



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

Gatwick must not be developed; their management have shown themselves to be not fit for purpose and they have consistently shown themselves to be creative with the truth ("Empty fields", breaking night time flying rules, NATs issues, the misdirection of "there have been no changes to flight paths..." etc. etc.).

The current Gatwick economic model is based on false economies propped up by non-payment of taxes (e.g. VAT, Fuel excise and Corporation Tax). Taxpayers should not be supporting this fake economy and I would like to see the true figures when they start paying tax and stop being given our UK money. Expansion is not acceptable for such a badly run organisation. Gatwick will not pay for the infrastructure "as shares will be sold in 2018---2020 by GIP off shore owners". Source GACC report.

With respect to the Heathrow proposals; these also seem built up on hopes and fake economic projections.

For all of the options the Commission have failed to mention any opposition to these 'plans' in terms of anti-Gatwick pressure groups, MPs, MEPs, the Green Party and so on. The reams of polysyllabic technical content will fool many people but there is more than enough opposition to communicate the truth to the less able amongst us.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern 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?

Gatwick could start by paying proper taxes thus bringing into play a truthful economy instead of cash projections and flight volumes based on taxpayer's money not being collected. That would instantly reduce the number of cheap flights and reduce the number of passengers and thus reduce flights to realistic and sustainable levels and so changing the projected model. This tax could help the local people affected by Gatwick airport live in a better environment. My heart goes out to them.

Gatwick could also stop the up to 50Km radius concentrated flight paths ASAP and concentrate instead on assisting local people (i.e. all affected people in the South East) to measure and mitigate the noise, nuisance and air pollution levels. I am appalled that no Independent measures have been made to record nuisance levels as well as air and noise pollution over affected areas of the South East. This is a serious shortcoming that could lead to health issues for young and old throughout the South East.

I do not believe that Gatwick should be owned by foreign investors. Gatwick is now totally profit oriented and only see the South East UK as a money pump. Bring Gatwick back to the UK and make it fully responsible to the citizens of the United Kingdom.

* For all options: Until we get sensible economic, environmental, infrastructure and urban models there is little else that can properly be mitigated. How do you mitigate things that are unknown or based on false assumptions?

BTW: I notice with some unease that PwC who made these assumptions has released a brochure extolling the virtues of investing in the Air Industry ([pwc-aviation-finance-fasten-your-seat-belts-pdf.pdf](#)). Is this not a conflict of interest?

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

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

The appraisal was not properly made available to the citizens who have been severely affected by the current concentrated flight paths and who will be affected by future plans. I have spoken to people who have stated they have no idea that they could complain, no idea there is a Commission for their comments and no idea that they can contact the CAA to comment on P-RNAV.

It is only the efforts of some MPs and MEPs, some councillors, the Green Party, the excellent pressure groups and individuals that have advertised this appraisal and consultation to the public in general. You should be reaching out to all of the affected people. I understand that this is a normal state of affairs for consultations; this is not democratic and the government must stump up to reach out to the people who are affected by any proposed changes.

With respect to this issue your documents, in general, read like investors prospectuses rather than

democratically provided sources of information. Your document does not mention the existence of pressure groups such as GACC, CAGNE, ESCAN, HWCAAG, HACAN, Airport Watch, ESSCAN, Gatwick Obviously Not, HWCAAG, Plane Wrong and many others. There is no mention of opposition from MPs, MEPs and local councils from across the political divide.

Further to this the consultancy documents are not easy to read. Not all taxpayer/voters/citizens have University level education and may not be able to quickly assimilate polysyllabic, technical statements as are common in the Gatwick document. I am sure the same can be said about the Heathrow documents.

The accusation that could be made is that this might be is a deliberate attempt to obfuscate the issues relating to expansion. I sincerely hope that this is not the case as I like to think we live in a democracy.

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

I think that the fourth option "No expansion at all" has not been properly considered.

I note that a survey of some 7000 people was carried out in which 6000+ stated none of the options considered by this commission. The Gatwick Airport media machine chose to ignore this and trumpeted long and hard over the tiny percentage that wanted development.

Removing government subsidies (i.e. tax breaks as mentioned previously) will result in less flights that cost more so the economic model WILL change. I find it hard to believe that 'economic experts' have chosen to ignore this in their findings; unless, of course, this is deliberate. I believe that, to sustain expansion, passenger taxes will have to be raised thus reducing the number of cheap flights.

