

[REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**One's Enough, Crawley's Anti 2<sup>nd</sup> Runway Campaign**  
**Written Submission to the Airports Commission Consultation**

**Prepared and submitted on behalf of One's Enough 28<sup>th</sup> January 2015**

**One's Enough has a membership of over 350 residents from across Crawley and neighbouring villages.**

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

- The proposed expansion, making Gatwick bigger than Heathrow and potentially as big as any airport in the world is totally unacceptable.
- Crawley was built in the 1950's for mainly Londoners to move out of urbanised, congested and polluted suburbs of London, to a healthier and greener environment with diverse industries and employment. The Gatwick expansion proposal will totally destroy that concept.
- The proposed new runway will be under 2 miles from Crawley Town Centre and a few hundred metres from large residential areas. This is totally unacceptable.
- The expansion will bring increased noise and air pollution, 40,000 projected new homes, increased road and rail traffic, loss of green space, lack of schools / hospitals / doctors / community services, etc. will totally destroy the environment that all Crawley residents cherish.
- The town and surrounding area and most of Sussex and the South East will become heavily urbanised, polluted and congested with the many health and social issues seen across the country's most urbanised areas.
- Whilst Crawley residents do not suffer the noise issues that those to the East and West of the airport do, GAL's own statistics show a marked increase in complaints from Crawley residents, even in the far south of the town.

- The only and main access route into Crawley from the M23 and the east, Crawley Avenue is already a “pollution hot spot” which can only get worse with access via Radford Road to Manor Royal being closed as proposed by GAL, and vast a increase of traffic using this route.
- Crawley’s housing, schooling, roads, social and health care (the town has a high incidence level of respiratory problems) requirements, and the main Brighton line, either cannot be met or are already at/or over capacity.
- These major issues will be greatly exacerbated by a Gatwick expansion and will all have to be addressed in addition to those that will be created by natural growth as included in the rejected SE Plan, should the Gatwick option be chosen.
- With Crawley unable to expand, new housing will have to be found in the green areas between Horsham and Crawley, and East Grinstead and Crawley.
- The central area of West Sussex will also be urbanised with huge housing developments in and around Haywards Heath, Burgess Hill and Henfield.
- The environmental cost to the whole of the South East for an expanded Gatwick and the promised, predominantly low skilled, low paid, employment in the area, mainly for inward migrating workers and families, is far too high and totally unacceptable.
- The Consultation recognises that much of the potential economic growth and employment will only be achieved by mass inward migration of workers and their families.
- The Commission’s view that workers will travel to Gatwick from the Sussex coast is not feasible, as the commuting costs and 24/7 potential shift working hours will not make personal economic sense.
- As with Heathrow, a high percentage of low paid/low skilled workers will have to live close to Gatwick, most on or as near as possible to the airport boundary. This will potentially give rise to the “sheds with beds” phenomenon as seen in the Heathrow area.
- While Gatwick will require inward migration, Heathrow already has a major local workforce catchment area.
- Any economic growth will be neutralized by increased costs for all forms of new infrastructure, health and social care.
- Any new employment opportunities for existing Crawley residents will be neutralized by inward migration, with every new job being competed for by at least one new migrant worker.
- The Gatwick proposal is based solely on having surface access via the M23 and the Brighton Line train service. This is totally inconsistent with GAL’s claim to be the most accessible airport in the UK.
- One can imagine the vast infrastructure around today’s largest airports and then imagine dropping that onto the confined area at Gatwick and Crawley.
- The following road and transport issues would cost the UK tax payer £ billions, as GAL obviously do not intend to pay for this magnitude of extra costs.
  - The M23 stops at the M25 to the north.

- The single carriageway A264 is the only access route from due east of the Airport all the way from Kent, through Royal Tunbridge Wells and East Grinstead, mainly through countryside or congested towns and villages.
  - The western approach on the A264 will bring chaos to the Crawley Area without a western bypass.
  - The Brighton Line will not be able to handle the 50 to 60 million proposed passengers with only improvements to train and platform lengthening.
  - The Brighton cannot be expanded to handle double-decker trains due to the number of tunnels and bridges and platform roof overhangs.
  - The East-West railway lines through Redhill are totally inadequate to handle travellers who wish to use the trains to access Gatwick.
- **To achieve the Commission's brief of "maintaining the UK's position as the largest hub in Europe and to maximise economic benefits for the whole country", the Heathrow options, as defined by the Commission, provide far greater economic benefits to the whole country and having a far greater number of surface access options already available or planned than at Gatwick.**
  - **A 2<sup>nd</sup> runway at Gatwick would exacerbate the North/South divide by encouraging workers away from the north into an already over populated and economically viable area in a small part of the country.**
  - **For airport travellers to get to Gatwick by road from all areas of the north, west, south west, central southern England and potentially 60% of East Anglia, they would all have to either pass Heathrow or be within 10 miles before taking another 20/30 miles and up to an hour to arrive at Gatwick.**

