

Are you responding on your own behalf or on behalf of an organisation or group?

PLEASE SELECT ONE BOX ONLY

I am providing my own response

I am providing a response on behalf of an organisation or group

As part of the draft master plan, we are proposing to grow Gatwick by making best use of the existing runways in line with Government policy. The benefits of growing Gatwick would include more choice of destinations for passengers, as well as additional employment opportunities and benefits to the wider economy. We are proposing to make Gatwick a more efficient airport, while at the same time mitigating our impact on the environment.

Given the above, to what extent, if at all, do you support or oppose the principle of growing Gatwick by making best use of the existing runways in line with Government policy? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Chapters 4 and 5 in the full version of the draft master plan.

PLEASE SELECT ONE BOX ONLY

Strongly support

Tend to support

Neither support nor oppose

Tend to oppose

Strongly oppose

Don't know

Please explain why you hold this view.

PLEASE SUMMARISE YOUR KEY COMMENTS

This seems to be pure opportunism in light of the fact that original planning permission and s52 agreement with the local council are expiring in 2019. The original restrictions were due to safety issues associated with using the emergency runway alongside the main runway. Have these issues been resolved to the extent that they would be permitted today? Or how will these issues be resolved if this plan is carried forward? What are the plans for emergency runway, if emergency runway is in use? No information about any of this is provided, but is central to making informed comment on the plans.

Moreover, the reality of the plans proposed are not to use the emergency runway as it exists, but to widen it to comply with international regulations - which sounds

like not like making best use of existing runways at all, but rather major infrastructure change.

Increasing the number and frequency of flights ultimately means more noise, more air pollution, more traffic congestion - this master plan offers no acceptable recourse for any of these impacts. The recognition "that the additional flights generated by the two-runway operation would have some impacts on the environment" is the sole mention of the damage that will be caused. It is a pitiful indictment of the lack of attention to the many social and ecological harms that would result - this warrants much more understanding and consideration. Additionally, the economic section does not reflect any of the environmental or social impacts to 2028 and beyond therefore the financial case made here are most definitely overstated and not a true reflection of the benefits to be offered.

But more than this, the starting point of this question needs to be addressed. The current Government's policy approach to aviation is fundamentally flawed. For Gatwick to blindly follow it is foolish.

Generally, the need for airport expansion in the South East and London has not been demonstrated. The costs - in terms of financial costs, air pollution, climate, noise and community impacts have not been sufficiently taken into account. The economic benefits arising from increased capacity in the South East have been overstated. Once the negative impacts and true costs are fully taken into account, I believe that no net benefit will arise. In addition, airport expansion in the South East will do nothing to rebalance the UK economy.

Recently published information about the impacts of climate change demonstrate that there is no global scope for more aviation. If there are only 12 years left to avoid global average temperature rise above 1.5 degrees, increasing passenger numbers, routes and aircraft movements cannot happen. Figures in the 2012 master plan were too conservative, growth was much higher than anticipated at Gatwick over recent years. This cannot be the case for the current master plan - any growth at Gatwick is not an option if we want to secure the future of our society, especially not a doubling in 30 years, which is the level of magnitude outlined. How this level of growth can be referred to as incremental or sustainable, as it is described in the master plan, is difficult to understand.

Moreover, the impacts of Brexit have not been examined or taken into consideration in the figures. Whilst it is stated that the emerging Aviation Strategy will clarify some of the uncertainty - what happens until it is released? It was slated for Autumn, now Spring. This makes it very difficult to understand some of the central ideas laid out in the master plan. Will Gatwick continue to 'remain

committed to implementing the SESAR PCP (Pilot Common Project)' for example?

Given the draft master plan looks out beyond 2030, to what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree that land that has been safeguarded since 2006 should continue to be safeguarded for the future construction of an additional main runway? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Section 5.4 in the full version of the draft master plan.

PLEASE TICK ONE BOX ONLY

Strongly agree

Tend to agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Tend to disagree

Strongly disagree

Don't know

Please explain why you hold this view.

PLEASE SUMMARISE YOUR KEY COMMENTS

If it is truly Gatwick's ambition to be the most sustainable airport in the UK, it simply cannot safeguard the land for potential runway construction 'in the national interest'. These two notions are completely incompatible.

The Government has already assessed plans to expand Gatwick and found them wanting. The Airports Commission "unequivocally and unanimously" selected Heathrow.

As well as the impacts from the development itself, supplementary infrastructure and industry would lead to the further development of the countryside. And there is no guarantee of funding to maintain these associated elements.

Cash-strapped councils will be asked to fork out for a development that takes businesses off local high streets which is one of the very few ways that councils can steady their incomes streams at the moment.

What more, if anything, do you believe should be done to maximise the employment and economic benefits resulting from Gatwick's continued growth? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Section 5.6 and Chapter 7 in the full version of the draft master plan.

PLEASE SUMMARISE YOUR KEY COMMENTS

The additional jobs are not needed and will apply pressure in an already pressurised area for housing and services.

The unemployment rate in Surrey and West Sussex is much lower than the national average. According to statistics released by the airport, 60% of flights at Gatwick are leisure related to other parts of the UK, so expansion of the airport would only entice visitors away from spending money in the local area which would negatively impact on the local economy. It is a fake argument to try and say that an airport expansion will benefit the local economy.

Any expansion will mean new workers not currently in the local area, which will be huge pressure on transport, housing and other local services.

It is important to point out that GAL is wholly owned by foreign shareholders - the real financial benefit of the development will not be felt by the local community - or indeed the UK - at all.

As with all long term plans, focus needs to be reframed away from solely economic considerations - growth and development. The master plan pays nothing but lip service to social and environmental considerations - there is no real substance to the understanding of the impacts - this is extremely myopic. Jobs jobs jobs is not the answer.

What more, if anything, do you think should be done to minimise the noise impacts of Gatwick's continued growth? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Sections 4.5, 5.5, 6.4 and 6.5 in the full version of the draft master plan.

PLEASE SUMMARISE YOUR KEY COMMENTS

It is important to emphasise the simple point - further expansion will increase noise. Fewer flights by quieter aircraft are needed. Opening up emergency or new runways impacts more people in the area - despite attempts to not fly over new areas, in reality this cannot be guaranteed.

As the longhaul and shorthaul aircraft will use the same departure flight paths, impact will be felt most by the communities already seriously impacted by the problems.

There are also some questions about statements made and general information provided in the action plan that require more information.

- What happens to adherence to the EU Environmental Noise Directive when the UK leaves the European Union? The master plan offers no details about whether Gatwick's intends to continue working with its Gatwick Airport Environmental Noise Directive Noise Action Plan, and continue to update these every 5 years.
- What are the outcomes exactly that Gatwick seeks from the planned modernisation of the SE airspace in terms of reducing noise impact? This is a grand statement, but has no substance to explain what this might look like or the outcomes that would ensue.

What more, if anything, do you think should be done to minimise the other environmental impacts of Gatwick's continued growth? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Sections 4.5, 5.5 and Chapter 6 in the full version of the draft master plan.

PLEASE SUMMARISE YOUR KEY COMMENTS

As it currently stands and according to the figures stated in the master plan, the best case scenario is that Gatwick's growth plans will increase its carbon footprint by 177,637 tonnes (CO₂e) annually by 2040. The worst case is almost double this (318,980 tonnes CO₂e). As a global society, we need to be stabilising and reducing our emissions a DECADE before the timeframe in discussion in order to avoid planetary catastrophe. This master plan is not fit for consideration in the carbon constrained world in which we must exist. Lauding the 'carbon neutral' status of it's direct emissions is a travesty, when Gatwick is consulting on a plan that will increase its overall climate impact by a third. And measuring per passenger emissions is disingenuous as passenger numbers per flight continue to increase - this is simply creative counting which masks the fact that absolute emissions continue to rise.

The reliance on the improvements in technology stated in the report are naive. Even if short haul electric aircraft or more efficient fleets over the next 20 years come to fruition, they will not be sufficient to solve aviation's climate problems.

And this is just the climate considerations. Many of the 2017 figures cited in the master plan suggest that air pollutants are on the rise in the vicinity of Gatwick, this could be a trend that continues. Moreover the measurements primarily mentioned in the master plan discuss the surrounding roads and communities -

where is the information on the airport's roads and the impacts to the passengers and employees exposed in these areas?

Do you believe our approach to community engagement, as described in the draft master plan, should be improved, and if so, how? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Chapter 8 in the full version of the draft master plan.

PLEASE SUMMARISE YOUR KEY COMMENTS

The stance taken with the master plan seeks to inform communities but seems relatively passive in resolving the real and immediate issues that do and will continue to face them.

If you make use of Gatwick, what areas of passenger experience would you like to see improved?

PLEASE SUMMARISE YOUR KEY COMMENTS

Measures to improve accessibility are welcome but they must be done in collaboration with key stakeholders (including mobility/disability groups).

All transport must be fully accessible but there must be a recognition that all transport is not equal and we should not be promoting/expanding air travel for the reasons outlined above.

Improvements should in no way be used as a justification for dangerous and unnecessary airport expansion, such as that laid out in the master plan.

Are there any aspects of our Surface Access Strategy that you believe should be improved and, if so, what are they? Before answering, you will find it useful to read Section 4.4 in the full version of the draft master plan.

PLEASE SUMMARISE YOUR KEY COMMENTS

The ambition of the modal shift goals are too weak. Moving from a current 44% (39% rail) share to a 48% share by 2022 (over 40% rail by 2019) is simply too incremental (and may even just reflect natural trends). When providing an additional 9,565 extra car parking spaces (or almost 25%) more and undergoing massive motorway expansion to accommodate the increased influx of cars, this becomes not just an unambitious sustainable transport strategy, but a laughable one. Tinkering around the edges of modal shift is not sufficient (but given that fundamentally this is about getting more aircraft in the air, nothing is), more vision

and clarity on how provision can be made to offer passengers a realistic choice for leaving their cars at home is required.

Moreover, with the plans for additional freight to also be brought to and from Gatwick, the master plan also needs to consider long term plans for rail freight provision.

As there are no guarantees for where the funding for road maintenance will come from when more traffic comes to the airport on the local road network, more attention needs to be paid to the longer term considerations such as these. Moreover, the growth of traffic in the region needs to be more closely examined. It may be that areas of the road network will be unable to withstand growth, even before Gatwick's expansion is considered. How will issues such as this be addressed?

Plans are also afoot to alleviate the 'Croydon bottleneck' at the network level, given that the line connecting Gatwick to London and the coast is at breaking point. It must be guaranteed that improvements to the station as part of the Gatwick master plan factor in the impact that increased rail patronage will have to the wider network. Gatwick's activities should not mean that improvements essentially 're-seal' the unlocked bottleneck after completion.

Do you have any other comments to make about the Gatwick Airport draft master plan?

PLEASE SUMMARISE YOUR KEY COMMENTS

All three proposals create huge negative local and global impacts which have not been thought through in any level of detail at all here. The unashamed focus on economic growth is downright dangerous. When Gatwick should be considering ways to mitigate its current impacts, attention is devoted to causing more harm.

A myth is peddled about how airport expansion benefits those with least in society when $\frac{3}{4}$ of leisure travel is by the richest people in society and over half of the British population don't fly at all. Only 15% of the population take 70% of the flights. Air travel has paid no tax for 70 years.

Aviation is a top-ten global polluter and, worryingly, emissions are expected, at the current rate of expansion, to balloon by 300% if something isn't done soon. Just as we can't develop any new fossil fuel reserves or push ahead with fracking, we can't expand Heathrow or any other UK airport and hope to keep to the upper 2C limit for global average temperatures rises agreed in the Paris

accord. Unless we take aggressive and sustained action to halt the use of Britain's current fossil fuel stores, the more ambitious 1.5C limit is already beyond our reach.

This plan needs to reflect better on the latest information - and it must be rejected in full. There can be no use of existing runways, there can be no more runways built.

Which, if any, of the following applies to you?

PLEASE SELECT AS MANY BOXES AS APPLY

I work at Gatwick Airport

A member of my family works at Gatwick Airport

My job is dependent on Gatwick Airport

A member of my family's job is dependent on Gatwick Airport

None of these

Don't know

[EMAIL] keithtaylor@greenmeps.org.uk

[AGE] 65

[GENDER] M

[ETHNICITY] WB