

CAGNE

Communities Against Gatwick

Noise and Emissions

umbrella community group for Sussex and Surrey

The Gatwick Airport Master Plan for a 3-runway airport – the community response
July 2019

Has the Gatwick Airport 106 money kept pace with the growth of Gatwick on our counties purse?

Poor Master Plan consultation – Gatwick management say that two thirds of those consulted want the emergency runway to be used, but the consultation took place in areas not impacted by aircraft noise and gave little detail to the ramifications of Gatwick's expansion plans.

The House of Commons Gatwick Co-ordination Group has stated in writing (July 2019) that they have 'concerns over....the proposed scale of expansion in terms of its impact on rail and road transport infrastructure, new homes, soft infrastructure pressures, and noise and air pollution.They are not convinced by Gatwick's projections for local economic growth, and that there would be 'diminished quality of life for local residents'.

The Gatwick story to date - In April 2019 Gatwick Airport sold a 50.01% stake to VINCI Airports for £2.9bn with Global Infrastructure Partners (GIP) retaining a 49.99% interest in Gatwick; GIP having purchased Gatwick for £1.9bn in 2009 and stating that they would not be looking for a new runway.

Can Gatwick be trusted? Gatwick management then embarked on years of campaigning against Heathrow Airport for a new runway. They failed to convince the government appointed independent Airports Commission who found after years of research unanimously in favour of Heathrow expansion. And yet we now face Gatwick management seeking to obtain a second runway by 'stealth' with no full parliamentary scrutiny on top of Heathrow expansion.

Growth and unacceptable levels of aircraft noise - This has caused an enormous increase in noise complaints from over a 30-mile radius to Gatwick Airport from Sussex, Surrey and Kent residents. Gatwick argue planes are quieter and this may be true, but in 2006 there were 4,791 complaints. As recorded by Gatwick Airport for the first quarter of 2019 they were up by 5,923 reaching a staggering 24,204 on the same period in 2018.

The emergency runway would be using the same flight paths as used today 24/7. Any gaps in arrivals and departures will disappear due to Gatwick's predicted 36% increase in the number of flights, as detailed in the Gatwick Master Plan documents. The CEO stating the number of take offs and landings would increase from around 55 an hour to up to 70.

Departing short haul planes to the east and west flying north would use the emergency runway. This freeing up the main runway to accommodate more long haul and short haul as well as all aircraft arrivals back into the UK.

Aircraft noise cannot be mitigated so is Gatwick to offer of a compensation package to meet the vast swathes of Sussex, Surrey and Kent that will be devalued due to the creation of noise ghettos?

Emergency Runway

The emergency runway will have to be moved, a 12m gap between runways is required, and the centerline of the emergency runway by 198m. Currently the two runways cannot be used simultaneously. Is this a new runway or 'making best use of existing facilities'? As directed by the government document 'Beyond the Horizon'. With 'no new runway' comes no compensation for anyone.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) published this year new guidelines. Stating the enormous significance of aviation noise and how harmful it is to community health at far lower decibel levels than previously known.

Economics; is Gatwick's master plan a threat or an opportunity?

- The Gatwick travel-to-work area is one of the most congested and densely-populated areas of Europe
- Road congestion is a regular feature of travel in the region, the resulting inefficiency being a significant cost to other businesses
- The Office for National Statistics has stated that the South East region has the highest rate of employment in the UK, earning the second highest incomes on average (after London). A major increase in jobs vacancies would inevitably cause further inflationary pressure on employers. Local businesses have to compete with Gatwick Airport when recruiting and retaining staff – an inflationary and inefficient situation ... and expansion would exacerbate the situation.
- The region has a relatively well-balanced, vibrant and stable economy... not too reliant on any one sector. The level of expansion that Gatwick proposes (Gatwick state with the emergency runway an extra 8,000 jobs would be created with 20,000 in the region with Gatwick Diamond estimating a further 37,000 new jobs created from new business parks) would dramatically result in an unbalanced economy and bring even heavier reliance on the prosperity of the airport to the region – a very unhealthy and risky position for a community.
- One of the business 'networking' groups local to Gatwick have attempted for many years to support the (overseas) owners of the airport; they generate publicity on the basis of straw polls taken with their membership. However, in one of their latest polls only 32% of their membership responded (being 160 businesses) – and as a percentage of businesses in the Crawley District this was only 5% of businesses. So, despite their efforts, no credible case has been put forward by the wider business community for Gatwick expansion.
- Business travel is now just 9% of UK residents' flights versus 18% in 1997¹⁷

Infrastructure to accommodate Gatwick's emergency runway

The drip, drip growth of Gatwick has resulted in a significant impact on the lack of infrastructure investment. Since December 2009, Gatwick reports that it has grown passenger numbers from 32 million to more than 46 million in 2019, with no significant investment in infrastructure to service passengers, workers and freight reaching the airport.

Is Gatwick to fund research into the infrastructure truly required to accommodate their master plan for uncapped growth in passenger numbers and freight?

