

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

I have looked into the Gatwick proposal in great detail, including attending the Airports Commission Consultation Gatwick Area Drop In Session at the Arora Hotel on 16 December 2014 which was very informative. I conclude that building the 2nd runway at Gatwick would be a disaster for the local area. I also do not think it makes sense from an aviation view or economic view.

I have not looked at the Heathrow options in as much detail. Although, I would not wish misery on the neighbourhoods affected, as far as business and aviation needs are concerned, either of the Heathrow options would be preferable to Gatwick.

**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?**

All these comments relate to Gatwick:

The trouble is the negative impacts would be huge because of the scale of expansion GAL are proposing. Although, the number of new passengers/flights won't be maximised overnight that is what is being proposed and that is what needs to be planned for.

The option would be improved if the proposal was scaled back in size significantly.

The option would be improved if proper consideration was given into how to develop the roads and railways to be able to cope with the increase. This should be done before development and not just be tax payer money, GAL should contribute significantly.

The option would be improved if the need for housing was addressed.

The option would be improved if it planned for the certain strain on local services, schools, hospitals etc. The nearest A&E is at East Surrey or Brighton both overly stretched at the moment. Again, this should not just be tax payer money, GAL should

contribute significantly.

The option would be improved if the runway was sited further away from built up areas of housing.

The option would be improved if as much as possible could be done to reduce noise to the surrounding neighbourhoods.

The option would be improved if the proposed flight paths did not go over areas of housing. Areas that have been previously unaffected or affected to a much lesser degree would be subjected to a totally unacceptable level of noise. Many people have chosen their homes because of the rural tranquillity.

The option would be improved if GAL offered reasonable compensation. Money towards double glazing and £1000 off council tax is not reasonable. GAL should offer to buy homes most affected at the market rate (before blight) and, if this option were chosen, it should be possible at that time and not only when development has started. Most people would prefer not to have to leave their homes but at least it would give them the choice.

The option would be made better if all promises were made to be legally binding.

**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?**

I feel that the Commission is conducting the appraisal in a professional way.

I cannot say the same of GAL, who are spending huge amounts on advertising propaganda and patronising the people who will be adversely affected by their proposal. For example, Stewart Wingate says 'our responsibility to ensure that we continue to minimise our impacts, including keeping noise to a minimum.' However, GAL encourage more noise at night by not charging landing fees for night flights.

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

I think it is wrong to have short listed these 3 options.

The South is hugely overdeveloped, whereas the North would welcome some investment and

connectivity.

Even, if we are saying the capacity has to be in the South, why not consider enhancing the airports to the North of London e.g. Stanstead and Luton these are both underused airports. There is also capacity at other Southern regional airports e.g. Southend and now Lydd. In fact Gatwick still has 30% capacity, it's only Heathrow that is full.

Also, will air traffic actually increase? Do we need extra capacity? There are many arguments to say we don't.

**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?**

**Delivery**

Strategic fit:

2 runways at Gatwick and 2 runways at Heathrow would create 2 half hubs linked by the M25. This would increase traffic and pollution with little gain for the locality. 70% of the population of England and Wales would be within a 2 hour rail journey of Heathrow – the equivalent figure for Gatwick is 35%. Expanding Gatwick would increase the north-south divide.

Major airlines support expansion at Heathrow and do not want to transfer to Gatwick. British Airways has expressed a definite preference for expansion at Heathrow. Delta Air Lines / Virgin Atlantic have said they would not shift services from Heathrow even if Gatwick won the fight for expansion. Even EasyJet, the biggest airline operating from Gatwick, have questioned the case for a new runway at Gatwick airport and said they may reconsider using Gatwick if the cost of a 2nd runway increases airport charges.

There is still capacity at other airports (e.g. Stanstead and Luton ) so, even with a 2nd runway, it is not guaranteed that Gatwick will get a significant increase in flights, especially as the cost of building a new runway would have to be paid for by Gatwick passengers, increasing the cost of flying from Gatwick.

Without a 2nd runway and with 30% capacity remaining, Gatwick can continue to expand for the next 20 years. Airlines that do not require an expensive hub and wish to keep costs down will continue to use Gatwick. It would become the natural place to accommodate additional low-cost demand over the longer term should Heathrow expand. Should Gatwick have to raise charges to build a second runway, Stansted could ramp up competitive pressure in providing cheaper flights.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

## **Local economy impacts**

Local economy impacts:

There are no real benefits to Crawley, only a huge environmental cost.

The Gatwick proposal would be bad for local business. Unemployment in the area is low (Crawley 1.8%) so businesses would find it hard to fill vacancies locally. Gatwick has already been in talks with South London boroughs and seems to have earmarked Croydon as its source for apprenticeships. Most the jobs will go to people who have to either relocate or travel some distance to the airport.

The roads and railways would be congested making commuting and work related journeys slow and expensive.

A number of local businesses would be forced out of their premises as GAL would have to acquire the land

250 Manor Royal business units would be demolished. What happens to those businesses? Road access to Manor Royal would be reduced due to road changes.

A 2nd runway will affect everyone in Crawley. Crawley will become congested and polluted. Most new jobs and economic benefits will go to workers and businesses outside Crawley. Most new local jobs will be low skilled and low wage.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

## **Noise**

Noise:

Noise would be a major concern

noise nuisance will be doubled or more. The noise generated by the Gatwick option affects a much wider area than the options at Heathrow.

There will be a large increase in the number of houses (and schools) that will be seriously affected by noise. Many of the houses that are today just outside the 54 decibel boundary will be within the belt where noise will exceed 57 decibels. 55 decibels is recognised as "serious annoyance".

4,100 homes around the airport are expected to qualify for £1,000 annual handout against the council tax payments and as for the noise pollution the compensation offer is to fund sound

insulation in homes (£3,000 towards the cost of double glazing and loft insulation). Extra insulation will not make it possible for residents to be able to enjoy the outdoors or have windows open in the house. Personally, we struggle to imagine living like this. The quality of life will be ruined for many people.

More houses are being built now in the Crawley North East sector, Forge Wood, these have been overlooked in the many of the figures. Additionally, there are proposed developments on the West side of Copthorne, again these homes have not been included.

The new runway would bring planes 1km closer to Crawley and the surrounding neighbourhoods and therefore the noise from planes using the new runway will affect more people than the planes that will continue to use the existing runway. So, even with no extra capacity, the new runway would have a negative effect on many more people. Additionally, if both runways are in operation, that is the noise of two planes taking off, not one.

The noise figures being presented are predicted levels for 2040 and assume that planes will be significantly quieter by then. This is a big assumption. Even if planes get quieter, what happens until those quieter planes are operating?

Aircraft noise is much more intrusive in rural and semi-rural settings where there is low background noise.

Many towns and villages could have their present peace shattered. With changes to the way flight paths were managed this year, a lot of people have been exposed to either new or increased noise disturbance. They, understandably, do not like it and have complained. If a 2nd runway is built at Gatwick, many areas will be subjected to much more noise. Flight paths can change, so assuming an area won't be affected is short sighted.

For the people affected by noise, it doesn't matter if it is 10,1000 or a 1000000 people affected we wouldn't say it's OK to torture 10 people but not 1000! The number is only significant in terms of the money needed to compensate these people and that should be legal, transparent, up-front and the expense borne by the airport.

Even as a single runway, Gatwick is allowed many more night flights than Heathrow. Heathrow makes attempts to be a 'good neighbour' something Gatwick claims to be but is obviously not. At Heathrow, there are no scheduled departures between 11pm-6am and flights scheduled to land 4.30am-6am can't land before 4.30am. Gatwick encourage night flights.

The WHO's 2009 Night Noise Guidelines state that "above 55dB L<sub>night</sub>, the situation is considered increasingly dangerous for public health."

If Gatwick were chosen night flights should be eliminated. If this greater control is possible at

Heathrow then it would be possible at Gatwick and the extra capacity offered by the 2nd runway would ensure that it would be possible.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

**Biodiversity**

Biodiversity:

The scale of the expansion is vast and the consequences would be felt throughout the county. The 2nd runway would create widespread urbanization of the County and would incur the loss of precious green space.

Pollution falls on the Ashdown Forest, but it is certainly having a huge adverse effect on the flora and fauna. The Forest can't be moved. The doubling of flights from the 2nd Runway proposal would double the problem and ultimately destroy the Forest.

Additionally, much woodland including ancient woodland would be destroyed.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

**Water and flood risk**

Water and flood risk:

There doesn't seem to be a lot of certainty about this but paving over any large area is going to have a pretty big impact.

We have had floods in this area. Last year after the heavy rains, many people in the area lived on 'islands'

water too deep for normal cars. Increased lack of natural drainage by the building of the runway, terminal, extra houses etc is only going to make the problem a lot worse. NB We (and Gatwick) have been on flood alert for the last couple of days after heavy rain.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

## **Quality of life**

Quality of life:

Obviously noise, transport, lack of green spaces would be hugely detrimental to quality of life (discussed under relevant sections).

How will amenities such as schools, doctors' surgeries and hospitals be able to cope with the influx of new workers? There is no major A&E department between East Surrey and Brighton. There are no quick links to either of these e.g. M23 access to East Surrey.

Everything would become too busy  
doctors, hospitals, schools etc. People have chosen to live in this area for it's relative tranquillity. A lifestyle that might be expected in London is not what people want here.