The views of the citizens of the South East have been largely ignored, in my opinion. I am also concerned about how much of these proposals was put together as a money making scheme for a few self-interested people and organisations rather than a solid attempt to increase the prosperity of the taxpayers and voters of the UK.

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

There is no need for expansion. We should reduce the number of planes in the air by collecting fair taxes (thus reducing the number of cheap, government subsidised flights), removing short haul flights and improving public transport in the UK. Luton and Stansted have unused capacity.

Gatwick is not sufficiently connected to properly manage the current traffic, let alone an increase.

The proposed plans may lead to an out of control, disjointed “Frankenstein” air industry model rather than an optimised, controlled, coherent system. Optimisation is the key, in my opinion.

In your consultation you state “Gatwick Airport’s existing runway is currently operating at over 85% capacity, with limited room for further growth in ATMs.”

The reason for this is that the number of flights has been artificially increased on the back of flight subsidies that have been funded by non-collection of taxes. In other words the taxpayer is footing the extra traffic both financially and by the noise and air pollution they are experiencing. This is a disgrace, in my opinion and the government should be taken to task for allowing such un-democratic process.

A second statement is “A key positive impact at the local level from expansion at Gatwick would be job creation in the local economy. Commission forecasts suggest that across the full range of scenarios, between 200 and 23,600 jobs would be supported by 2030, rising to between 7,900 and 32,500 by 2050.”

The area has very low employment and the only way to source these ‘jobs’ would be from non-local people, where do you expect them to live? The area is 'domicile saturated' and, apart from environmentally sensitive sites there are no places for them to live. I also note that the “Borough of Crawley” have made positive noises about sourcing these jobs. I believe the people who think this are incorrect. One minute they claim they have achieved low employment; next minute they are saying there are tens of thousands of jobs. Cannot be both.

Your statement: “...any increase in noise levels as a result of expansion is likely to be of wider concern....”

As has been shown in the recent P-RNAV trials means that huge areas of the South East will suffer the noise and air pollution that we are experiencing right now. My family and I live 20 miles from Gatwick and we are appalled by the noise; and we are not the worst affected village. Gatwick have singularly turned tens of thousands of people against them. People who are ignored by Gatwick; whose ‘Noise Line’ is not fit for purpose as they don’t talk about noise.

I ask you to consider if Gatwick management and NATS are fit to run the current flight numbers let alone increased volumes.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Local economy impacts

Very few, as far as I can see. Many of the passengers won't even leave the airport. The costs in terms of lost person hours due to sickness from noise, air and general nuisance seems to me to be a big factor.

Further to this the suffocation of the local roads will mean that people in the area will not be able to get to their workplaces in a reasonable time. It is already overstretched and even recent road improvements have failed to make much improvement.

People going to Gatwick will not want to use local retailers. Right now, there are duty free and other shops on the Gatwick site sucking profits out of the local economy.

I also see the local economy being stretched by the secondary effects of a huge influx of traffic and people not contributing to the local economy but very much contributing to the Gatwick tax subsidised profits.

Quotes from GACC:

"The claim by Gatwick Airport that a new runway would create huge economic benefits has been debunked by GACC. It is shown that virtually all the extra income would go to new workers attracted into the area, with little benefit for local residents."

"If Gatwick were using their claims to sell shares, they could be sued for issuing a 'fraudulent prospectus'."

From what I have found out I wholeheartedly agree. Gatwick are not fit to manage what they have let alone what they want.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Noise

Noise levels reported by affected citizens are being ignored by Gatwick, the CAA and the government. I can tell you it is unbearable at times. We are 20 miles from Gatwick. Why are we not recording noise levels if so many people are complaining? I understand there have been tens of thousands of complaints.

I wonder about the long term effect of increased ambient noise levels and also the short term effects of very high ground noise levels (maximum I have recorded was a Virgin plane at over 90dB; it was banking somewhere low over the village of Withyham, East Sussex). The UK is already noisy, any extra burdens may be intolerable. The issue with this is that the effects on the health of the voters and their children may come back and bite the UK when people start falling sick. So we foot the NHS bill whilst foreign investors cream the profits.

Even if Gatwick do not get their plans approved I ask you to recommend that independent noise analysis be paid for by Gatwick (and Heathrow, for that matter), the airlines (especially the cheap ones) and the air authorities must address the issue of air noise.