### **Q3. Comments on how the Commission has carried out its appraisal?**

- The Commission was wrong to have dismissed Stansted from the final options in the Consultation.
- The Commission should also reconsider the need for any further runway capacity anywhere in the country whilst excess capacity is available at all UK airports apart from Heathrow.

### **Q4. Any relevant factors that have not been fully addressed?**

- **Currently the proposals indicate that the A264 single carriageway (all the way from Royal Tunbridge Wells through East Grinstead) joining the M23 Junction 10 will be the only route from the east into the expanded airport.**
- **None of the existing junction improvements in any of the East, Mid and West County plans will be sufficient to handle the volume of traffic caused by Gatwick expansion.**
- **There are a number of obvious major new road developments that must be considered as part of the overall cost of the Gatwick proposals for an airport handling up to 96 million passengers per year. These costs should be either paid for by GAL or committed to by the Government should Gatwick be the preferred option.**

**These include:**

- East Grinstead ring road,
- A22 to M23 Junction 9,
- Crawley Western by pass,
- Pease Pottage to East Grinstead Western by pass.

**Potentially 50 miles of new dual carriage way road.**

- **Also to be included are the costs for road improvements to**
  - **A22 North and South of East Grinstead**
  - **A24 north of Horsham.**
  - **A new M23 Junction for East Surrey Hospital**
  - **Expanded M23 Junction 10A to provide southern access and egress at the Balcombe Rd.**
- There are no details as to the alternative traffic routing to replace the closure of Bonnetts Lane, Charlwood and Radford Roads.
- The linkage of the Balcombe Road and A23 at the proposed improved M23 Junction 9A is unclear. Will drivers on the Balcombe Road be able to access the improved M23 Junction 9A.
- Crawley' road and housing infrastructure is such that many of the key arterial routes cannot be widened unless houses are demolished eg. Ifield Avenue, Southgate Drive, Worth Park Avenue, Three Bridges Station, etc.
- The Commission identifies large scale requirements for new housing, schools, hospitals, doctors, community services, transport, etc. but no mention of how these will be funded.
- "Guarantees" for controlling both noise and air pollution are not supported with details of how this will be funded, monitored and enforced.
- The effects on the UK's legal commitment to reducing Global warming are not included.
- GAL promise air pollution will not exceed EU requirements, but these levels will still be much higher over today's levels. The Crawley Avenue/Gatwick road junction is already a pollution hot spot.
- There are many schools, nurseries, children's playgrounds and sports fields in Langley Green, Ifield, Pound Hill, Northgate, Three Bridges and Copthorne that will be subjected to increased air and noise pollution, again no details are available as to how these will be managed and controlled.
- Copthorne Village one of the largest villages in West Sussex with approximately 2,000 existing residences and a population of 6,500 will be less than 3 km from the end of the proposed 2nd runway, but has not been included in any GAL proposals nor in the Airport Commissions Consultation document.
- The omission of Copthorne is compounded as the village will be the most seriously affected populated area to the east of the airport with the indicative flight paths, directly over the village, for aircraft taking off or landing every 60 seconds during the day and also frequently during the night.
- The new residential developments of Forgewood (2000 residences and school) and St Modwens/Wates developments (546 residences and school) have also been omitted from the proposals and Consultation.
- The proposed new schools in both Forgewood and St Modwens developments will be within a few hundred metres of the arriving and departing flight paths and their development must be questioned on health safety for the pupils.
- Details, locations and costs for new reservoirs and sewage plants to accommodate 40,000 new houses, additional 60 million passengers and thousands of new migrant workers into the area are unavailable.
- The Consultation does not recognise that many of the new airport jobs will be low skilled and low paid, therefore many workers will require low cost housing close to the airport.
- The "dormitory sheds with beds" phenomenon, as seen all around Heathrow, will potentially become a reality for Crawley and the County and should be identified in the report.