A new runway and a huge new terminal at Gatwick would make Gatwick larger than Heathrow and alter the character of Sussex, Surrey and Kent forever. The quality of life will deteriorate hugely. There will be an increase in air and noise pollution and a loss of green spaces. We all owe it to future generations to help protect our beautiful countryside and our historic towns and villages.

Several research studies have found that dying from a heart attack is more common among people with increased exposure to aircraft noise. A study carried out by Matthias Egger of the University of Bern found that people exposed to a daily average of at least 60 decibels of noise had a 30 per cent greater risk of dying from a heart attack compared with those exposed to less than 45 decibels. (The report was published in the journal Epidemiology). Those exposed to the higher decibel levels for 15 or more years, had a risk 50 per cent higher.

Another study, funded by the European Commission and led by researchers from Imperial College London, examined 4,712 people who had been living near airports in six European countries, including the UK, for at least five years. This study concluded that living under a flight path for more than 20 years can raise the risk of heart disease and stroke due to the disruptive effects of night-time noise, a new study suggests. The researchers found that for every 10 decibels of aircraft noise exposure on an average night, the risk of developing either of the conditions increases by 25 per cent.

Noise pollution and air pollution affect health. Gatwick has flights throughout the night.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

**Cost and commercial viability**

Cost and commercial viability:

Major airlines support expansion at Heathrow and do not want to transfer to Gatwick. British Airways has expressed a definite preference for expansion at Heathrow. Delta Air Lines / Virgin Atlantic have said they would not shift services from Heathrow even if Gatwick won the fight for expansion. Even EasyJet, the biggest airline operating from Gatwick, have questioned the case for a new runway at Gatwick airport and said they may reconsider using Gatwick if the cost of a 2nd runway increases airport charges.

There is still capacity at other airports (e.g. Stanstead and Luton ) so, even with a 2nd runway, it is not guaranteed that Gatwick will get a significant increase in flights, especially as the cost of building a new runway would have to be paid for by Gatwick passengers, increasing the cost of flying from Gatwick.

The necessary infrastructure costs do not seem to have been factored in. It is 'assumed' that the government will pay for these at some point in the future.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

### **Operational risk**

Operational risk:

The runways are only just far enough apart to be able to operate at the same time in mixed mode. Is it safe? What about strong cross winds? Also, presumably this would mean the planes have to maintain as fixed path as possible

bad news for anyone living underneath because there would be no respite.

What about aborted landings? Where do they go? The current path used by these would be the main flight departure route.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

### **Economy impacts**

Economy impacts:

Major businesses across the country support a hub airport at Heathrow and do not choose



Gatwick for expansion.

There are no real benefits to the local area, only a huge environmental cost. Most new jobs and economic benefits will go to workers and businesses outside the area.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

#### **Surface access**

Surface access:

There will be a dramatic increase in the number of people travelling: 55 million extra airport passengers per year, plus all the people commuting to work. The Brighton to London rail line is one of the busiest commuter lines in the country, currently trains run pretty much full 06:30 to 10:00 and 16:00 to 20:00. Upgrades are needed to be able to cope with existing capacity. Also, Clapham Junction and East Croydon are bottlenecks that need to be addressed whether or not Gatwick doubles its capacity.

For residents in many areas of West Sussex, buses are infrequent and inadequate for most work journeys and there are very few safe cycle routes even to the nearest station. West Sussex residents generally commute to work by road or rail. The extra congestion will adversely affect these journeys.

The Howard Davies Commission has looked into how busy the roads are. What is shocking is that a problem is only perceived to exist when the roads are congested to a point most people would call unacceptable. Transport models assume that motorway traffic is satisfactory as long as it is moving even if the speed is very slow (anything above zero mph). 100% capacity is when more traffic is entering a road than leaving it. 85% capacity is the point when people will start to look for alternative routes. To date, they have only considered the main routes (M23/25 and A23) and have not considered the feeder roads.

To decide if Gatwick is chosen, the Howard Davies Commission is making big assumptions that the government will be improving transport but how can this be sensible given how limited public finances are (with cuts to education, health and policing all deemed essential). The Commission are assuming government will fund transport infrastructure improvements, for example where train lines between Gatwick and London avoid bottlenecks by the construction of 'bridged' lines; this would be a very expensive improvement. The estimated financial cost of the 2nd runway at Gatwick does not include the cost of any of the transport changes, as the Commission argue that these improvements are being planned anyway, funded by the Government. Even if the Government can afford it, they will only make changes as the need arises. Therefore, there will be a problem before a "full" solution is put into place. A "full" solution will take time and be dependent on money available. In the meantime we will all have to suffer congestion and lengthy journeys. Additionally, the Commission stated that they are only looking at North-South traffic as they are assuming this is where the demand will be; there is to be no provision for East-West traffic. The

East-West travel options are limited served by a cross country rail branch line at Redhill or road journeys carried on the M25. The latter needs the planned investment just to remain viable.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

**Air quality**

Air quality:

With the expanded airport handling more than double the flights a year (rising from 250,000 to 560,000) there will be increased air pollution. Add to that the pollution generated by the surface transport systems to carry these extra passengers

the areas surrounding the airport will be heavily affected.

