

Airports Commission Second Runway at Gatwick Consultation

CAGNE Response

‘Sharing Gatwick information with residents of West Sussex’



Question 1 – What conclusions, if any, do you draw in respect of the three short-listed options? In answering this question please take into account the Commission’s consultation documents and any other information you consider relevant. The options are described in section three.

- The Airports Commission should be more critical of Gatwick’s statements and figures.
- Pollution, Carbon implications and the fact that London is already serviced by 5 international airports is missed
- Expanded Gatwick brings little benefit to the UK economy, will be a burden to local authorities and will cost the local residents in huge increases in council tax to pay for infrastructure to support an airport larger than Heathrow
- Is Gatwick in a financial position to provide the funding which is needed to build the new runway and pay for supporting infrastructure? It is very questionable whether they will ever deliver on a promise to build a new runway, as the current owners are planning to sell the airport in the near future.
- Gatwick are not trusted to ensure promises are fulfilled and legal agreements will not go far enough in securing the funding that will be required for infrastructure
- Infrastructure costs should be added to the price of Gatwick’s expansion as was the case with the Estuary airports as it is felt that the cost could be similar for Gatwick
- Heathrow has noise abatement procedures and works with communities over noise whereas Gatwick does not
- The Airports Commission should look outside of details provided by Gatwick and pay greater attention to the consequence on the surrounding, a factor seemingly being overlooked; why should there suddenly be funding when there has been a lack of funding of infrastructure in the county for years? Heathrow has the infrastructure already established and the workforce.

Question 2 – Do you have any suggestion for how the short-listed options could be improved i.e. their benefits enhanced or negative impacts mitigated? The options and their impacts are summarized in section three.

Gatwick should be removed as an option. There is no need for a new runway in the southeast as long as there are vacant runways to the north. Reduce carbon footprint and provide passengers with a better service by allowing them to fly locally and work locally.

Question 3 - Do you have any comments on how the Commission has carried out its appraisal? The appraisal process is summarized in section two.

- The information provided about noise is very hard for a layperson to understand. Concern is expressed about the impact noise will have on areas previously unaffected by aircraft noise as well as the increase that current routes will endure.
- Question should be asked about NATS plans for our skies and how they are seemingly not controlled by the CAA and are powered by the desire for greater profits with no consideration for the impact on residents.

- Aircraft have not yet been designed that will bring reduced noise to residents and should not factor into consideration at this stage. We note that at the Heathrow public hearings that the following is quoted and yet no mention of this is instigated for Gatwick where the surrounding noise is far lower than in Wandsworth, ie 30decibels vs 70 decibels at Wandsworth, and so aircraft noise is far more intrusive in rural areas than in urban areas.

"The CAA's own evidence to the Commission says that there is no perceptible improvement in noise between the latest aircraft types, such as the Boeing 787 and the A380, as they fly over Wandsworth. In real-world conditions, one is just as disturbing as the other. Our concern is the Commission is using computer-generated noise models which say that these new aircraft are quieter. The CAA's own evidence at Heathrow is showing that over Wandsworth there is actually little or no perceived benefit from the latest aircraft." (page 59)

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/386011/heathrow-area-transcript.pdf

and Sir Howard did pick up on this in his response :

"Sir Howard Davies - Thank you for those contributions, which raised a lot of interesting points for the promoters and some for the Commission. One or two of them were, I think, rather detailed, looking at the CAA modeling over Wandsworth, for example, which I have noted down as things that we need to give further thought to but I do not want to give an on-the-hoof response to those." (page 64)

- The noise contours provided do not show the REAL effect of the additional flight movements and the routes which will be introduced additionally to accommodate a 2nd runway. The Leq average is meaningless to peoples' appreciation and understanding what noise is. As a result, the general public has not been informed about the impact on their quality of life and their well-being, e.g. the fact that 2/3 of the Horsham population (of 60,000 people) will suffer from significant noise is mentioned nowhere in the document.
- Little is made of the three **new** departure flight paths over West Sussex and new two arrival routes. There is no compensation for loss of home value, quality of life, health risks and detrimental effect on all residents in a 20 mile radius of new routes.
- It does not take into account the true noise impact aircraft noise has on tranquil areas that surround Gatwick and the far-reaching affects suffered by aircraft noise due to Gatwick and that rural areas surround it.
- Homes will be less than 100 yards from the new airport boundary. The new development of Forge Wood will be 1 mile from the end of the runway and it has 2,500 new homes, a primary school and outdoor recreational areas that are not shown on any maps. There is also a new primary school planned for Manor Royal which will be next to the new runway. Children are badly affected by constant noise, especially those with special needs and one of the new routes off a new runway would go over a special needs school.
- Crawley is full and housing is expensive in the surrounding areas, this would mean large-scale building of affordable houses which all local authorities find difficult at present. This would full to surrounding areas of Gatwick as 1 in 5 that work at Heathrow live adjacent to the airport especially as detailed by the Commission, they will be low skilled. Crawley has a 40% shortfall in housing now.
- Apprenticeships in what if workers are to be low skilled? At present these go to Croydon not communities affected by Gatwick noise.
- Gatwick compensation does not cover the cost of insulating a whole house and the £1,000 off council tax for a few, does not equate to the drop in house value, health risks and loss of quality of life. There is no compensation for those that will be badly affected by new flight paths in Warnham, Rusper, Slinfold, Wisborough Green, Kirdford, Copthorne, Billingshurst, North Horsham, etc, etc.