- The relocation of 250 businesses displaced by the expanded airport is not adequately addressed and the option to utilise spare space within the expanded airport grounds is questionable. It is unlikely that these businesses could be accommodated within the existing Crawley boundary with loss of jobs for many Crawley residents, which should be included in the report.
- The Gatwick Diamond already complains about shortages of business and industrial floor space in the area, which should be recognised and addressed.
- GAL says only 163 houses within the boundary of the expanded airport footprint will be demolished and those houses within the defined noise contours will be compensated but no mention of the many houses in Langley Green, Ifield, Pound Hill and Copthorne that will be severely blighted, with many in Langley Green abutting the proposed runway noise bunds.
- There are no modelling charts to show the potential income from an expanded airport for the county against the huge costs required for new and improved infrastructure, housing, social needs, etc.
- The report does not include an analysis of the impact on the airport that is not chosen for an additional runway.
- The report does not emphasise the potential for the whole of the north of West Sussex becoming a single urbanised community, from Horsham through Crawley and onto East Grinstead.
- The report should recognise that Crawley does not have room within its boundaries to expand, but to only to cram more people into existing housing.
- The report should recognise that with the need for housing close to Gatwick the main towns of Horsham and East Grinstead will be required to build new settlements towards Crawley, as will Mid Sussex need to expand or build new settlements between Crawley Down and Turners Hill with Crawley.
  - The report does not address the proposed eleven fold increase in GAL's 24/7 cargo/freight business and the impact road congestion and noise and air pollution
- The report does not emphasise the vast new block of urbanisation around Haywards Heath, Burgess Hill and Henfield to accommodate the potential vast increase in the population of West Sussex.
  - Any commitment of funding from either GAL or the Government must be covered by a legally binding guarantee.

As One's Enough's input towards the Consultation other questions, we support and endorse the GACC "Gatwick Unwrapped" and "Bad For Business" documents, which we attach for your files.

One's Enough also supports the lists of additional information required, improved and expanded analyses produced in both the Crawley Borough and West Sussex County Councils responses.

One's Enough supports the wide spread opposition, to an expanded Gatwick with a 2<sup>nd</sup> runway, across the South East including Crawley Borough and West Sussex Councils, and also those Councils across Kent and Surrey.

One's Enough, hopes and expects that the Commission to take the high level of opposition to the Gatwick option into account before making your recommendations to the Government.

**One's Enough and it's members totally oppose the Gatwick Expansion option.**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## Bad for Business?

A paper prepared by the Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign  
with help from local businessmen

An important objective set out by the Airports Commission is: 'To maximise economic benefits.....To promote employment and economic growth in the local area....To produce positive outcomes for local communities and the local economy'.<sup>1</sup> This paper challenges the assertion by Gatwick Airport Ltd (GAL) that a second runway would be supportive of this objective.

By engaging with opinion from local business communities, and taking a less selective view of the evidence, GACC concludes that the proposal would be detrimental for local businesses, the local economy and the community as a whole.

### Background

According to the Office of National Statistics there are over 30,000 businesses in West Sussex.<sup>2</sup> The majority are located in the north of the county, in the vicinity of Gatwick Airport. Surrey has 61,900 businesses but with less concentration around Gatwick.<sup>3</sup>

It would be a fair guess to say that there must be around 30,000 businesses in the Gatwick area.

### Business Opinion

West Sussex County Council and Crawley Borough Council commissioned a survey of West Sussex businesses in May 2013.<sup>4</sup> It showed that only 31% of firms had employees who ever took a flight for business reasons. Only 4% felt air travel was important 'for bringing overseas customers to your organisation.'

51% of firms agreed that there is a need for new runway capacity in the South East, and 52% favoured a new runway at Gatwick. Those were the 'headline results' that were used to influence the vote by West Sussex County Council to support a second runway. But the survey (and the vote) was before the full scale and implications of making Gatwick bigger than Heathrow were generally recognised.

Nevertheless 24% of businessmen considered that Gatwick expansion 'would dramatically affect local home (sic) and countryside' and 23% felt it would 'cause too much air and noise pollution'. That is confirmed in a letter to GACC from a Director of a leading Sussex company:

Established for over 150 years, we are a major international business that owns three of the world's leading brands and employs over 100 people locally.

Many of our employees have already complained of the increase in aircraft noise, particularly at night and at weekends and we are most concerned at the impact in future of a second runway at Gatwick on this. Worsening aircraft noise is not only affecting them personally and potentially the value of their houses but also their leisure time; whereby some of their favourite spots for peaceful relaxation are now blighted by aircraft noise. I suspect this will also have a negative impact on the leisure industry in the area.<sup>5</sup>

Shortage of labour. According to Gatwick Airport (May 2014) a new runway would create 122,000 new jobs in the South East. The Airports Commission (November 2014) puts the figure at up to 90,000 by 2060. Although it is said that these new jobs would be spread across the South East, inevitably most would be concentrated in or around the Gatwick area.