The Gatwick 'Noise line' do not consider noise or noise nuisance levels; when complaints are made Gatwick send letters that state the time, date, airline, flight path but not the noise/nuisance levels. Gatwick also claim to fine noisy airlines. I do not see these fines being made nor advertised and I do not see evidence of this money being released to those affected. It appears to be another nifty way to squeeze profits out of the tax paying citizens of the South East and into the pockets of foreign investors.

There is also the issue of some airlines not fitting the EasyJet Deflector Retro-Fit. Cheap, quick to deploy and will reduce noise levels. This indicates that noise is not an issue to the offenders.

I regularly visit National Trust places as far apart as Sheffield Park, Emmetts Garden, Wakehurst, Nymans and others (in Kent, Surrey and Sussex). On each occasion low flying planes have ruined a supposedly restful occasion and it seems that animals were disturbed by the racket (FYI see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noise_pollution#Wildlife). At the time of writing (the 1st Jan 2015) we have had plane after plane over our village, so we went into The Royal Tunbridge Wells. We visited parks such as Camden, Dunorlan and Calverley plus roads and paths between them. In a 2 hour walk we heard plane after plane making noises that must have been a nightmare for the residents. A few weeks ago we had a similar walk ruined in Penshurst and the surrounding area. What's this going to do to the tourists who come to see Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty?

Your document seems to mix carbon and noise pollution together. I do not believe this is scientific and wonder why you have done this. Could it be to confuse the real issues that Noise Pollution in the South East is being ignored? There are a lot of voters involved and many of them will remember just who it was who created the Air Industry monster.

From your document: ...“The above data cannot and does not capture the full noise impacts that might accrue from an expanded Gatwick. For instance, it is well understood that people who live beyond an airport's noise contours can often be irritated and upset by the overflight of planes. This may be particularly the case in rural or tranquil areas, which comprise some of the areas around Gatwick.”...

I think this is absolutely correct and is an indictment on the quality and scientific viability of this part of your document. I suggest it was written by economists or media people it is so technically poor.

Where are the noise pollution figures for affected areas outside of the immediate areas of the airports?

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Biodiversity

Increase in the number of planes will have an unknown, but in my opinion negative, impact on local biodiversity. This should be scientifically determined; not stated using subjective statements and economics as in your supporting document.

I regularly visit National Trust places as far apart as Sheffield Park, Emmetts Garden, Wakehurst, Nymans and others (in Kent, Surrey and Sussex). On each occasion in 2014 low flying planes ruined the supposedly restful occasion and it seems that animals were disturbed by the racket. This did not happen in previous years. I would like to see this studied but, of course, there is insufficient money made available to warrant proper scientific studies. I am sure that Gatwick Airport would like to contribute to making the South East UK restful and unpolluted. Ashdown Forest is now an area of aircraft noise.

Even from the creative figures you have supplied it can be seen that a whole lot of land will disappear under a business plan economically bereft of sense but strong on barren areas of concrete and cheap housing. What a waste of biodiversity just so that foreign investors can prosper on an unrealistic proposed model.

I also suspect that waste from the proposed expansion of Gatwick and Heathrow will provide an intolerable burden on the local authorities to correctly dispose of the waste. It is likely that new landfill will be required. Where is this to be buried? Are Gatwick considering the South East as a dustbin as well as an extension to their airport?

Here's a quote from GACC (Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign):

"The countryside around Gatwick, thanks to strict planning policies, is attractive and unspoilt its main characteristic being woods and small fields and historic villages. All the land to the north of the airport is designated as Green Belt where development is prohibited. Nationally designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) almost encircle the airport on west, north and east. The South Downs National Park lies about 20 miles south of the airport. Thanks to strict planning

policies, the main industrial and commercial development associated with the airport has been confined to the Crawley industrial area to the south of the airport. “

Here are two quotes from CAGNE (Campaign Against Gatwick Noise Emissions):

“Gatwick is surrounded by hills and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and is therefore restricted.

Noise, pollution and environmental damage to AONB. Impact on wildlife and rural economy due to mass house building and warehousing demanded by an expanded Gatwick.”

“...areas around Gatwick currently enjoy levels of tranquillity being rural locations. Many new flight paths, as dictated by Gatwick’s desire to be larger than Heathrow is today, would destroy this.”

I agree with these statements and suggest that we cannot go on burying our land under tar or concrete and we cannot push ecology very much further. These eco-systems have been built over thousands of years, when will the greedy appropriation of other creature’s lives and our own stop?

Here are two further comments from the GACC Site:

“**[REDACTED]**, Chief Executive of the Sussex Wildlife Trust warns that the idea of a second runway at Gatwick Airport is a great worry to the Trust. Gatwick Airport at present has a huge ecological impact and adding an extra runway will make this worse. Read his blog.”

“Landscape author **[REDACTED]** describes the value of the land which would be destroyed by a new runway. Read his article and his expert, comprehensive and well-illustrated description of the landscape.”

Gatwick plans will push this area they pollute even further into the UK than ever before. Do you really want Gatwick Airport Ltd. to run our countryside?

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Water and flood risk

Quote from GACC:

“Flooding

Where will all the floodwater go as Gatwick divert the River Mole again into more pipework, and what about the enormous amount of water collected from the roof of new terminal buildings, where

will this water go as Gatwick face frequent flood warnings now?"

The community in the area has already had enough of flooding and I see no evidence that Gatwick management understand the issues involved. Are they going to add some tens of millions of pounds to foot the bill for strengthening flood defences or is this coming from the taxpayer?

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Quality of life

My quality of life and those around me have been seriously affected by the P-RNAV trials this Summer and still go on now.

Due to the noise I cannot use my garden a lot of the time and I am kept awake till at least 11.00pm. Low flying has continued till 2.50am on one occasion. As stated before, I live 20 miles from

Gatwick and I do not live in the "empty fields" which Gatwick stated they would be flying over.

Is it to be that not only are the people of the South East are going to have their sleep hours defined by Gatwick as between 23:30 and 05:30 but they will also be kept awake throughout the night against even what they state on their own web site? Say one thing and do another, so how can you believe what they say?

Further to this being unable to use our garden during the day due to the racket is a clear breach of our Quality of Life. Gatwick do not respond or acknowledge after the first two complaints; that's a disgrace. They state that "flight paths have not changed"; they are lying in that flight paths are much lower, more concentrated and more frequent over our living area than last year. They have already taken an old lady to court for complaining too much (the case was thrown out).

Gatwick regularly breach the already too lax night time flying regulations. There is good reason not to believe that Gatwick cannot deliver anything they say they can.

In my opinion any expansion would make this worse, they need to reduce low level night flights to zero and enforce the no flight time between 10pm and 8am so people can get some sleep.

Noisy airlines and Gatwick should pay a hefty fine to the relevant local council for the benefit of those affected. Fines must not be converted into fat profits paid to the foreign investors, as they are now.

As I write there have been hundreds of low level flights since 8am on Friday 5/12/2014 until now

13:14 on Sunday 21/12/2014 (20:30). This morning the flights started at around 05:43.

The findings stated in your document are incorrect and out of date. It does not take into consideration anything that the people of the South East are saying. Why are there so many pressure groups, MPs, MEPs and councils against this scheme? The answer lies the fact that document alludes to a study that is wholly unscientific and does not include the tens of thousands of people whose Quality of Life is affected by Noise Pollution and Nuisance, AS THEY ARE RIGHT NOW.

A proper study is required in which the affected people are asked their opinions and not some fluffy, subjective media-friendly "study". Pathetic, if you ask me. Is this a good use of taxpayer's money?

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Cost and commercial viability

How can an organisation that does not pay proper taxes like the rest of us be viable? Where would a change of government that removes these subsidies leave Gatwick, bankrupt?

I also understand that much of the day to day Gatwick money comes from the EasyJet planes located at Gatwick Airport. What would happen if EasyJet moves out to protect their profits. Or as has happened several times before with airlines, goes into administration. Are we going to see half built roads, a half built runway, thousands of imported workers with half built houses to live in and so on?

In any case, where is the money coming from to create all those homes, roads, railways and so on? Pumping profits over to foreign investors and getting in foreign workers is not going to benefit the South East. As for the effect on the GPD, this is overstated and based on incorrect data (e.g. where's the tax breaks that the next government may not be able to deliver?).

At the moment Gatwick profits are coming off the back of misery for tens of thousands of South East UK citizens; or voters/taxpayers as the government may prefer to see them.

We should be optimising the economy and general operation of the air industry not obscuring the truth by unfair subsidies.

In your document there is no easy way to find content relating to this issue.

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

Operational risk

Gatwick planes have already dropped aircraft parts on Langton Green and I have seen blue ice (from the toilet systems) in fields when I lived in Penshurst, KENT. I do not believe that this is the end of accidents or negligence. I suspect many operational faults are not reported. My understanding is that the only reason the Langton Green dropping was reported was that a couple of people just happened to see what happened.