Question 4 – In your view, are there any relevant factors that have not been fully addressed by the Commission to date?

- There are very little benefits for current residents of West Sussex. Our areas are valued on tranquility and surrounding countryside unlike London's inflated prices that are not affected by aircraft noise.

CAGNE

- There will be no compensation for any loss in the value of my home or for the impact on the quality of life for residents. Our areas are valued on tranquility and surrounding countryside unlike London's inflated prices that are not affected by aircraft noise.
To increase in flights from 250,000 to 560,000 per year will have a devastating effect on this rural area. Warnham will be not only over flown but will suffer SAM, indicative routes of ADNID and WIZAD so no respite from noise as the noise shadows will almost join. ADNID was bad but the new runway will be 1km closer to the parish, going from no aircraft noise to continuous as well as new arrivals. Rusper does not even feature in the noise contours. There are no benefits for these residents and it will devalue an historic village that has always had a premium property house price due to its traditional features and conservation area. ADNID will go over a special needs school as well as three primary schools not flown over before. Schools do not have insulation or air conditioning to protect them from noise or pollution. Most of these schools have outside classrooms as they are in rural locations which they would not be able to use. The new runway will be used by low cost planes i.e. EasyJet, etc and they produce the most pollution and noise.
- Health – Night flights are detrimental for health and Gatwick encourages night flights by charging very low, if any, landing fees. Night flights should be more expensive and there should be as few as possible.
- In rural areas, nighttime noise is very low (less than 30decibels). Night flights are therefore far more intrusive than those in an urban area (where there is more background noise). They will therefore have a greater impact on people's sleep, health and productivity.
- Gatwick will affect more new people than Heathrow and Gatwick will affect twice the population of Greater London
- New flight paths over areas not previous impacted by aircraft noise will endure noise day and night. Gatwick will cause urbanisation of West Sussex leading to the devaluation of vast swathes of areas that are currently buoyant, successful, and nice places to live as rural homes are valued on tranquility and countryside.
- The increase of those affected by aircraft noise (stated as 30,000) does not include those living in rural areas beyond the 57leq noise contour. Rural areas are far more affected by aircraft noise than urban areas.
- Little is made of the damage to local ecosystems and habitats, many of which are unique and irreplaceable.
- Traffic increases – our roads and country lanes are already congested.
- There seems to be no consideration for the knock on effects and increases in road users from mass housing (1 in 5 that work at Heathrow live adjacent to the airport) and industrial parks, and airport users endeavoring to avoid congested main roads (an estimated increase of 100,000 vehicles a day)
- Gatwick can never be used to full capacity because the proposed second runway will be too close to the first. The new southern runway will be noisier as it will take all the bigger planes affecting many people who have not experienced aircraft noise before. The CAA raises safety concerns for dual mode on both runways as the parallel runways are too close and thus maximum capacity will not be reached.
- How will the single railway line deal with 90,000 extra travellers in the Gatwick area? These should NOT be a burden to the already overcrowded commuter trains and overcrowded stations. According to the Department for Transport, a new railway line would have to be built to serve an increased flight volume to and from Gatwick as well as new platforms at London stations. There is no proposal to do this.
- No mention of freight being low at present at Gatwick unlike Heathrow, nor that increase in freight would result in huge increases in warehousing in the area, land take and large vehicle movement on the roads around West Sussex.
- Crossrail investment of £14b to build has better connections from Heathrow, surely Heathrow will maximize the investment already made in Crossrail whereas Gatwick has no direct connection to Crossrail.
- HS2 phase 1 will cost around £22b surely it is better to build the south north connection via Heathrow and enable business to travel north with east and maximise the investment in HS2. Gatwick is not connected to HS2 and thus will not assist with taking business, and so jobs, north. Gatwick is the wrong side of London.
- The modest rail improvements proposed are made on the basis of being funded from increases to the rail carriers' profit. This will mean large fare increases for commuters as well as over crowding. For example - <http://www.itv.com/news/meridian/update/2014-12-19/rail-woe-for-gatwick-travellers/>
The infrastructure costs for Gatwick has not been accessed and no comparison has been drawn to the lack of new infrastructure that would be needed.
- Little has been undertaken in climate change studies especially in an area that has good air quality and environmental surrounds which all contribute to air quality. To remove nature and its habitat is detrimental to the environment, both land and in air quality.

