

**CAGNE**

**Communities Against Gatwick  
Noise and Emissions**

**The umbrella aviation community and  
environment group for Sussex, Surrey, and Kent**

**Gatwick Airport Public Consultation**  
**9<sup>th</sup> September – 1<sup>st</sup> December**

**<https://www.gatwickairport.com/business-community/future-plans/northern-runway/documents/>**

Suggested responses to questions posed by Gatwick Airport who seek to rebuild the emergency runway as a second runway

**Question 1**

**Answer**

**Strongly oppose**

**Questions 2**

**Answer**

Gatwick Airport is a volatile business format as we have seen in 2008 recession and with the pandemic due to its business model of leisure travel to EU.

Economic gain should not be at the cost to the local environment and the planet, so no expansion of airports should be taking place.

Aviation has no true alternative to fossil fuel in production to meet the vast quantities that would be required by aviation.

The planet must come before any economic benefit.

**Question 3**

**Answer**

Aviation has been actively reducing jobs with automation, even pre-Covid, and continues with this plan to save overheads with automated air traffic control and planes. Airports often promise jobs when seeking expansion, but they tend not to materialise. Green sustainable jobs need to form the future for our areas, with apprenticeships in green industries if we are truly seeking to reach net zero.

If we keep relying upon Gatwick for jobs, we will continue to see low skilled jobs instead of jobs in industries that will aid the reduction in global warming.

Due to Brexit, all industries are suffering a lack of workers, so we see jobs as a hollow offer by this airport.

#### Question 4

##### Answer

Gatwick has never been a cargo hub and there is nothing to lead residents to believe it will become one. The only cargo Gatwick is known for is plane belly-cargo of long-haul planes, of which Gatwick has few currently. We do not support cargo becoming a major factor at Gatwick due to the lack of rail or road capacity for large lorries.

This may be an aspiration of Gatwick, but it is one that residents would not benefit from as cargo would have to be transported past other airports, such as Heathrow and Stansted, that have specific cargo planes landing during the night.

To move the incinerator to accommodate cargo warehousing would mean it is no longer placed alongside Mount Royal that was meant to benefit from this facility in waste disposal (stated at time of planning application) and heat for the industrial site and the North Terminal.

#### Question 5

##### Answer

The rebuilding of the emergency runway as a second runway would require, by Gatwick's own documents, major flood defences in diverting the River Mole and disposing of runway water. The concreting and tarmacking of a new runway and taxiways (28) removes the biodiversity of nature. We therefore oppose the building of this runway and taxiways.

This would disrupt the species connectivity corridors and framework of wildlife for which no schemes can mitigate.

The huge changes to the roads feeding Gatwick would once again destroy much biodiversity.

#### Question 6

##### Answer

Gatwick state in the Master Plan and subsequent papers that they will be building outside of the airport boundary. *'The land subject to the application for development consent extends to approximately 820 hectares, of which approximately 747 hectares lies within the ownership of Gatwick Airport'*

This is clearly Gatwick expanding outside of its boundary along with the mass new road infrastructure that Gatwick is proposing to feed cargo and 75m passengers annually to this site.

This is also not as Gatwick seek to suggest 'minor adjustment or utilising existing infrastructure'. As Gatwick details this is a reconfiguration of taxiways, changes to aircraft stands, reconfiguration of airfield facilities new surface and multi-storey car parks. additional hotels and offices and most importantly moving the emergency runway 12m north from its current location.

This is a major expansion with all the negative consequences that it will involve for the area. This a "Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project" hence the DCO process which clearly disproves Gatwick's attempts to portray the changes proposed as minor and insignificant in the impact and scale.

#### Question 7

##### Answer

As above, the changes planned by Gatwick to the feeder roads are of a major new road construction/ configuration. Add this to the construction of a new runway and taxiways, local areas will be impacted by the construction traffic.

This new road network would be turning Gatwick into a Heathrow complex of service roads.