A report by Optimal Economics commissioned by Gatwick Airport points out that: 'Within the Gatwick Diamond, there is a projected excess of employment over resident labour supply throughout the forecast period.'<sup>6</sup> Gatwick Airport, however, blithely ignore the labour shortage warnings highlighted by their own economists; it is inevitable, that as unemployment across the area remains low, the result will be a chronic shortage of labour. That situation is likely to put many local firms at a serious disadvantage.

██████████, a former manager for Royal Mail, writes:

My experience showed that there was a constant recruitment problem for what is now referred to as the Gatwick Diamond. Not only did the churn effect of staff turnover lead to inefficiencies, but a constant high vacancy level led to increased costs through overtime pay, as well as poor quality of service. It was only through offering high overtime levels, and a variety of bonus payments, that the business could attempt to compete on pay with the airport - but effectively fail in doing so. The [Airports Commission consultation document] recognises that there is no local pool of unemployment to draw on, but ... does not admit that the Gatwick Diamond has a history of being an "employment hotspot" (albeit disguised by the recent recession), and is already dependent on ... an immigrant workforce. It is arguable that the current reliance on an EU migrant workforce will be put under further strain



given the current political situation.’<sup>7</sup>

3

Higher costs. Shortage of labour would tend to push up rates of pay, again causing difficulties for local firms. The Managing Director of an advanced technology company located close to Gatwick has written to say:

Such a shortage of labour will inevitably create a price war and wages will sky rocket in an already very expensive area. Companies operating in a very competitive global market will be substantially disadvantaged.<sup>8</sup>

██████████ makes a similar point:

The most probable outcomes - and track records should demonstrate this - is that labour intensive small businesses will need to compete on wage price, which will impact their profitability and may threaten their commercial viability. For labour intensive Public Service infrastructure, in addition to the Royal Mail, we should also look at local government, health service, some transport and other government agency organisations, who will not be able to compete for wages, and therefore experience churn and vacancy levels which will impact on the quality of service they provide to the local social and business communities.

Inward migration. The main effect of the creation of so many new jobs would be to draw in people from other parts of the UK and from the EU. That is welcomed by some firms because it would mean a bigger market for local shops, hotels, guest houses, taxis etc. They may, however, not have realised that it would also cause an influx of new shops, new hotels, new taxi firms etc.; meaning in turn more competition, and could result in local firms being put out of business.

More houses. Consultants commissioned by the Gatwick Diamond Initiative and the West Sussex County Council estimated that there would be a need for around 40,000 new houses. The Airports Commission use a lower figure and GACC is currently investigating the difference.

A large number of new houses would be good business for house building firms, but how many new building firms would move into the area? Would it mean better jobs for local building workers or would most of the new jobs be filled by transient labour from elsewhere?

Road and rail congestion. A separate paper by GACC has shown that a second runway would mean around 136,000 extra road journeys a day in the vicinity of Gatwick. That is just for air passengers, and travel to work by airport employees

and journeys to work of employees of new firms. In addition there would be all the extra commercial traffic generated by the larger airport and all the new firms. The result would be delays at many road junctions. Longer journey times both for staff and for deliveries would have an adverse effect on local firms.

4

For rail services no improvements are planned other than those already in hand to cope with the forecast growth in demand without a new runway. Result – serious overcrowding.

██████████ the owner of a small business near Gatwick, has written to say: I am very concerned that a second runway would create intolerable pressure on our local roads as there has been no definitive plan for the expansion of the road network that will be needed for at least a ten mile radius of Gatwick. If the planned passenger traffic (oh, and allied traffic such as people going to work) is achieved then there is simply no way that the current one motorway (and that is fed by the M25 from one end and that can't cope at the moment so God only knows how it will cope with not only the increase in Gatwick traffic but the annual increase that we see year on year) and single carriageway A roads such as the A272, A25, A29, A264 from East Grinstead and A22 will be able to cope, it's bad enough now. The other dual carriageway roads such as the A24/A264 and A21 will also be clogged with traffic. If the powers that be seriously believe that they are going to fit the traffic that currently surrounds Heathrow and duplicate it into the roads that surround Gatwick then someone needs their head examining. It is a joke and the amount of destruction of the green belt to accommodate this expansion and all the add-ons such as housing and industrial estates is bordering on criminal. Loss of business premises. The construction of the new runway would involve the demolition of 286 business premises, including City Place (head office of Nestlé) and part of Manor Royal. 286 firms would have all the expense and hassle of having to re-locate. Gatwick Airport have suggested that some firms might be accommodated on land that they would acquire between the airport and the M23 – but that to make sufficient space available, the airport car parks would need to be double decked. So the land would not come cheap. And many firms would not wish to become tenants of Gatwick Airport Ltd. If firms wished to move elsewhere, there might be problems getting planning permission.