- No inclusion of new workers family vehicles adding to the huge increase in pollution from vehicles on main and secondary roads, Horley, Three Bridges, Pound Hill and Northgate already have issues with pollution from the roads.
- Climate change act would force regional airports to reduce capacity to allow a new runway to be used to full capacity in the southeast, creating greater unemployment at regional airports as well as being which is counter to CCC and IPCC assertions. See **

Question 5 – Do you have any comments on how the Commission has carried out its appraisal of specific topics (as defined by the commission’s 16 appraisal modules), including methodology and results?

- Airports Commission has recognised that Gatwick has a noise problem and that Gatwick has ignored the impact aircraft noise has on rural communities.
- 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 trialed in during 2014 caused pure misery. Current routes will endure twice the amount of air traffic with 560,000 flights a year.
- Little is made of that aircraft noise has a far greater impact on rural areas/ quality of life, than in urban areas.
- There is no research into the impact concentrated routes have on the health of those living below.
- Why does the Airport Commission believe Gatwick, larger than Heathrow, can cope with one road in and out of Gatwick (the M23) and one railway in and out of Gatwick will cope with passengers and workers when Heathrow has an extensive road and rail network? Gatwick is current accessed 56% by road.
- The Commission has made little of the impact Gatwick expansion will have on the environment and impact on the rural areas of West Sussex and beyond.
- No details of the land take that would be required for additional schools in the area of Gatwick
- Little is made of the lack of hospitals and schools that we already suffer nor the impact-increased pollution from aircraft and road users will have on residents and pupils health.
- The terminals are on the wrong side and would force airlines to cross the runway. The dual mode will not work, as planes landing on the north runway will have to cross to take off from the south runway and visa versa. The passenger railway will have a visual impact and passengers will have to change trains.

Question 6 – Do you have any comments on the Commission’s sustainability assessments, including methodology and results?

- Gatwick is currently sustainable but to expand it would be unsustainable, as surrounding areas have suffered years of lack of investment in infrastructure and already struggle with the projected growth in population.
- AC calculations suggest that more houses are required at Heathrow than the forecast at Gatwick and yet Heathrow have a ready made transport system and housing available for staff.
- The Gatwick area and surrounding areas have very low unemployment, and what is proposed will for current residents cause a mass inward migration of workers to an area that already has issues with finding affordable housing, schooling, medical care and facilities at present.
- The infrastructure cost are underestimated, Department for Transport say the cost of widening 1 mile of motorway is £10 million; the M25 is already congested; the M23 reduces to a single lane into Croydon; the M23 will be at full capacity by 2030; trains are already overcrowded and subject to daily disruption. Cost for schools and other local infrastructure would also have to be taken into account.
- How can you build new infrastructure when there is no vacant land?
- Gatwick’s offer to assist with a new hospital is seen as a ‘white herring’ as they only offer £45.6m for all of the southeast and a new hospital would cost £400-600m. We believe that there will be one pot of money and it will not go far for all the needs of the southeast that Gatwick will affect.
- Gatwick spends much time in Wandsworth and Croydon promoting Gatwick as a source of jobs; where are the jobs for those on the coast now or the apprenticeships?
- The financial benefits to the UK are much lower than at Heathrow; we have to question the billions therefore that would be required to invest in the infrastructure around Gatwick and throughout the southeast to support an airport larger than Heathrow. This does not seem like sound economics of the public purse nor moral, as Gatwick pays no corporation tax.

- Flooding – the River Mole is a flash river and any changes to its routes will cause issues further down stream. It would seem that the taxpayer is having to pick up the bill for this, eg Dorking, as Gatwick seeks only to deal with flood risk to benefit them by pumping more water into the River Mole.
- CAGNE do not believe it is the role of the Airports Commission to ascertain what would happen to an area if the airport were not to expand. We believe this cannot provide extensive knowledge or research and thus will not be factual enough and should not be undertaken by the AC.