Will a new roundabout or slip road off the M23 benefit anyone other than Gatwick Airport? It would not change the capacity of the M23 that is currently being

transformed into a SMART motorway to deal with the current levels of traffic – NOT the Gatwick Master Plan.

Taxpayers money for the improvements in the railway line at Croydon (Windmill Junction) are for current growth in passenger numbers – NOT for Gatwick's Master Plan for 2 or 3 runways.

The £150m being spent on the Gatwick station does not improve the line as it cannot be expanded from its single line, and Network Rail detail additional trains cannot be added to the line.

Gatwick state that 44% currently travel to Gatwick by public transport whilst the remainders use the roads with Gatwick detailing a '9,565 EXTRA CAR PARKING SPACES 24.5% AN INCREASE OF FROM 2017 CAPACITY' this illustrating Gatwick expect most leisure travellers to drive to the airport.

If it is down to the local authorities to fund electric charging points for vehicles? Is it therefore realistic to say that emissions of traffic endeavouring to reach Gatwick will decline due to electric vehicles?

Gatwick continues to breach air quality monitoring close to the airport (GATCOM report July 2019) and do not monitor further afield for small particles that have been identified to cause serious health issues.

Will local authorities subsidise bus travel to take cars off the roads?

Our public transport facilities are unable to cope with present commuter levels; there is no credible plan that will cope with significant travel expansion.

Housing and amenities - There are no details given by Gatwick to the number of workers required to operate a 2-runway airport. No details to the number of new, affordable houses that would be needed on top of the current council housing quotas to accommodate Gatwick's Master Plan for significant growth in the area. As you are well aware Crawley has a lack of housing and is already looking to neighbouring counties to accommodate their requirements.

Is there a climate change emergency?

Gatwick's master plan flies in the face of climate change, as aviation is one of the biggest threats our planet faces today contributing to 5% carbon emission globally as it burns fossil fuel.

Did you know that flying from Gatwick Airport to New York is a distance of 5,569km and releases 1.2 tonnes of Carbon per passenger? This equates to a 6-minute shower once a day for 6 years. Releasing 1.2 tonnes of carbon means melting 769 tonnes of glacial ice.

New planes and the modernisation of airspace may reduce CO2 emissions (fuel) but if you are adding more and more planes to the sky you are removing any saving made.

Productions of aviation biofuel will likely need to be in conjunction with carbon capture and storage (CCS) to be competitive with competing uses for biomass (e.g. in industry, electricity generation, or hydrogen production). We see this as non sustainable as many industries look to a similar medium to replace conventional

fuels. The number of cars on the road, electric, petrol or diesel, will still cause congestion on inadequate road systems. Electric batteries continue to use up the planet's resources and serious questions have to be asked to how the batteries will be disposed of in the future.

Published on May 2nd, from the Committee on Climate Change (CCC), the Government's official advisers, is recommending that the UK becomes 'net-zero' carbon by 2050.

Read the full report:

<https://www.theccc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Net-Zero-The-UKscontribution-to-stopping-global-warming.pdf>

What price do we place upon the views of green space?

If we are to concrete over our green space to accommodate this Master Plan, what legacy will we be leaving future generations with the decline in biodiversity of the land, wildlife and clean air?

Social economics – According to the government less than half of the UK population fly, and yet everyone subsidises this environmentally damaging industry as aviation pays no tax or duty on fuel. Only 15% of UK population take 70% of flights** and 7 out of 10 travel for leisure and ¾ of travellers are ABC1 social class**.

Aviation is a volatile industry reliant upon the consumer having funds to fly overseas for leisure; Airlines detail that there is already unwarranted passenger capacity and thus airlines are failing, this specifically goes against the government's predictions in the green paper for leisure growth. Aviation growth is not sustainable in its present form due to unrealistic ticket pricing and lack of resilience which will inevitably lead to more airlines in financial difficulty.

Is it Safe? There is a lack of land for Gatwick to move the emergency runway, it would have to incorporate the taxi way, Juliet, remove part of a building and aircraft will have to cross the emergency runway from the main runway to reach the terminals. This must raise safety concerns (airports given by Gatwick as examples of this working have terminals between the two runways unlike Gatwick).

To safeguard land for a 3rd runway on the never, never, is totally disingenuous. It blights communities further and traps residents unable to sell their homes. This should be strongly opposed as Crawley needs land for affordable housing and it hinders all predictions a council can make to future growth and services required.

**http://www.transportforqualityoflife.com/u/files/190116%20Curbing%20Aviation_A%20Fair%20Tax%20Package.pdf

⁸ Ibid and Pink Book, ONS, Chapter 3 Trade in Services, Table 3.2: Passenger revenue – where exports comprise air tickets sold by UK airlines to foreign residents and imports comprise air tickets sold by foreign airlines to UK residents. The net deficit in 2017 was £2.4bn:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/nationalaccounts/balanceofpayments/datasets/3tradeinservicesthepinkbook2016>

⁹ Travel Trends 2016, ONS, Table 2.09:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/leisureandtourism/datasets/overseasresidentstheuk>

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid

¹⁹ CAA Airport Statistics 2017, Table 12.1: