

CHARLWOOD WORKS, CHARLWOOD, HORLEY, SURREY RH6 0BU, ENGLAND

www.roband.co.uk

E-MAIL MESSAGE

To

**The Airports Commission Consultation Document dated November 2014
Gatwick: Reasons it is Inappropriate to Build a Second Runway at Gatwick.**

I am against the second runway option at Gatwick

The following is my response to the proposal to build a second runway at Gatwick. As part of this response I will also touch on the desirability for any additional runway capacity in the South east of the UK.

Background

I am the Chairman and Managing Director of Roband Electronics plc. Trading for nearly 60 years we are a well respected company, employing nearly 100 people. We specialise in the design development and manufacture of highly specialised electronic power supply systems, predominately for the aerospace and defence sectors. I am qualified with a Masters in Electronics and have spent my life in engineering with much emphasis in avionics.

It is not our normal activity to respond to such a document as the Commission's Consultation Document but I will try to keep my points as clear and concise as possible. Please forgive me if they are in layman's terms rather than that of more experienced planning lobbyists.

Roband was founded in 1956 and since 1963 Roband has been situated entirely on the North West corner of Gatwick Airport runway, as shown below. We share a long common border with the airport and have many mutual interests regarding drainage, security, access and also the usual neighbourly issues.



Because of our long standing physical proximity to the airport we take a very keen interest in what is happening and what is likely to happen. Because we as a company are design engineers in avionics and I as a business person am also responsible for running a successful business **I/we have a unique insight as to the desirability, or otherwise, of such a dramatic expansion in capacity at Gatwick and because of that insight WE ARE TOTALLY AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO EXPAND GATWICK WITH AN ADDITIONAL RUNWAY.** On behalf of myself and my company I would welcome the opportunity to address the commission in person to properly outline my concerns. Not on behalf of any campaigning organisation just on behalf of myself and my own company, the one that has been here and shares the common border with the airport since 1963.

We are members of

- The Aerospace & Defence Electrical Power Systems National Technology Committee
- The ADS Small Company's Committee, a forum within the ADS promoting the interests of SMEs

We are also members of the Local GDB (Gatwick Diamond Business Group). However we do not agree with their position regarding the expansion of Gatwick airport expansion. Many members of the GDB do not actual work or live anywhere near the principle affected areas.

It is not our normal activity to respond to such a document as the Commission's Consultation Document but I will try to keep my points as clear and concise as possible. Please forgive me if they are in layman's terms rather than that of more experienced planning lobbyists.

Safety

Here is a copy of an e-mail I sent to [REDACTED] the GDB which he was kind enough to publish on a relevant web site and included in the Jan/Feb 2015 issue of the Source magazine, the local journal for the GDB. I have left it totally unedited.

Sent: 15 December 2014 12:20

Subject: Airspace

For a long time, and absolutely predating the issue of the second runway, based purely on technical feedback I have said the airspace over the south east of England has been way to overcrowded and that the slightest 'unforeseen event' would cause chaos. Well on a very minor scale we saw what a very short term computer problem did, it actually caused total chaos that lasted well into the next day. So serious that the government is calling for an immediate enquiry. No matter how clever or up to date the computer systems being used, there are bound to be future similar occurrences.

The problem would have been far last dramatic if the airspace was less crowded. When first we discussed the prospect of a second runway the principal argument I used was that more aircraft in such an already congested area would be unsafe. If there were any computer glitches at all there will never be enough air traffic controllers ready, able and capable of keeping the airways safe.

This seems to me so self evidently blindingly obvious that I am still wondering how people are continuing to press for more runway capacity in the south east of our country.

I know that 'high value' vested interest will usually manage to argue that black is white but if you ever wanted an example of why we do not need another runway either here or Heathrow, or actually anywhere in the vicinity at all, then the events of Friday past are a perfect picture.

The above covers most of the key issues but I should add that when we are in peak season, from the top of Box Hill and also the general environs one can look out and see just how congested the sky already is. If we then crowd more aircraft into the narrowing flight paths there would self evidently be a clear increasing risk. The holding patterns would become a nightmare. Having so many aircraft in the skies approaching so many different airports but that are otherwise so close is a disaster waiting to happen. I have had a number of private discussions that reveal if another and potentially longer computer glitch were to occur with just a few more aircraft in the sky than we saw last December, let alone if there were to be a massive increase from another runway, then even if you could get enough human traffic controllers into situ quickly, and that is by no means certain certain, they would not properly be able to manage the situation adequately and guarantee safety of the airways.