Question 7 – Do you have any comments on the Commission’s business cases, including the methodology and results?

- Business travel is on the decline given increased use of technology as an alternative to travel. The forecasts used are unrealistic
- For every 3 passengers flying out of the UK, Gatwick only brings 1 passenger flying into the UK to spend money here, Gatwick export 71.2% of passengers annually – Gatwick is a major exporter of funds from this country
- Building a new runway in the south east widens the gap of the north south divide. Take jobs to those unemployed north of the M25 and take new business north where it is needed as the south east is already overcrowded and can not continue to withstand mass housing nor support the north financially
- Gatwick has only one major revenue stream – Easy jet. If increased landing charges were to cause Easy jet to partially re-locate to another airport, Gatwick would be critically injured and the business case for expansion would collapse.
- British Airways CEO says Gatwick has no business case. Airlines do not want Gatwick - 30 airlines are in the queue waiting to use Heathrow, and **none** of those choose to use Gatwick now. (Note the news that Vietnam Air decided 2 weeks ago to move from Gatwick to Heathrow)
- There are no guarantees that businesses will be able to compete and will be forced out of the area due to increases in office and warehousing costs.
- There is no business case; there are no guarantees that new businesses will be attracted to a congested area with a shortage of quality staff and housing shortfall as well as poor quality of life for staff and their families.
- Vietnam airline has pulled out of Gatwick 2015 and relocated to Heathrow because they cannot make routes work financially and yet China has invested in Manchester airport and fly direct to China and Emirates fly more planes out of northern airports than Gatwick.
- Gatwick is located on the wrong side of London with poor connections and does not work for passengers or long-haul airlines
- Heathrow has the warehousing, office space and infrastructure to support businesses associated/ that need to be close to an airport whereas Gatwick does not
- What will happen if there is not the increase in passenger numbers or airlines wanting to use an expanded Gatwick? Gatwick will be saddled with enormous debt and therefore passengers may expect fares to rise by a factor of three or four times. Will Gatwick off shore owners find a buyer willing to take on the debt of expansion?
- Gatwick should adopt no night flights the same as Heathrow.
- There is no guarantee that the 286 businesses demolished to make way for a new runway would be relocated in West Sussex; there is no guarantee business rates will continue to go to local authorities; there is no guarantee that businesses will want to move to an area congested, overcrowded, with a shortage of staff, has direct access to London and plagued by gridlock on the M25/ M23.
- We suggest that the infrastructure required will cost less than putting the M25 in a tunnel at Heathrow.
- Should billions of tax payers money be invested in the infrastructure for an airport that can never be the future for this country’s economic growth as cheap flights do not bring economic benefits for the local communities nor the country?
- Gatwick can not accommodate the 286 including the new HQ of Nestle with land and these businesses are uneasy about Gatwick being their landlord.
- Gatwick as a member of the Gatwick Diamond Business Association has an obvious interest to convince other businesses to support the second runway bid. But not all local businesses can see an advantage in having an airport serving leisure destinations in close proximity and see Gatwick as a burden on local work force, already struggling to find staff, and find Gatwick has a detrimental influence on salary structures that other business cannot compete with.

- Gatwick Diamond has not provided any evidence of new businesses that will move to West Sussex.
- Can Gatwick actually raise funds to build a new runway, terminal and monorail, and how will this affect passenger prices and landing fees?
- Ramifications for Gatwick biggest customer - EasyJet, 18.36m departing and arriving scheduled seats, and yet they do not want a 2nd runway at Gatwick, why?
- For every 12 jobs created in the South East, 1 job has been created in the rest of England over the last 4 years. Unemployment is in the north and thus any public purse should be spent to deal with this unemployment instead of forcing residents to migrate for work.

Question 8 - Do you have any other comments?

