[redacted]

Freepost RTKX-USUC-CXAS
Airports Commission Consultation
PO Box 1492
Woking
GU22 2QR

RECEIVED
- 4 FEB 2015

1st February 2015

Dear Sirs

Please find attached my response to the Airports Commission Second Runway Consultation questions.

In addition though, I would add the following comments and observations.

- The character of much of Surrey, Sussex and Kent would be altered forever;
- It would cause large scale in-migration of labour from other parts of the UK and from the EU;
- About 40,000 new houses would be needed, also many new commercial premises, causing urbanization and loss of countryside;
- A severe strain would be put on local hospitals, doctors, and schools;
- Increased aircraft noise would affect three times as many people as at present;
- New flight paths over previously peaceful areas would cause intense disturbance, distress and anger;
- It has been calculated (GACC) that 100,000 more vehicles a day plus more commercial traffic would use the roads, causing serious road congestion and delays;
- With 90,000 extra people a day using rail services, the result would be standing room only;
- Nineteen listed buildings would be demolished – more than at any time since the WWII blitz.
- 14 hectares of ancient woodland would be destroyed;
- Twice the number of flights would mean twice the climate change damage;
- Very substantial costs for new infrastructure would fall on the taxpayer.

As well as my own, personal opposition to expansion at Gatwick, all of the following bodies have also voted against the planned expansion of Gatwick:

- West Sussex County Council
- Kent County Council
- Crawley Borough Council
- Horsham District Council
- Mid Sussex District Council
- Mole Valley District Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Tunbridge Wells Borough
- Wealden District Council.
- The Council for the Preservation of Rural England
- The Woodland Trust
- Friends of the Earth
- Greenpeace
- RSPB
- WWF UK
- The Green Party
- The Liberal Democratic Party.
- None of the local Members of Parliament support a second runway.

[redacted]

I very much hope that your review and recommendations will support the extremely concerned residents such as myself and will result in you ***NOT*** supporting the plans for ***ANY*** expansion at Gatwick and in the immediate short-term, a return to the flight paths used prior to November 2013.

[redacted]

[redacted]

The consultation

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.

- I think that the Airports Commission should be more critical of Gatwick's statements and figures. I genuinely do not believe that Gatwick can be trusted to ensure that the promises they have/are making will ever be fulfilled.
- Gatwick is very unlikely to be in a financial position to provide the funding which is needed to build the new runway and supporting infrastructure. It is very questionable whether they will ever deliver on a promise to build a new runway, as the current owners (all of whom live outside of the UK?) are planning to sell the airport in the near future so have limited and/or any genuine interest in the long-term well-being of the areas residence.
- The Airports Commission should look outside of the details provided by Gatwick and pay greater attention to the consequence on the surrounding areas of Gatwick expanding which seems to have been overlooked.

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.

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 non-technical person to understand. You should express immense concern about the impact noise will have on areas previously unaffected by aircraft noise – such as Billingshurst - as well as the increase that current routes will endure. As a resident of Billingshurst, I can assure you that the increase in aircraft flying over the village, the altitude and the dreadful noise that we are enduring NOW is driving me and my family to despair. We cannot sit in our garden due to the noise; we cannot fall asleep at night because of the noise; we cannot relax in the evening and do the simple things such as watch the television without being disturbed by the noise – NONE OF WHICH was the case less than a year ago.
- 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 of 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.
- 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.
- Aircraft have not yet been designed that will bring reduced noise to residents and should not factor into consideration at this stage

[redacted]

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

- There will be no compensation for any loss in the value of my home or for the impact on the quality of life for me and my family. Our areas are valued on tranquility and surrounding countryside unlike London's inflated prices that are not affected by aircraft noise.
- The increase in flights from 250,000 to 560,000 per year will have a devastating effect on Billingshurst and other, similar rural areas close to and surrounding Gatwick.
- 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, night time 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.
- New flight paths over areas not previous impacted by aircraft noise – such as Billingshurst - will endure noise day and night. Gatwick will cause urbanization 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 precise reasons that drew me and my family to the area 10 years ago and kept us here when we chose to move house last year – a process we started BEFORE the impact of the new flight paths.
- 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 affects and increases in road users from mass housing and industrial parks and airport users endeavoring to avoid congested main roads (an estimated increase of 100,000 vehicles a day)
- Runways – 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.
- Railways – 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 link would have to be built to serve an increased flight volume to and from Gatwick. There is no proposal to do this. I travel to London Bridge and/or London Victoria daily and I am already starting to find it difficult to get a seat in the morning. Those joining the train from Horsham and Littlehaven often have to stand all the way in to 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/

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?

- Airport Commission recognizes Gatwick does have a noise problem as Gatwick ignores the impact aircraft noise has on rural communities.

[redacted]

- 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.
- There is no research into the impact concentrated routes have on the health of those living below – But I can assure you, it is already ruining mine and my families life!
- Why does the Airport Commission believe Gatwick, larger than Heathrow, can cope with one road in and out of Gatwick (the M23) and how one railway in and out of Gatwick will cope with passengers and workers when Heathrow has an extensive road and rail network?
- The Commission has made little of the impact Gatwick expanding will have on the environment and impact on the rural areas of West Sussex and beyond.
- Little is made of the lack of hospitals and schools that we already suffer from, or the increased pollution from aircraft and road users will have on residents and pupils health.

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 from years of lack of investment in infrastructure and already struggle with the projected growth in population.
- 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. According to the Department for Transport, 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.

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.
- Gatwick has only one major revenue stream – Easy jet (who also now support the expansion of Heathrow and NOT Gatwick - http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-31060825 . 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.
- 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.
- There is no guarantee that the 286 businesses demolished to make way for a new runway would 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 dire access to London and plagued by gridlock on the M25/ M23.
- 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 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

[redacted]

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?

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?