I read about the Virgin aircraft that was flown around the UK when a fault developed. Could it be that there are too many planes to be properly managed. A typical example of an over-stretched industry. Gatwick staff and the pilot, I am glad to say, managed to avert a disaster but what were the safety margins? Why this Heath Robinson approach? Why so many possibly disastrous issues?

Further to this, by expanding concentrated flight paths we run the risk of awful terrorist hijacks and I do not believe that Gatwick is competent enough to make proper plans to reduce the risks involved.

Security is a responsibility that affects profits; As Gatwick's first allegiance is to foreign investors I can see them cutting back on safety.

What happens if several planes from the concentrated flight path are quickly captured and crashed into London or Tunbridge Wells or Gatwick or anywhere? Remember these planes are flying very close already. It could all be over in a few minutes, long before the RAF (I was brought up in the RAF) could get there. Either way, what could the RAF do? Blow planes full of passengers out of the skies? These scenarios may sound daft but remember 9/11?

More flights equals less security means more profits for foreigner investors. Do not get me wrong I am in favour of sustainable, ethical and economically viable investment that benefits all. Alas none of these options do; especially Gatwick, the worst possible choice. Why should investors worry about the communities they affect if it is all covered by insurance or tax payers cash?

I do not believe that Gatwick is capable of managing anything judging by the number of web sites highlighting serious service management defects (e.g. cleaning and catering etc.) that have sprung up.

I have also looked into how NATS have managed air space after the latest "single line of code" failure. That is a laughable statement from NATS. How are they supposed to manage a huge number of planes and flights when they cannot manage a real-time system?

* First, that specific failure indicates to me that the Air industry itself is not capable of testing real-time, 100% availability systems with total and partial, active-active failover to a secondary site (Business Continuity) and also, if the entire site went down (Disaster Recover triggers such as terrorism, power outage, flooding, hurricanes, snow, storms etc.) what then? If they cannot manage their code how can they manage fail safe systems?

* Second, my research has shown there have been many NATS failures over the last few years. What happens to a concentrated flight path when NATS fails next time? Planes in the Thames or in my garden? The whole Air industry is a patchwork of poorly privatised business and technical systems and needs an overhaul before it is allowed to expand. By then perhaps the aircraft will be less polluting.

These last two points indicate that operational risk is already too high; we need to optimise the air industry not allow it to expand uncontrollably. Gatwick are inexorably linked to NATS; both can be seen to be in need of optimisation rather than expansion.

I also note that there is no easy to find help in your document about Gatwick on this topic.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Economy impacts

What profits will the local and UK taxpayer see when it is all going overseas and we are not getting our full tax quota from Gatwick?

The deleterious effects on citizens that P-RNAV has had during 2014 indicates there must be an unrecorded massive loss of worker hours and worker effectiveness due to lack of sleep, rest and possibly pollution. This will affect the efficiency of many workers within many organisations. The entire SE community is being threatened by Gatwick's operations.

Low cost and short haul flights are also being supported by the taxpayer's money and must be stopped to ensure we get a better view of this damaged economic model.

Gatwick, as a private organisation, will continue to contribute as little as possible to the UK coffers and as much as possible to the foreign owners.

From your document: "The economic impacts of transport economic efficiency of the scheme vary by scenario as passenger benefits are heavily driven by passenger demand forecasts. Low-cost is king and global growth, with the highest levels of forecast demand, have the greatest benefit associated with adding capacity. However, under global fragmentation the impacts are much weaker. These figures are based on carbon-traded forecasts, the benefits would likely be lower

under a more stringent carbon framework, this is an issue discussed in more detail in the economic case.”

This content has little in the way of substance. To me this typifies the low standard of some of the content you have supplied; it means very little to most people. To me it indicates that you suspect Carbon trading to be a key driver in economic benefits. If this is the case then this economic model you have presented is built on a house of cards; who can tell what the state of carbon trading will be in six months’ time let alone longer?

Air pollution and noise pollution are not being recorded; thus they become unknowns which may or may not affect local and UK economy. Who will pay to fix the damage?

* It is certain that areas of outstanding beauty and nature reserves will go under concrete, tarmac and flight paths.

*It is certain that the environment will suffer and I humbly request that independent scientific investigation is carried out before any expansion is considered.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Surface access

Once again the Commission has failed to make it easy for non-technical people to get answers from your documents.