An additional runway is going to be a safety nightmare with a consequential disaster a very real possibility this much is self evident. It means another runway or rather that much more traffic funnelling into the same space, would self evidently be wrong at either Gatwick or Heathrow. If we genuinely need more air capacity, and I am not at all certain that case has been properly made, then it must be located in an area that does not share the same airspace in such a dramatic manner.

Business/Workforce/Homes/Wages

The case for a second runway in the south east seems to essentially being sold on the basis that it is good for business and therefore good for the local population and country at large. Very fanciful figures have been suggested of how much it might actually be worth. Certainly the owners of the airports may get richer, the people providing services may get richer, the airlines may get richer (Easy Jet and BA are not so sure that they will if the choice is Gatwick, both are rather against an expansion at Gatwick) hotels and taxis and that sort of thing, but very little of that will translate to increasing the wealth of the pre existing population. And actually very little of an expansion at Gatwick would directly or even indirectly lead to an expansion of wealth creating jobs. The argument seems to be if you build more airport capacity it will stimulate the economy. Actually that is the wrong way round. What should happen is if the economy is thriving then demand will increase pressure for more airport capacity but that is not what we have. Other than the airport owners and a few vested interest groups such as the airports/airlines, planners, developers and builders the need for more airport capacity is not an issue. In all the years I have run my business I never heard anybody say their business is being strangled by the lack of airport capacity. They do say that about the road and rail network or lack of long term strategic investment in wealth creating industries, but never, never do they mention the need for more runway capacity.

In bold black below, I have extracted statements from the Gatwick web site at <http://www.gatwickobviously.com/economy>, and commented in normal print.

Our plans will provide an economic boost far beyond Gatwick and beyond London, to other regions – to the North, to Scotland and to Ireland.

I am not sure there is any substance or evidence that this '***economic boost far beyond Gatwick and beyond London***' will happen. I cannot imagine that anyone in Ireland/Scotland or even the North of England is actually anticipating a business bonanza as a result of a second runway at Gatwick. If this was to be an actuality then it would be equally valid for an expansion at Heathrow and is therefore not a plus point for Gatwick. There would be no reason either would have a meaningful benefit over the other. If the object is to spread economic benefit into the regions surely it would make more sense to build the runway in the provinces. I actually

informally put this point to members of the local business group recently and even for the staunchest supporters of Gatwick they thought the statement laughable.

Expansion at Gatwick will attract new clusters of high intensity businesses which will create 120,000 jobs. The benefits of growth, including jobs and housing, will be spread more evenly through the capital and region and not just focussed on the already congested areas of West London and the Thames Valley.

Where exactly will these clusters form, and the 120,000 jobs that go with them? Every job implies more than two people to be housed and dealt with. Are they to be created in the South East where we already have virtual full employment and a shortage of housing and massively overloaded infrastructure? Are these jobs in addition to the more reasoned argument below? I suggest the figure is a fiction with no substance.

If the 120,000 jobs were to be created in addition to those given below then the area in general would just come to a standstill because these are in addition to any organic growth that would have happened anyway. The South east just does not have the man power or infrastructure to support this. The statement' ***jobs and housing, will be spread more evenly through the capital and region and not just focussed on the already congested areas of West London and the Thames Valley***' is so bizarre I almost considered not answering but really the south of London, the suburbs, the satellite towns are already full to overflowing, there is an implication in Gatwick's statement that somehow only West London and Thames valley are somehow very different to the rest of the region.

The problem is the whole of the south east is overloaded, and what is being suggested here is that to accommodate the imagined new industries and all the housing and infrastructure, we would actually have to pave over vast tracts of beautiful countryside.

Gatwick can create more than 22,000 airport-related jobs by 2050 and contribute £1.73 billion per year to the local economy. This economic growth will result in a maximum of 9,000 new homes.

And using data relating to the current state of affairs from

<http://www.gatwickairport.com/business-community/about-gatwick/at-a-glance/facts-stats/>

- Gatwick provides around 23,500 on-airport jobs, of which around 2,650 are London Gatwick employees
- Gatwick provides a further 20,000 jobs indirectly

So even rudimentary calculations would support the 22,000 additional jobs at the enlarged airport, it would be reasonable to assume another 20,000 further indirect jobs would be created. However most informed opinion believes this to be an underestimation and around an additional 20ish thousand jobs would be created because the indirect labour itself has indirect consequences. Or in other words, for every job considered airport related, then two off site jobs will be needed. 60,000 in total.

