot the bill for this, NOT Gatwick.

Who will fund infrastructure, roads, policing, hospitals, schools, religious buildings
not GAL

tax payers!

The cost to communities will be massive and far greater than the Councils will be able to realistically support financially.

SE residents are not aware that absolutely no proposals have been suggested to improve the road infrastructure by GAL, and only a derisory £10 million has been offered by GAL for junction improvements?

£10 million will only pay for a set of traffic lights and a lot of white and yellow lines.

There is very little unemployment throughout the region with 6,723 vacancies currently within a 10 mile radius of Gatwick.

There is currently only 1-3% unemployment in the area, but 286 business premises would be demolished if the second runway went ahead.

There will be little opportunity for high skill apprenticeships and youth employment (other than seasonal low paid employment) due to the nature of the airlines, handling agents and airport business plans.

Only minor aircraft servicing is undertaken at Gatwick, while all the in depth maintenance is done abroad.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Surface access

New and improved roads that would be needed to provide the level of access required into an expanded Gatwick, potentially becoming as big as any airport in the world, and may include:

M23 and M25 widening

Crawley Northern By pass A264 Faygate to A23 Hookwood

East Grinstead Western By Pass

Pease Pottage to East Grinstead Western By Pass

Gatwick Eastern Approach A22 to M23 Jct 9

Junction 9 flyover for south bound slip

Gatwick southwest approach A24/A29

Gatwick western approach A264/A25 and the small country roads

The A27 coastal road

A23 re-alignment

Re-provision of Balcombe Road

Improvements to Longbridge roundabout

Airport Way widening

New terminal accesses

Cost for a dual carriageway/motorway road is approximately £30 million per mile. Potentially about 50 miles of such roads will be required - cost £1½ billion!

GAL are not interested in what happens outside the airport boundary, and only offer up a meagre token to attempt to be seen as responsible neighbours, that they are not! They only want to make money at public and environmental expense. GAL has not paid any corporation tax for 3 years.

Only a derisory £10 million has been offered by GAL for road junction improvements. What about the road infrastructure (above)?

£10 million will only pay for a set of traffic lights and a lot of white and yellow lines.

Where are the huge car parks going to be located at the airport to cope with the massive 90 million plus passengers per year?

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Air quality

Serious health issues arise from constant emissions.

A new runway would increase climate change damage from aircraft emissions
aviation is the fastest growing cause of climate change.

GAL indicate a Gatwick Airport with two runways would handle 560,000 air transport movements

per annum.

There will be potentially an extra 308,000 flights per year from Gatwick

There will be potentially 136,000 extra road journeys a day in the vicinity of Gatwick.

Some areas around Crawley already fall below prescribed limits.

With both runways planned to be handling arrivals and departures, there could be no scheme to provide respite from noise and pollution by alternating the use of the runways, as at Heathrow.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Community

There is no doubt that expansion will adversely affect the whole infrastructure of Crawley, Horsham, East Grinstead and the surrounding towns and Counties of the South East.

Communities may naively believe that economically a second runway would be beneficial to the SE, but If Gatwick is chosen, then the massive infrastructure costs will have to be borne by all neighbourhoods and the surrounding Counties.

That is something many residents will not currently realise and probably not be willing to bear.

A two runway Gatwick is forecast to handle 96 million passengers a year, making it bigger than Heathrow at present.

About 40,000 new houses would be needed, equivalent to a new town the size of Crawley, a severe strain on local hospitals, schools etc.

Crawley is already full and there is no space left for more house building.

The 'new' airport boundary would be only 100 meters from the residential area of Crawley and the new runway threshold only 500 meters from homes that are now being built in 2015!

A second runway would mean around 136,000 extra road journeys a day in the vicinity of Gatwick, Crawley, Horsham, East Grinstead and the surrounding area.

Traffic congestion would have an adverse impact on local and rural businesses.

What about parents trying to get kids to school while the local roads around Crawley, Horsham and East Grinstead and Gatwick are clogged?

