

# **CAGNE**

## **Communities Against Gatwick**

### **Noise and Emissions**

#### **Final report 25.11.16**

#### **Gatwick Airport Arrival Review**

#### **IMM - 04**

#### **Gatwick Airport Noise Information**

Feedback from West Sussex and Surrey community group CAGNE

#### Introduction

We would find it misleading for Gatwick to claim it 'endeavours to be a good neighbour' and thus this line of Stewart Wingate's letter should be removed or other wording found.

The second paragraph is disingenuous in that it suggests people move to this area because of Gatwick and imply that they only wish to make use of the destination it offers. This may be true in some cases but not for all as some moved to Sussex, Surrey and Kent to get away from noise and urban living, to live amongst rural tranquil areas, to be surrounded by natural beauty and green space, and this we find this statement misleading to the reader. It also mentioned that it is a hub, which is not factual

Therefore we find this statement is likely to be misleading to the reader.

#### Page 4

The opening paragraph sounds as if it has been taken from the Gatwick second runway sales brochure. This brochure is designed to warn residents of the impact of Gatwick and yet it details more about the success of the airport and destinations. This paragraph should be removed or re-written to reflect Gatwick's location, ie West Sussex, a rural county.

Third paragraph details times of ATMs, this does not include the period 10am-12 noon when areas are impacted by long haul planes. This must be detailed and the fact that Gatwick has night flights.

#### Page 5

This should not just mention westerly departures at 70% but also should detail arrivals percentages to the east as a comparison.

#### Page 6

The departure map's height measurements are not clear as it would seem to suggest that the end of an NPR is 4,000ft etc but in fact planes reach this height more quickly

The noise monitor map should be checked for accuracy, as we believe the monitor in Warnham was removed at the end of the ADNID trial.

Page 8

Paragraph two should indicate that the lowest track in a holding stack is 7,000ft so as not to blight these areas as well.

The maps/ graphs

For a person who is not educated in aviation and aircraft movements, these maps

The maps give no indication of height and frequency of aircraft that these areas endure. They need to show clearly where the runway is and what the circles are i.e. holding stacks.

Page 9

CDA – it is suggested that CDA reduces noise and yet we have not seen proof of this during the changes to arrivals. Is it wise to include CDA without explaining in more detail that it is a voluntary procedure and not one Gatwick can enforce. It is also subject to airlines' own standard operating procedures eg Cathay Pacific, and that pilots from overseas may differ greatly in their competence at CDAs.

We note there is no mention of NAP1 or NPA2 under departures and thus question the inclusion of CDA under arrivals.

Page 10

Refers to 3,000ft but gives no description or scale of what noise is like from aircraft at 3,000ft or above. There needs to be more detail to what noise is, perhaps the Government policy of noise up to 4,000ft, noise / CO2 up to 7,000ft, etc. *Cannot understand this. MB*

Page 11

Again lack of height details.

Map/ Graph should show runway location and identify the holding stacks.

There is no mention that both holding stacks are used for east and west landings.

Page 12

Missed Approaches/Go Arounds – there should be an indication to how many missed approaches can be expected per year.

Page 13

The point that Missed Approaches largely occur due to the airport endeavouring to increase ATMs is not mentioned.

Page 14

Paragraph 3 is misleading as the ICAO noise classification would suggest that aircraft are governed to make sure they are not quiet and yet the fact is that aircraft at Gatwick that fit into the ICAO category 4 are some 25 years old and thus not modern or quiet. *I don't understand what you are trying to say here.MB*

Paragraphs 6 & 7

Should detail that fact that winter night quotas can be moved to the summer quotas.

Page 15

When endeavouring to explain that people hear noise in different ways, we would ask that rural areas are identified as being more impacted by aircraft noise due to the low level of ambient noise, especially as night. Rural areas in Kent, Sussex and Surrey surround Gatwick.

Page 16

The report does not mention the fact that we are told constantly that 'planes are getting quieter' and this should be mentioned so not to blight all communities in a 30 mile radius that suffers Gatwick noise currently. *Again, I don't understand what you are trying to say here.*

Seeking a fair and equitable distribution of arrivals and departures to the west and east for West Sussex and Surrey  
[www.cagne.org](http://www.cagne.org)  
[cagnegatwick@gmail.com](mailto:cagnegatwick@gmail.com)  
[www.facebook.com/gatwickcagne](http://www.facebook.com/gatwickcagne)  
Twitter @cagne\_gatwick