In simple terms the likely job demand from a new runway will be around 60,000 in the immediate locality (easy commuting distance). My original guesstimation before reading any back up data was around 60,000 more jobs created in Gatwick's reasonable catchment area, so confirmation from more informed reading was interesting.

But I am prepared to comprise that this figure could be a bit high so I will restrict my next argument at around 50,000 new jobs for the sake of easy arithmetic. For the Gatwick catchment area I would suggest that the majority of people will have to have a commute of 20 minutes or less and only a selection of more senior/professional type jobs within 40 to 60 minutes. That means the vast majority will be in the immediate vicinity of Gatwick.

50,000 additional people required, with families, partners, relatives', dependents, pets etc.

So that could be conservatively estimated to be 200,000+ more people in the area. An area which is already virtually full employment and with a current chronic shortage of housing and infrastructure. It would seem to me 40,000 new dwellings to cater for in the order of 200,000 people, over and above what is already needed is a disaster waiting to happen. And I am only taking a mean average view; it is likely to be worse. I cannot begin to imagine how Gatwick's **a maximum of 9,000 new homes** would be anywhere near sufficient. It beggars belief that such an estimate can be considered feasible. And if the airport is prepared to suggest such a wildly inaccurate conclusion it must make one wonder about any of their other figures.

And what we are discussing here is in fact it has to be new people coming into the area. If the jobs were to be filled by locals then the pre-existing employers will be massively disadvantaged. As things stand today it is extremely difficult to get quality personnel in the Gatwick area. One of the biggest topics for discussion at the GDB and in the locality at large is getting and retaining staff. The cost of housing is prohibitive and the cost of living excessive in the area so in effect we will be competing for the same labour pool and wages will sky rocket and the current businesses will become uncompetitive as a result. How, may I ask, is that good for business? The pre-existing companies will be substantially disadvantaged. The cost of housing will rocket too because of the lack of resource and as such the local population will be disadvantaged.

Currently much of the new developments locally are on sites that do not make ecological sense being often on flood plains and destroying natural habitat for wildlife. The area in general is already subject to flooding, the immediate vicinity around Gatwick is well known as an area that floods. We have flooded at roband several times in the last three years, and have recently had a major re-decoration and new flooring, courtesy of the insurance companies as a result of a recent flood. 40,000 homes much of which will inevitably have to be built on flood plains makes no sense to the airport or the locality. Flooding is a much under considered issue. The Airports plans for flood defences are so far short of being realistic that I wondered why they bothered to write them. To date they have not managed to alleviate the current, and by comparison, minor straight forward issues.

The schools, hospitals and roads are already stretched to breaking point. This additional burden will bring the area to its knees. Drainage is struggling to cope, regular floods through re-routing of local rivers and tributaries will get worse. Even now more and more building is taking place on flood plains and that is what is being proposed again. Gatwick is a natural flood plain itself and barely manages to cope in extreme weather. There are schemes afoot to improve things but most informed opinion suggests that any minor alleviation will be more than wiped out by the actual building at the airport. The misery of local flooding will become more of an epidemic and that will certainly cost more than the country thinks it might earn!

I have seen nothing to substantiate the claim that an enlarged airport would contribute £1.73Billion to the local economy. The airport will obviously earn, the airlines will earn and a few specialist suppliers will earn and I suppose taxis and hotels will earn, but no true value added companies will be attracted. The cost of living, housing, overstretched infrastructure and astronomic cost of labour will put everyone off coming here. The only winners will be the short term ones such as developers and planners and builders and these tend to be of the giant monolithic companies who will move on when the work is concluded.

And of course the vested interest of the airport owners will make a killing. The current consortium, who I will touch on later, are all overseas investment companies, with no long term connection to the well being of the locality of the UK itself are publicly stating they will sell Gatwick in 2016. Hardly a demonstration of commitment to the area.

I honestly have no idea of how the figure of £1.73Billion comes about and I tend to believe it was a finger in the air guesstimation or taken from one of those fancy computer models that failed to predict the banking crisis or the current fall in the price of petrol. In other words totally untrustworthy.

Finally on the business case.

When the 'need' for the second runway was muted it was on the premise that we needed a greater hub capacity and point to point flying was not what was required. The airlines seem to be all in favour of that expanded hub mode. In particular I heard a senior official from Virgin say that Heathrow was the only conceivable place. BA, as I understand things, has adopted the same attitude.

For whatever reason the competition has changed, apparently it doesn't matter what sort of runway it is as long as an additional runway is built. It is actually very unclear how we are now discussing the possibility of an expanded point to point airport. The entire case for additional runway capacity centred in the south east was and is entirely a business case and accordingly there is no option than to improve the current hub facility and because it is already in existence it has to be Heathrow. There is no other solution that fits that business case.

When the GDB (called CADIA at that time) started its support for an additional runway it was on the absolute fundamental understanding it HAD TO BE making Gatwick a hub airport, that was the only way the business case was possible and more business passengers would be attracted. It was felt that a point to point airport was totally unsuitable for making Gatwick a serious player for the business requirement. Once it was clear that making Gatwick a hub airport was never going to be an option, then the local business group completely changed their approach and somehow point to point was good for business, better than a hub in fact.

The truth is, they just like the idea of a bigger airport, it somehow makes the area seem more important, and surely that is the wrong reason for such a strategic decision.

If the reason for more capacity is not to improve the hub and we genuinely need more point to point capacity then certainly Gatwick makes no sense at all either. There is more than enough capacity for the foreseeable future expanding Luton and Stanstead and if we need more than that then the East Midlands can be expanded, an area of unemployment where the locals actually see the advantage of expansion, it would much cheaper all round affording the airlines a lower handling cost on the ground and it does not overload an already congested area like the south east. Bournemouth/Southampton, Bristol, Manchester and Edinburgh can all accommodate more movements and alleviate the congestion in the south and simultaneously free up slots for the greater variety of longer distance flights that the GDB seem so keen on. Point to point can actually be located anywhere, a hub is more location dependant and was the whole point of original reason for this competition and therefore has to be Heathrow. Gatwick clearly makes no sense to have any additional runway.

Environment/Locality/Transport

These issues are so interlinked it is better to keep them together rather than keep repeating oneself. Unfortunately it also repeats some of what has been said before.

The area is a virtual full employment area and the roads and all other entire infrastructure overloaded to the point of saturation. The South east itself is overcrowded. There is already far too much development on flood plains that have caused distress to inhabitants and businesses. The area immediately surrounding Gatwick is prone to flooding and that has always been so. The most recent developments have just ratcheted up the situation so that in recent years my own property, adjacent to the current airport at Gatwick has experienced far more flooding than

ever before. This is directly because of removal of flood plains and poor planning and maintenance at the airport.

A new runway with all the additional building would inevitably make this a substantially worse situation. The Gatwick plans to alleviate the risk of flooding are frankly not even slightly credible. We recently saw that the Gatwick management had to answer for itself in parliament because of inadequate past, current and future planning and in this respect their plan for flood protection with a second runway is no better. They can't manage what they have created now, how will they sensibly be able to reliably forecast and manage a substantially worse state of affairs with the second runway, 60,000 new homes and the effects of global warming and erratic weather getting more so. I do not propose to discuss the effect of global warming and the jet stream on rainfall in the South East of England but as we approach 2050 the rainfall patterns will be much more concentrated bursts of weather chasing local chaos. Gatwick's plans, that I have seen, are not appropriate. As part of Gatwick's plan the idea of totally re-routing the river Mole and imagining that will afford protection is just not credible. All they are doing is marginally moving the problem. I do in fact recall when they last re-routed the river for a similar reason and then as now it just made things worse!

Till now the area of Surrey/Kent/Sussex have managed to certain extent to maintain something of a balance between quality of life/beautiful natural environment with sufficient urbanisation to enable people to work and live. We have many beautiful villages and much wonderful countryside such as the following quote I found from a campaign web site

'Gatwick is surrounded on three sides by Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty – the High Weald AONB and the Surrey Hills AONB – each visited by over a million people each year in search of peace and tranquillity. Local councils have a statutory duty to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of these areas, and this applies to any decisions they may take, not merely to planning applications'

I can attest to beauty of these sites and an additional runway would certainly destroy the tranquillity that we should all be able to enjoy. The South East is already devoid of enough of this type of space and we should do everything to preserve the quality we currently enjoy. These areas of beauty are enjoyed by people from all over the country and overseas tourists, this green and pleasant land' and all that.

The sheer number of new houses needed, equivalent to another town the size of Crawley, the fact Stewart Wingate, CEO of Gatwick has said a second runway at Gatwick would mean Gatwick will be more than twice the size of the current Heathrow, and all the additional myriad of additional road, rail, support buildings, schools, hospitals, fire stations, etc and not to forget all the 'new businesses' that is the given reason for the expansion., more than adequately illustrates how devastating the effect of building a second runway will be. The whole to the area to the south of London just beyond the M25 down to the coast will effectively be paved over.

So much of what is now protected green belt land will simply become a construction site, a concrete jungle.

And of course we have numerous woods and lesser know spots that will be devastated and also losing many historic and listed buildings will vanish. The village of Charlwood itself will lose access and cease to be anything other a pretty place cowering in the noise pollution from the airport.

This is not a doomsday scenario rather a statement of the obvious. A second runway at Gatwick means we will be destroying the entire area to the south of the M25 and recent trials of new flight paths has seen terrible disturbance in all the affected areas. These trial areas will inevitably be the same areas that will be affected by a second runway.

There is apparently much propaganda made of the fact that to the south of the M25 there is a more rural feel with a lower density of population than around Heathrow, so therefore less people will be disturbed by an increase in air traffic than at Heathrow.

This is such a distortion of the truth. Like Frank Carson used to say, it's the way you tell 'em. The truth is that an increase in air traffic and the additional new essential flight paths will cause far more distress surrounding Gatwick just because the area is so tranquil. If you have a very quiet area and suddenly introduce a loud noise then the disturbance is disproportionate. At Heathrow already congested and busy, the background levels of noise are far higher and therefore an increase is less disruptive. That is just anthropological fact. Another way of looking at it is that a current quiet area will be subject to noise and it will then become forever noisy. Around Heathrow and already noisy area will remain noisy.

It has been said that the increase in noise of the additional runway at Gatwick would only affect 'a few people.' The new area that would suffer from the new flights paths is immense covering many many square miles. And because the actual plans are not yet formalised it is hard to be specific but it is not just a handful but in many hundreds of thousands probably much more than that. The numbers of people affected will be substantial in both cases.

It goes without saying our roads are full to bursting and the section of M25 and the intersection with the M23 is well known to be a major disaster area not just peak times but all through the day seven days a week. Doubling the capacity at Gatwick would just exacerbate the situation and take us well beyond the tipping point. The M25 motorway will need substantially more lanes from the M 4 to Dartford just to cope. This is not just for the extra airport traffic but also for the all the 'additional £1.73billion' of business they are anticipating. And of course, just building more transport links will generate extra journeys because history shows that whenever a road is built the traffic increases to fill it very quickly to beyond its capability.

The overriding problem being we have far too many people in the South east already and really we should be cooling the economy not heating it up.

The extra jobs that are promised and created, as stated above at around 50,000 all need to be imported because we have virtual full employment. OR these jobs will have be filled by people already in the area; we have a skills shortage as it is, thus creating a wage explosion that will inevitably be bad for everyone. So in reality we have to import 50,000 new workers and conservatively that is 200,000 people more because of partners, children and dependants. The schools and hospitals are full to bursting already so we need more capability in that respect and there is a real shortage of water and sewage capability so that needs to be addressing. Water is likely to be the biggest nightmare because have no idea how to cope now with the unusual conditions.

The cost and impact of such a mega expansion has simply not be been properly considered and the costs as given by the airport are works of fiction of the type that only highly paid PR consultants could invent.

The quality of air would plummet due to the extra transport in the sky and on the land, health would suffer. The desirable tranquil area we live would be transformed into a paved industrial park. What is in fact the point of ever having had the green belt and protected areas of natural beauty and tranquillity if for extremely dubious commercial reasons where vested interest is simply allowed to ride rough shod over the majority view point and pave over the landscape.

The locality will be devastated. I am not sure that the local business community have quite taken on board the physical location of the new runway and what it will mean to Manor Royal industrial estate in Crawley. The working environment for those located there will be diminished substantially and access made far worse from a number of directions. The old saying, 'there is none so blind as those that will not see' would seem an appropriate reflection on the many 'business' people who are apparently in favour now.