Who will fund infrastructure, roads, policing, hospitals, schools, religious buildings
not GAL
tax payers!

The cost to communities will be massive and far greater than the Councils will be able to realistically support financially.

The SE Councils will need to mitigate the environmental devastation (air and noise pollution/grid locked roads/loss of green belt etc).

The SE Councils will also have build the required infrastructure to accommodate the airport (roads/homes/schools/health care).

The SE Councils will have to cope with the many thousands of migrant workers/families that will be needed to be employed by and around the airport
GAL will not!

Where are all the schools, doctors, hospitals, social services to come from for the inwardly migrating workers that Gatwick will demand?

Will the SE Councils really be able to handle this level of increase?

Will the SE Councils and residents really want to inflict this environmental destruction on the beautiful country side?

Will the SE Councils and residents really want to concrete over much of the green lands and villages that surround Gatwick to provide affordable housing for inward migration workers?

With the increased terrorist threat, how much will the policing bill be for an expanded Gatwick and who will pay for it?

Where will the water supply come from required for Gatwick and mass housing?

Where will all the waste go from the mass housing and Gatwick's 96m passengers?

Do not be taken in by GALs minimal promises of compensation and aid, the cost to the local towns and surrounding Counties will be far, far greater than they will ever be able to afford.

Who will fund infrastructure, roads, policing, hospitals, schools, religious buildings
not GAL
Tax Payers!

Medical services in the area are already overstretched and failing to meet their commitments and targets, so how will they cope with such a huge increase in population?

The Government can't afford a new hospital now for the Horsham/Crawley area, so what makes residents think that funding will suddenly be found? At least one new hospital will be required. If there is ever a major disaster at Gatwick, with the larger aircraft operating, where will the casualties be taken?

GAL is quoted as saying it will pay for a new hospital; that £46.5 million fund is to be spread across the whole SE for improvements, not just locally. How much does a hospital cost to build? Where will it go?

Do not be taken in by GALs minimal promises of compensation and aid, the cost to the Tax Payers will be far greater than local Councils can afford.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Operational efficiency

The present terminals are on the 'wrong', north side of the existing runway, while the new runway would be to the south of the present runway. It is therefore proposed that the runways would operate in 'independent mixed mode', with each runway handling both arriving and departing aircraft. Aircraft using the new southern runway would use a new terminal between the runways, and would mainly use flight paths to and from the south. Aircraft using the existing runway would use the two existing terminals and would mainly follow flight paths to and from the north of that runway. This will not suit the low cost airlines operations. Consider a flight coming in from say Spain/France/Italy and going to the new southern terminal. This aircraft is then scheduled to operate a flight to Scandinavia /Northern Ireland/Scotland. Operational efficiency will be reduced and fuel burn costs increased as the aircraft moves from one side of the airport to the other, a slow, safety critical process. EasyJet (Gatwick's present largest user) has already said it would consider pulling out of Gatwick if the second runway plan goes ahead.

With both runways handling arrivals and departures, there could be no scheme to provide respite by alternating the use of the runways, as at Heathrow.

The proposed runway separation of 1,045m is only just greater than the minimum of 1,035m allowed for mixed mode operations by international safety regulations. Thus there would be frequent occasions when two aircraft approaching Gatwick would be side-by-side and only one kilometer apart for the final twelve to fifteen miles. This separation requires accurate navigation and might not be practicable in strong winds. This will reduce the resilience of Gatwick to bad weather delays.

The chances are therefore much greater for 'missed approaches' to be performed by aircraft that for one reason or another are unable to land. These 'missed approach procedures' have many times in recent years ended in disaster (six large passenger aircraft have crashed with the loss of all on board in the last 20 years). The Go-around Safety Forum held by the Flight Safety Foundation, Eurocontrol and the European Regional Airlines Association in Brussels last year heard that one in ten go-around reports recorded a potential hazardous go-around outcome. Go-around's occur between one and three times every 1,000 flights. As the go-around procedure at Gatwick is to turn over Crawley while climbing, the potential for a major disaster is being increased over two fold.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Delivery

Do not allow GAL to turn the Surrey, West Sussex, East Sussex corner into an urbanised, polluted, noisy and congested industrial environment that most long term residents will want to escape from as is the case all around Heathrow.