Recently the government has advised against siting schools next to polluted areas. Many schools will be affected by the increase in air pollution from the increased aircraft and the increased road traffic.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

**Carbon**

Carbon:

Assuming this refers to climate change? A new runway will add the problem greatly. Should we be building a new runway?

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

Gatwick Second Runway

**Place**

Place:

I live in Copthorne. Despite being close to the airport, at the moment Copthorne isn't overly noisy.

(We do expect some noise being so close). Copthorne has about 2,000 existing residences. In the very near future this will increase significantly. Planning permission has been given to St Modwen for 500 more residences and a new school. Wates are applying for permission to build a further 46 new homes.

As the crow flies, the 2nd runway will be less than 3 km from Copthorne and the proposed 2nd Runway Flight Path will take flights directly over Copthorne. There will be aircraft taking off and landing every 60 seconds (sometimes less) and flying at 1,500 -2,500 feet above residences? Unlike other UK airports, there are flights all through the night too. Copthorne has to be the most seriously affected populated area to the east of the airport yet Copthorne has been consistently overlooked and ignored by GAL.

The 2nd runway at Gatwick would devastate Copthorne and ruin the quality of life currently enjoyed by its residents.

GAL says they will need to buy 165 homes which would be within the boundary of the expanded airport. Nobody wants houses pulled down, but the 2nd Runway flightpath means many more houses will be severely blighted. Arguably the blight impacts are already being felt. If Howard Davies decides that Gatwick should have a 2nd runway, there will be a, possibly lengthy, period while the Government makes a decision. Blight incurred before a government decision hasn't been raised as an issue but it could have a huge negative impact on the neighbourhoods surrounding the airport. Additionally, any compensation offered by GAL would not be accessible until the new runway is up and running.

Blight needs to be addressed by the Government and compensation offered as soon as an airport is selected for expansion.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

### **Community**

Community:

The area would change enormously. Many workers moving into the area, the blight on houses and long established residents trying to move out would destroy communities.

Langley Green, an area most affected, has a high level of social housing. These people will not be

able to move away from the noise and pollution. Langley Green is also one of Crawley's neighbourhoods with the highest concentrations of various ethnic groups. In 2008, the Government was forced to review the impact of Heathrow airport expansion on local ethnic minority communities following a legal challenge from Hounslow Race Equality Council. The Airports Commission itself state that any proposal should 'reduce or avoid disproportionate impacts on any social group'.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

**Operational efficiency**

Operational efficiency:

It looks like the siting of the new terminal between the runways along with the plan for the north runway to fly north and the south to fly south could reduce operational efficiency. What happens when a plane arrives from the south but is then on a northerly departure for example? How do the airlines feel about this? Also the people, getting people between the two terminals is complicated by this design.

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

Gatwick Second Runway

**Delivery**

Delivery:

Can we trust GAL? They are owned by a consortium who are seeking to maximise the value of their business, they are not committed to long term management of the Airport. They show little regard to their 'neighbours'. We would need legal agreements.

**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?**

As there is low unemployment in the area, jobs will be filled by migration into the area. This is not an economic benefit. An economic benefit would be to create jobs where people are unemployed.

Also, it would make the area far too reliant on the aviation industry. Sheffield relied on steel, Tyneside relied on the docks....

**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?**

Major airlines support expansion at Heathrow and do not want to transfer to Gatwick. British Airways has expressed a definite preference for expansion at Heathrow. Delta Air Lines / Virgin Atlantic have said they would not shift services from Heathrow even if Gatwick won the fight for expansion. Even EasyJet, the biggest airline operating from Gatwick, have questioned the case for a new runway at Gatwick airport and said they may reconsider using Gatwick if the cost of a 2nd runway increases airport charges. In the last few days, Vietnam Airlines have switched routes from Gatwick to Heathrow.

There is still capacity at other airports (e.g. Stanstead and Luton ) so, even with a 2nd runway, it is not guaranteed that Gatwick will get a significant increase in flights, especially as the cost of building a new runway would have to be paid for by Gatwick passengers, increasing the cost of flying from Gatwick.

GAL do not pay corporation tax. Shouldn't we be investing in a company that gives something back to the country it is using?

The proposal only makes commercial sense for its owners.

**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

**Q8 Do you have any other comments?**

We hope that you carefully consider these points.

A second runway at Gatwick would have devastating consequences for the whole of the area.

We sincerely hope you do not recommend Gatwick for expansion.

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

No Airports Selected.