

Responding to the Airports Commission consultation on a second runway at Gatwick

Closing date 3 February

References are to paragraphs in our publication “*Gatwick Unwrapped*”
which contains a full explanation and the original sources.

The consultation document is at
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/381912/AC01_tagged_amend_25_11.pdf

A. **Simple quick response.** Send an email to airports.consultation@systra.com saying that you are opposed to a second runway at Gatwick. Or write a longer email giving the reasons why you are opposed (but don't spend too much time perfecting your letter - better to get others also to write).

B. **Detailed response using response form** - either online or by post. The response form is at <http://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/s/134578HXH DU> Suggested lines of reply below. These are in note form - please use your own words - identical responses tend to be disregarded. No need to answer every question.

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

A second runway at Gatwick is unacceptable.

Q2. Any suggestions how the short-listed options could be improved?

If a second runway were to be built, far greater improvements would be needed in road and rail infrastructure, in housing, schools, hospitals etc. Part of the cost should be borne by the airport.

Greater recognition of noise in rural areas (*Unwrapped* 23-25).

Promises to be in legal agreement (*Unwrapped* 84)

Local safeguards (*Unwrapped* 17, 27, 28)

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

Welcome rational approach by the Commission.

Deplore advertisements and lobbying by GAL.

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

Commission wrong to have ignored under-used airports north of London.

Q5. Comments on specific topics?

Strategic fit.

A second runway at Gatwick not wanted by airlines. (*Unwrapped* 81-82)

It would not 'improve the experience of passengers'. (*Unwrapped* 74-80)

It would worsen the north-south divide, and hence not maximise benefits for the UK.

Economy impacts -

Economic benefits of Gatwick runway as calculated by the Commission are half those for Heathrow. North-south divide. (*Unwrapped* 69-72)

Local economy impacts

Likely to be negative as many firms would suffer from shortage of labour and traffic congestion. Adverse impact on rural businesses. (*Bad for Business* www.gacc.org.uk/latest-news)

Surface access.

Greatly increased road traffic due to air passengers, airport staff, plus new firms attracted to the area. Proposals put forward by GAL, and accepted by Commission, insufficient.

Greatly increased rail use. Proposals insufficient. (*Unwrapped* 43-56)

Noise

Noise in rural area more annoying because of low background noise. Affects a much wider area than at Heathrow. Therefore simple comparison of numbers at Heathrow and Gatwick invalid. (*Unwrapped* 23-25)

New flight paths cause great distress and anger. (*Unwrapped* 34-40)

Doubling the number of aircraft on existing flight paths not acceptable.

Air quality

Even if the forecast is that Gatwick with two runways would not exceed EU limits, no wish to have air quality worsened. (*Unwrapped* 66)

Biodiversity

Concern at loss of 70 ha. of woodland including 14 ha. of ancient woodland.

Loss of countryside due to need for 40,000 new houses, and displaced commercial premises. (*Unwrapped* 62-64)

Carbon

Aviation is the fastest growing cause of climate change. A new runway would increase climate change damage. (*Unwrapped* 67-68)

Water and flood risk

Give local experience of floods. Would be increased by run-off from runway and buildings. (*Unwrapped* 65)

Place

How your town or village would be affected. Noise / traffic / housing etc.

Quality of life

Would be made worse by increased noise, traffic jams, rail over-crowding. By pressure on schools, doctors, hospitals, social services.

Community

Would be put under stress by in-migration of workers from elsewhere in the UK or from the EU.

Cost and Commercial viability

Increase in charges per passenger would be unpopular with public. Would lessen commercial viability in relation to other airports. Higher airport charges would make raising finance difficult.

Operational Efficiency

Reduced by the fact that existing terminals are on the 'wrong side' of the runway
(Unwrapped 31-33)

Operational risk

Parallel arrival flight paths only 1 km apart. (Unwrapped 33)
With only one motorway and only one rail line, Gatwick would be at risk if disruption, and also delays due to congestion.

Delivery

No trust can be put in promises by GAL unless put in a legal agreement before Government makes a decision. (Unwrapped 84-85)

Q6. Comments on the sustainability assessments?

Economic growth and increased employment are not benefits if only achieved by the in-migration of labour.

Q7. Comments on the business cases?

The business cases for both Heathrow and Gatwick would collapse if aviation were to be subject to fuel tax and VAT, even allowing for air passenger duty.

Business case for Gatwick rejected by easyJet and British Airways.
(Unwrapped 81-82)

Q8. Any other comments

Repeat - no new runway and no new flight paths.

Having done your response, please ask other members of your family to respond - but to be counted a separate replies it is necessary to use different email addresses.

Please also ask your friends and neighbours to respond. You may like to give them this advice, but emphasise the need to use different words.