Frequently gridlocked NOW. Gatwick is simply unable to provide a reasonable case for their expansion or a second runway. I wonder if their investors realise that when the M25, A22, A23, M23, A264, A24 and other roads come to a standstill people will not use Gatwick? Right now, all of these roads are frequently gridlocked at rush hours and often outside of rush hours. Who will want to leave home and sit in a slow moving crawl for hours? What affect will this have in people trying to get to their homes and workplaces or carrying out their work or pleasure activities?

The roads and rail are in need of improvement NOW. Expansion itself and the need for 30 to 40 thousand more homes will just add to this burden.

If this Gatwick runway is built what effect will the thousands of lorries, workers, services and so on have on and already overburdened surface access infrastructure?

We need a joined up approach to UK transport not just fiddling with the system and allowing expansion to be controlled by foreign investors.

Quote from GACC report:

"GACC has published a paper by [REDACTED] which predicts chaos on the roads and standing room only on the trains if a new runway were built at Gatwick."

My opinion that even this report is understated.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Air quality

A quote from GACC:

Air Pollution; we quote from a recent authoritative report by a transport expert

"...Heathrow is the worst affected place in outer London....the problem is primarily roads....it is important that we cure the NOx problem whatever happens at Heathrow. Even if we shut Heathrow tomorrow, we need a solution to NOx.....".

Aircraft do emit NOx, but the proportion of total NOx in and around Heathrow that comes from aircraft in and around Heathrow is typically between 5 and 20%....."

Are we about to recreate this around Gatwick by allowing it to expand?

I agree, but what disturbs me the most is that I can see no evidence of levels being scientifically recorded of any of the following: NOx, SOx, PAH and other aromatic pollutants, airborne particulates, unburnt fuel droplets and unknown emissions. There have been a few Gatwick numbers flying around but these have no scientific relevance.

We are not recording air quality in the whole area that will be affected by an expanded Gatwick operation: i.e. the South East United Kingdom. There seem to be no plans to do so.

Together, the above stated pollutants make a good toxic material delivery system for us and our children to breathe in. The particle sizes and nature of the particles should easily make it to the surface of the lungs where they are most likely to do the most damage. Unburnt fuel and sooty particles are ideal for absorbing all of the above pollutants which can then get into our bodies and do their proven damage. PAHs and other aromatics such as Benzene are carcinogenic. NOx and SOx are linked to breathing disorders, acid rain and greenhouse effects. CO2 is linked to greenhouse effects.

I note that there are still piston driven planes using Lead Tetraethyl, banned from cars as you are aware. Another toxic material delivery system. The commission has no data on this.

Is there to be an analysis of the increase in traffic leading to stationary vehicles on the overstretched roads? This has the potential to be highly polluting yet is not recorded.

I am also concerned about the effects of the current pollution on our flora and fauna. This is not being measured (which I find highly irresponsible). Do we want to wake up to a Silent Spring (Rachel Carson for those who do not know)?

I won't be around in 2050 (or maybe I will make a 100) but I do not want to leave my grandchildren and their children breathing a worse sort of muck than bought in the Clean Air Act. This, of course, was the ground level pollution by SO_x, NO_x, aromatic hydrocarbons, particulate matter and other chemicals derived from burning too much coal under a restricting layer of cold air (an occlusion). Over 8000 people died and many more were made very ill. So how easy is it to keep clean thousands of square meters of air; especially in view of the existence of many pollution concentrating occlusions? I urge you to take a responsible path and put a block to any expansion.

In my opinion the airport industry and particularly Gatwick are not responsible enough to be trusted with keeping toxic pollution below dangerous levels. They are profit driven so why should they worry if a few tens of thousands of people get hurt?

Your documents seem to rely on statistical projections rather than sound scientific methods. I also believe that the data is window dressed to attract investors. This is a matter of people's health not just the profits of a few rich foreigners.

This statement from your document is worrying:

"Given the uncertainties around future background air quality levels, coupled with insufficient data on aircraft and surface access emission levels post 2030, the Commission has only undertaken quantitative assessments for the scheme's opening year (2025 for Gatwick Airport Second Runway) and 2030, with qualitative assessment of potential impacts in 2040 and 2050 where appropriate."

Where are the current figures for NO_x, SO_x, PAH and other aromatics, airborne particulates, unburnt fuel droplets and unknown emissions? How on earth can you assess future levels when you do not know what the current levels are for the South East? Since the P-RNAV trials begun in early Summer 2014 has there been an increase in people getting asthma in the area?

The answer is you do not know.

How can you make any decision around so many "uncertainties"?