Please consider the environmental devastation that will befall our beautiful Counties if you and the Government approve the Gatwick option in the coming months.

Do not be blinded by what will no doubt be eventually proved as a false economic benefit. The second runway will not mitigate the financial, safety, security and environmental cost to the SE Counties residents.

West Sussex, Kent and Surrey County Councils have voted to oppose a second runway.

Mole Valley, Horsham and now Crawley have voted to oppose a second runway.

I ask you to carefully consider the safety implications, the devastation and the cost to the whole

SE should a second runway ever be built at Gatwick.

If you do this, then I am sure you can only oppose a second runway at Gatwick.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Q6 Do you have any comments on the Commission's sustainability assessments, including methodology and results?

The cost of a second runway will be massive and far greater than the Counties and Councils will be able to realistically support financially and politically for long into the future. Who will fund infrastructure, roads, policing, hospitals, schools, religious buildings?

Even for Gatwick to reach its 45 million capacity with a single runway there will still be major issues and costs that local neighbourhoods and Councils will have to bear, along with many environmental issues. This is obviously something that will need to be addressed in the future.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Q7 Do you have any comments on the Commission's business cases, including methodology and results?

What will Gatwick (tucked away in the SE) expansion do for the UK north-south divide? The employment benefits of any airport expansion should be for the country as a whole and not just the SE?

Despite what expansion proponents might say, the business community is not unanimously in favour of building new runways. Engagement with stakeholders in the international business community revealed that many businesses get tired of being the excuse for ploughing ahead with ill-thought out big ticket government investments.

The large, major international airlines have for years done their very best to get their operations away from Gatwick and relocate them, at considerable cost to themselves, to Heathrow. So where is the increase in air traffic going to come from that necessitates two runways at Gatwick and for how long before the oil runs out?

The economic benefits of a new Gatwick runway as calculated by your Commission are half those for Heathrow. The Commission recognises that Gatwick brings in far less than Heathrow due to cheap flights being 'King'.

Business air travel is on the decline due to technology.

There will be no economic boost to the local community, as mass infrastructure expenditure will mean more money going out than in. It is estimated that the cost of Gatwick will start at an extra £100 per household and there are no guarantees that business rates will continue to go to local authorities.

Increases in charges per passenger to pay for expansion would be unpopular with the public and would lessen the commercial viability of Gatwick in relation to other airports. Higher airport charges would make raising finance difficult. If aviation was then to be subject to fuel tax and VAT, even allowing for air passenger duty, the business cases for both Gatwick would collapse.

The Business case for a second runway at Gatwick has already been rejected by British Airways.

There is very little unemployment throughout the region with 6,723 vacancies currently within a 10 mile radius of Gatwick.

There is currently only 1-3% unemployment in the area, but 286 business premises would be demolished if the second runway went ahead. Where will these businesses go? There is no where locally!

Many firms would suffer from a shortage of labour, while traffic congestion would have an adverse impact on local and rural businesses.

There will be little opportunity for high skill apprenticeships and youth employment (other than seasonal low paid employment) due to the nature of the airlines business plans. Only minor aircraft servicing is undertaken at Gatwick, while all the in depth maintenance is done abroad.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Q8 Do you have any other comments?

Gatwick though is in the wrong location for massive growth. Airport expansion should be north of London for road, rail, public transport and air traffic control reasons reasons.

GAL states Gatwick will be sold in 2019. So will a new runway ever be built, or is this all to make Gatwick a better proposition to new foreign owners? Sell with planning permission that will put the Airport price up!

GAL are not interested in what happens outside the airport boundary, and only offer up a meagre token to attempt to be seen as responsible neighbours, that they are not! They only want to make money at public and environmental expense.

GAL has not paid any corporation tax for 3 years.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

No Airports Selected.