- **No new runway at Gatwick Airport and no new flight paths!**
- Gatwick is in the wrong place. It is surrounded by numerous designated Areas of Natural Beauty (AONB), has relatively poor connections to the rest of the UK and is under Heathrow's flight paths.
- Billions of taxpayer's money will be required in the concreting over of rural areas to provide the infrastructure needed to support an enlarged Gatwick – an airport that will become larger than Heathrow is today. This will involve the destruction of ancient woodland and the demolition of listed buildings
- Should billions from the public purse be spent on an off shore owned airport? Is it not immoral to spend UK taxes on a company looking to sell its investment in 2019?
- Can Gatwick afford to build a new runway, terminal, mono railway from day one, how much will that cost the passenger on top of landing fees, and will EasyJet relocate?
- No costing's for affects to climate change and the carbon footprint a new runway will cost to the planet.
- No costing's to health implications from the added pollution from aircraft movements and huge increase in traffic in the region that will lead to health problems for the young and old.
- Pollution from roads and the extra vehicles that new workers families will bring have not been included in calculations or the effect these and passenger/ workers traffic/ freight will have on the air quality in and around the airport. The knock on effect it will have on other roads in West Sussex, Surrey and Kent as they are crammed full of people from the 14 counties that you suggest are meant to be accessing the airport to work as well as passengers. FYI Pound Hill, Northgate, Three Bridges already have issues with air quality as does Storrington due to out dated road systems, and the stop start of congested traffic
- The Brighton to London railway line is already at capacity in the number of trains that move along the lines that is an issue for current businesses in the area. The rail operators already refuse to place more trains on the track due to rail congestion at London and Croydon. A whole new line would be needed to accommodate Gatwick and this is not in any budgets nor is new platforms at Victoria and London Bridge. The current improvements are for the current growth, not Gatwick.

Thank you

CAGNE

www.cagne.org

'Sharing Gatwick information with the residents of West Sussex'

**** CAGNE** would also like to add support to the following findings-

<http://www.aef.org.uk/2015/01/20/carbon-gap-airports-commissions-new-runway/>

The carbon gap in the Airports Commission's new runway analysis

Filed in [Airports](#), [Climate Change](#), [News from the AEF](#)

Tagged as [airport expansion](#), [Airports Commission](#), [appraisal](#), [Committee on Climate Change](#), [runway](#)

Jan 20 2015

A key issue in the airport expansion debate is whether or not a new runway would be compatible with national climate change commitments. The Airports Commission gives the impression that the issue has been fully considered, but in fact a number of questions remain to be answered.

We have three major concerns about the Commission's approach to analysing the climate change implications of airport expansion. Below each issue we have given our recommendations of what the Airports Commission needs to do before publishing its final report. We would urge everybody responding to the Airports Commission's [consultation](#), which closes on the 3rd February, to include our three recommendations in their response to questions 4, 5 or 6.

Issue one: Forecasts

The Airports Commission has produced its own forecasts of carbon dioxide emissions from aviation that are lower than official forecasts from the Department for Transport.

No explanation has been provided for the discrepancy, which applies both to national level forecasts of aviation and to the anticipated (no new runway) '[baseline](#)' emissions for Heathrow and Gatwick. As a result, we are concerned about the reliability of the Commission's forecasts of emissions from a new runway.

What the Airports Commission should do: Explain why its CO2 emissions forecasts are lower than the Government's latest forecasts, what assumptions are made and how sensitive to the results are to them

Issue two: Policies to reduce emissions

Even with lower emissions forecasts, the Airports Commission's own work has shown that building a new runway would be inconsistent with UK climate change commitments unless new, unspecified action was taken by Government to cap aviation emissions.

The sustainability assessment for each short-listed scheme predicts that national aviation emissions would be higher than the level consistent with the Climate Change Act if the runway scheme proceeds, even if aviation is included in a carbon trading scheme.

The Commission has claimed that working out what additional policy action would be needed to limit emissions ([new taxes](#) or [planning restrictions on other airports](#), for example) is outside its remit, as is, indeed, assessing the likelihood that even carbon trading policies will be successfully extended to cover aviation.

CAGNE

What the Airports Commission should do: Set out in meaningful detail what policy developments would be required in order to limit emissions to the aviation cap while building new capacity

Issue three: Economic analysis

The economic analysis of the shortlisted expansion options does not include the economic costs of restraining greenhouse gas emissions from UK aviation to a level compatible with the Climate Change Act.

The Committee on Climate Change, the Government's official climate advisers, told the Airports Commission in an open [letter](#) in 2013:

“Given the need to limit aviation demand growth in a carbon constrained world, we recommend that this should be reflected in your economic analysis of alternative investments. For example, for each investment, you should assess whether this would make sense if demand growth were to be limited to 60% by 2050.”

The Commission has not completed this analysis, citing technical difficulties and the fact that the carbon component (costs associated with restraining emissions) “would dominate the capacity appraisals”. The Airports Commission's estimates of the economic benefits that would arise from each its shortlisted schemes are therefore misleadingly high. The admittance by the Airports Commission that it has not included the ‘carbon costs’ in its economic analysis is in a paragraph on page 25 of the consultation document.

What the Airports Commission should do: Fully include the economy-wide cost of keeping national aviation emissions to within 37.5 Mt in its cost benefit analyses, in line with the recommendations of the Committee on Climate Change. This analysis should be presented prominently in the final report.

CAGNE

www.cagne.org