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Carbon

Carbon emissions are unlikely to be lowered by increasing the number of planes. These numbers are open to serious discussion and I do not believe the document considered enough factors. I believe the document statements are not relevant to future expansion and have been provided to placate possible and existing investors in Gatwick.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Place

In my opinion the projections in the relevant document is unlikely to be anything but someone's guesswork. I would like to see a properly designed, scientifically based study.

Your statement:

“The mitigations proposed by GAL are valuable and will help to limit the impact but, particularly with respect to tranquillity, are unlikely to be able to make the impact of the development NEUTRAL. As such the Commission considers that the impact of the GAL scheme on our Place objective is ADVERSE.”

Indeed, despite the media-gabble of the section in general it is ADVERSE and I still do not trust Gatwick management to deliver on any mitigation or economic/environmental support. They are, in my opinion, profiteering, incompetent at the least and creative with the truth at the worst.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Community

In your document you only consider the effect on the local community. In fact, already the effects have been adversely felt across a larger community, namely the South East.

Local Community. An overloaded local community do not need the pressure of extra people, air and ground traffic, loss of amenity, noise pollution, air pollution, extra waste disposal, less green areas, nuisance levels and so on.

Gatwick make only pledges. Witness the so called Gatwick Noise Line.

The South East community do not need the air pollution, noise pollution and nuisance levels and will receive absolutely no benefits. How are we supposed to get around when the M23, M25, A22, A23 and local roads will be nothing more than car parks?

Gatwick have shown themselves to be very poor neighbours, even for people who live 20 plus miles away.

Your key statement...

"The Commission considers that without mitigation, the impact of Gatwick's Second Runway scheme on the Community objective would be ADVERSE. With the mitigation proposed the effect would be NEUTRAL, but more information on the secondary impacts of development is needed to be confident this is deliverable."

...is not relevant for Gatwick expansion. I also do not trust mitigation to happen for the local or entire South Eastern community as I believe Gatwick management are creative with the truth and do not have the money. I understand the Commission is expected to do the best for the United Kingdom not for investors in an airport that cannot manage itself and is not to be trusted as a community member.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Operational efficiency

These are based on false projections for the number of aircraft. I believe you must take into consideration what will happen if and when the Government start to tax Gatwick fairly and stop subsidising them. How will Gatwick operate if EasyJet relocate?

A statement from CAGNE (Communities Against Gatwick Noise Emissions):

"Gatwick is not seen as a business airport and there is no business case that this airport will be anything but a leisure airport. Airlines that have endeavoured to use Gatwick for business flights have repeatedly failed as it is not in London and does not have good links to London and the rest of the UK."

Very true, Gatwick is not aware of itself as being a small time operation. It is a small leisure airport not an international hub.

Also taking into consideration the NATS issues and regular engineering faults with aircraft I think it is time to rationalise Gatwick into what it is and not allow any expansion. This goes for the entire air industry; stabilisation not profit driven improvisation.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

Delivery

I do not believe that sufficient consultation has been made with the affected taxpayers of the South East (especially Kent and Sussex) to provide a safe choice of options.

The area cannot support a new town the size of Crawley; delivering this new town is not feasible.

Assumptions? PwC have shown that they are biased in favour of expanding the air industry as a means of providing wealth and for clients to use their services. I do not believe that they are capable of providing (nor is it their remit to provide) unbiased assumptions. They are wealth generators as witnessed in their PDF entitled "pwc-aviation-finance-fastern-your-seat-belts-pdf.pdf". This is nothing more than an prospectus for investors to spend their cash on PwC services. Why are they being asked to provide "Assumptions"?

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?

A key statement of your document:

"UK National planning guidance describes the role and value of sustainability appraisal as: an opportunity to consider ways by which the plan can contribute to improvements in environmental, social and economic conditions, as well as a means of identifying and mitigating any potential adverse effects that the plan might otherwise have. By doing so, it can help make sure that the proposals in the plan are the most appropriate."

You have failed to address the full scope of possible negative environmental impact on the entire South East. Huge areas of Hampshire, Kent, Surrey and Sussex have been left out of this commission that will be affected by an airport expansion. Gatwick ignores the impact aircraft noise has on rural communities.

You based the 3 options on a false economy as your advisers failed to consider the tax breaks Gatwick are currently getting. Also the economic dependency Gatwick has on a single airline, EasyJet.

You have failed to consider the effects that an imperfect NATS system may play in the years to come should any expansion be allowed. "One line of Code" and other disasters waiting to happen!