The managing director of the advanced technology company again:

Some businesses will need to be relocated. Mine for instance could be a prime candidate. The disruption will be immense. The land proposed for a new facility is rather inappropriate, being directly under the flight path with all that entails. No discussion of time scale or compensation has been started so we are in horrible 'planners blight limbo' with no apparent end in sight. With current planning rules any new building would likely be seriously affected by lack of parking space making

5

it less attractive for people to work here. We own our current site, the ownership status of the new place is unknown.

In short the expanded airport will be bad for the majority of pre-existing businesses and people that are already established here. The big winners will be the Airport itself, owned by a conglomeration of overseas investment companies who have only been in situ since 2009 and I understand are likely to sell out soon after the decision re the new runway. We have been here since 1963 and intend to remain. Impact on rural businesses. Many rural businesses depend for their success on peace and tranquillity. A prime example is Hever Castle, birthplace of Anne Boleyn.

Hever Castle supports up to 280 jobs in season. The castle's chief executive

██████████ 'When people come to rural attractions they are expecting a degree of peace and tranquillity. We believe that a second runway would almost certainly spell the end for Hever Castle as a visitor attraction.'<sup>9</sup>

The same is true for many rural businesses, for example quiet country hotels, film making enterprises, country parks and other outdoor visitor attractions.

Worse environment – worse for business

Surrey, Sussex and Kent are pleasant places to live. But if the environment is worsened by aircraft noise, by urbanisation, and by traffic congestion, it will become harder to recruit and keep high quality staff.

A professional communications expert based at Haywards Heath, has written to say:

The opening of the new headquarters and warehouse for a global component service provider to the aviation industry in Sayers Common 20 miles from the

6

airport is perhaps a portent of what is to come, especially should a second runway be approved for Gatwick.

The immediate Crawley catchment area is now bursting at the seams as it tries to accommodate the burgeoning airline businesses that Gatwick needs to support it. Some companies have become well established across East Sussex, West Sussex and Surrey and provide welcome local employment. But increasingly they are being forced further and further from the airport.

These remoter locations are inevitably less convenient operationally. Company round-the-clock activities and staff movements significantly add to the traffic on the local roads that were never designed to take it. Sadly many businesses are guilty of further infilling and concreting of our green and pleasant counties.

When considering the environmental damage that a second runway will bring - we must look well beyond the immediate Gatwick perimeters. The damage on the fringes of the airport will be just a small fraction of the total impact.

Consider the housing estates and rambling industrial development, roads and other infrastructure that Gatwick has led to in the last 50 years in the surrounding 30 miles - now double it for the proposed second runway. Do we really need it here? Isn't it time for another area to take the strain and enjoy the economic benefit that a major airport can bring?

The national picture. There is no significant national pressure from business for a second Gatwick runway. The CBI favours expansion at Heathrow rather than at Gatwick. Recently 23 Chambers of Commerce that represent more than 40,000 UK businesses have written an open letter to the Airports Commission about the benefits of Heathrow Airport expansion.

Many people believe that a second runway anywhere in the South East would take business away from other regions of the UK that need employment and thus be damaging to the UK's economic recovery and the rebalancing of the economy.

1 Airports Commission. Consultation Document Table2.1

2 ONS UK Business 2012

3 Surrey County Council

4 Attitudes to Air Travel in West Sussex. QA Research July 2013. The survey oversampled larger businesses, and businesses in Crawley.

5 Email 6 November 2014

6 Optimal Economics Report. Paragraph 3.46

7 Email from [REDACTED] ACMA, CGMA. 27 November 2014

8 Email to GACC 11 June 2014

9 <http://www.sevenoakschronicle.co.uk/Gatwick-runway-spell-end-Hever-Castle-tourism/story-19806450-detail/story.html#ixzz3Kk8pufMN>

*Copyright © 2014 Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign, All rights reserved.*

You are receiving this e mail because you subscribe to the aims and principles of Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]