And from my company's point of view senior executives from the airport told me, in my very own office, that there was no plan to 'demolish Roband's site' as part of the expansion of Gatwick. And yet within days of that at the Gatwick road show, it was clear the river Mole is likely to be diverted pretty much through our site. They explained at the roadshows that affected businesses will be relocated with land that is being set aside for the purpose. But the current sketchy plan is ill considered and the location totally unacceptable being at the end of the runway, under the flight path and what seems to be, as far as I could tell, next to sewage works.

Currently we may be next to the runway but we are not anywhere near under aircraft themselves and believe me we know being under an aeroplane would be purgatory in terms of noise. I am not sure I would retain my staff if we were actually located where the airport suggests we might be.

Airport Ownership

I was advised not to mention this but I think it a very important issue.

When last I checked the ownership of Gatwick was made up as follows:-
GIP own 48% they are a USA based company and lead the consortium.

The remaining 52% are owned by

The Abu Dhabi Investment Authority (ADIA),
the National Pension Service of Korea (NPS),
the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS)
and the Future Fund of Australia,

Like me, I suspect you have noticed they are all overseas investment companies. They purchased the airport in 2009 and have said in public that they intend to sell the airport in 2016. Not a great deal of commitment to the area or UKplc. Their only interest is making the biggest and fastest profit for their investors. In that respect, that will only happen if they get the government to agree to a second runway at Gatwick. They have no interest in noise disturbance, destroying the environment, creating a scramble for labour or over congesting our roads because they do not live or work anywhere near here.

But I do.

My company has been in Charlwood since 1963, we have maintained the site with 9 acres of natural woodland. After the current owners have jackbooted their way through our homes and environment have then cleared off, I will remain to live with the unpleasant consequences of what they have done. I want what is best for the area because that is what is best for me too and that is so overwhelmingly not to build the second runway.

It is in fact consortia like these owners that are driving the argument for the new runway, nobody else. They have to drive it because there is no credible case for a more capacity in the south east. I have yet to hear a single person, business or personal, tell me their business is suffering as a result of lack of runway space. They complain the lack of roads and rail are hurting, but never lack of flights. So there is honestly no imperative for a greater capacity, especially when there is so much free space at so many regional airports and Stanstead and Luton.

The airports are a national strategic facility and only what is good for the nation as a whole should be considered. There is a north south divide. We need to stimulate the economy in the provinces, more capacity at Heathrow or Gatwick would serve to deepen the divide not close the gap at all.

I think the problem the commission was faced with was the exam question being loaded. The question should have been what strategy we need for the UK as a whole for managing an increasing desire for flights. But in the face of ecological considerations we would also need to recognise it would be a good thing to reduce the numbers of flights too. In short and to use a current buzz expression, we need to take a far more holistic approach to flight and transport needs. And any rudimentary analysis shows, move the congestion away from the South east.

Conclusion

- The case for a new runway in the South East is not established.
- Even if it were to be required Gatwick is clearly the wrong location.

Some key considerations for the case against a runway at Gatwick

- Pre-existing business would be disadvantaged
- The local population would be disadvantaged
- The infrastructure is already creaking through the area being totally overcrowded
- The road network will not cope, the plans are totally inadequate and the costings for the improvements hopelessly understated.
- The case for economic growth is not credible, the economy is already overheated in the South East
- The north south divide will widen
- The environment will suffer
- Substantial building on flood plains inevitable
- Flooding will be a real issue
- The airport owners are all overseas investment companies, their interest is profit not the betterment of the area and UKplc

It is my observation that from Gatwick's data and their roadshows, they have substantially underestimated the negative impacts and overstated any perceived benefits. There are no specifics of who will benefit. Mine is a high tech electronics company in avionics and it is almost certain we would be no better off if the airport were to be expanded. Certainly when put up to any proper scrutiny their plan is not viable.

I would wish to address the commission in person and hopefully if there is an opportunity you will be able to spare me a little time.

I apologise for repetition in the above and the slightly informal nature of the response but this is not my usual field and I wanted to make sure I covered what I believe are the key points. I also apologise for grammatical errors, as the deadline for submission approached I found that time slipped away with the myriad of other day to day stuff. However, I feel sure you got the drift.

Many thanks for the opportunity of letting me state my opinion.