I believe you have incomplete information on the environmental effects that any expansion would cause.

I believe that, for Gatwick at least, there is no evidence to suggest that the local infrastructure can support any expansion. There is only one major road connection to Gatwick (M23) and that is already under severe pressure from time to time.

Gatwick is not big enough to support any further expansion and the area is overburdened already without adding to the mess. Ever tried to drive from East Grinstead to Crawley on the unimprovable, tiny B roads? Gatwick should be reduced not expanded; it is an overstretched little minded, poorly managed airport.

Here is something from CAGNE's site:

"New flight paths have been hidden in the supporting documents. It shows a route over areas never flown over before which when a similar route was trialled in during 2014 caused pure misery. Current routes will endure twice the amount of air traffic with 560,000 flights a year."

If the first "new flight paths" bit is true then, in my opinion, this is a national disgrace and shows that Gatwick Airport Ltd. are prepared to bend the truth.

I know the second "misery" part to be true and Gatwick do not listen. Even as I type there has been a steady stream of whining planes (all day), there are tens of thousands of people living around here. Not the misdirecting "empty fields" statement that Gatwick have made.

I also note that Gatwick sent flyers to homes in Kent extolling the virtues of their "operations". I also note that disaffected citizens forced Kent County Council to withdraw their support for Gatwick expansion. I do not know if the two events are related; I can only state my belief that people have come not to believe or read media puffs.

In order to make decisions of this magnitude there should be no unknowns and FULL consultation with all affected parties. Anyone deploying such a plan will run the risk of creating a lot of unhappy and ill people' from investors to taxpayers to business users and so on.

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?

The business case presented by the commission does not consider the full scope of economic impact including, but not limited to:

- * Gatwick Diamond do not provide any evidence of new businesses that will move to West Sussex.
- * There is no evidence of any businesses which would wish to move to an area already over-congested and too near a Leisure airport that cannot provide for business.
- * How on earth do Gatwick expect to raise the funds to build all the new infrastructure? Investors will be scared off by the prospects; for example the dependence on EasyJet. Oh, it's us the taxpayers. Well, I for one do not want to pay for such a hare-brained, no benefits scheme.
- * UK Health Services. The South East will be bombarded by noise and air pollution should expansion go ahead. The health impact has not been considered. Health must be considered in such an unhealthy proposal.
- * Failure to consider economic effects of altered and lower, noisy flights on businesses and individuals in the South East.
- * EasyJet are the major cash cow for Gatwick. With increased landing charges it is probably that EasyJet would leave Gatwick with a major loss of income for the airport.
- * Mistrust of Gatwick's real intentions based on a history of misdirection. I would hope that they do not fool you as well; like con-men they I believe will leave their victims in a mess whilst they make off with the dosh. I do not plan to be a victim and, as a taxpayer, I object to my money being used to generate misery under a (in my opinion) "dressed up" business model.

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 have shown no inclination to deal with either the local community or anyone in the South

East who does not meekly go away and hide. Just pledges.

There are many people who cannot make themselves heard in this consultancy because they are too frail or too poor to afford the internet. In other words they lack the means to communicate their pain. How do you proposed to reach out to these? Depend on pressure groups, people like me, local councils, on-side MPs and MEPs etc.?

Your commission has singularly failed these people in not communicating with them in a way that would allow them a voice. I find this undemocratic and unfair. Your first consultation did not reach out to the voters/citizens people of London, Kent, Surrey, Sussex, and Hampshire who have been severely affected by the recent disgraceful Gatwick/NATS P-RNAV. You have not asked even 50% of the people affected by these changes yet you choose to give them one option "Expand".

Gatwick have tried this expansion trick before and each time it has cost the taxpayers dearly. It is time for Gatwick to start paying their taxes and stop promoting cheap, noisy, polluting flights using money they should be paying taxes on. I think people should be for ever grateful to pressure groups such as GACC for helping to stop them each time.

Gatwick is obviously not the right choice and never will be unless UK taxpayers spend billions on a foreign investment. Of course, the casualties will not just be people but centuries old woodlands and ancient buildings. What I did not realise is that Gatwick owners are intending to sell the business sometime between 2018 and 2020. So much for long term investment.

Finally, the air industry in general (including Gatwick and Heathrow) needs to be optimised; I want us all to enjoy air travel at the inconvenience of as few people as possible. Out of control expansion is creating a Frankenstein system that will cause severe damage to the United Kingdom.

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

No Airports Selected.