It is not realistic to believe that passengers (75m) will cycle to the airport with luggage. Workers (18,400) do not necessarily live locally but travel by car as there is no east to west rail link, the CEO of Gatwick for example travels on the M25 and M23 to access the airport as do other management from Essex and Bucks.

It only takes one accident on the M23 and all the residential roads become full of taxis, private cars, etc. – a new interchange for Gatwick will not prevent this. Once again, Gatwick is seeking only to benefit Gatwick. Smart roads, M23 and M25, are deemed as not safe, so this volume of additional traffic, in passengers and cargo, should be avoided.

### **Question 8**

#### **Answer**

Once again, Gatwick is only seeking to deliver what Gatwick needs in feeder roads to deliver the significant increase in passengers from 46m to 75m, plus cargo HGVs.

Who is paying for the upgrading of all roads that will feed this new interchange that Gatwick is proposing? Who will then pick up the maintenance bill of this new interchange?

We must question the air-quality issues being created by Gatwick today from the roads, tyres, and emissions, as well as from the airfield, as an Imperial College report suggests that the small particles that come from the airfields cause serious health issues. (Dr Gary Fuller report)

### **Question 9**

#### **Answer**

Same as question 7

### **Question 10**

#### **Answer**

The M23 has been made a smart road for natural growth in the southeast. Pre-Covid, it was expected to be at capacity by 2040 without a 2<sup>nd</sup> runway at Gatwick.

As anyone will know, marketing gimmicks of car-sharing, etc. do not have latitude and so cannot be counted upon to reduce traffic to Gatwick.

We also must add the commuter traffic that the new station is meant to accommodate, as well as Gatwick passengers. A new station does not increase the capacity of the single railway line that can't be expanded. The railway line cannot take cargo due to the lack of capacity and cargo would slow up the passenger line.

### **Question 11**

#### **Answer**

One accident brings the M23 to a standstill and all traffic is diverted, or naturally diverts, onto residential roads.

### **Question 12**

#### **Answer**

There are no plans in the proposals for storing alternative fuels, so we must assume that Gatwick does not believe they are feasible any time soon. If they are feasible, where are they to be stored when the rebuilding of the emergency runway and taxiways will take up most of the spare land within Gatwick's boundary?

As the aviation industry state 'there is no one silver bullet' for an alternative fuel for aviation. Electric is not feasible for commercial routes due to weight, power restrictions and lack of range of the batteries. Blue and green hydrogen all come with climate issues, as well as production problems for mankind and the natural world; municipal fuel is a non-starter.

### **Question 13**

#### **Answer**

Gatwick is misleading residents with talk of noise envelopes as Gatwick 2 will be followed by the modernisation of airspace; as such, all areas could be overflowed. So, with more planes would equal more respite for those under current flight paths which in turn could be sought by flying over new areas for efficiency and saving of fuel. As noise groups seek 'to share the noise burden', with 'noise sharing' nobody is safe from aircraft noise if you allow Gatwick Airport to significantly grow with 2 runways.

### **Question 14**

#### **Answer**

Residents who live in rural areas want to be able to enjoy the outdoors. No consultation will mitigate the significant increase in aircraft noise.

Planes may be getting quieter but the frequency and the difference in noise levels further out from the runway and closer in as still a major factor (CAA noise contour report 2020) that is not being addressed.

The removal of the independent noise body (ICCAN) by the aviation minister does not help the ongoing push by communities for the understanding of the impact on health and wellbeing by aviation.

For Gatwick to suggest building of noise barriers it is clear that they only seek to mitigate noise for those close to the new runway, north. There is no such thing as mitigation of aircraft noise in the air, as all residents should be allowed to enjoy their outdoor space without having to endure the noise of this international business.

### **Question 15**

#### **Answer**

The consultation has been poor as it has not gone to the villages/ parishes that are, or will be, significantly affected by aircraft noise.

Gatwick has been disingenuous by suggesting that aircraft noise will be limited (envelopes are not understood) and has not given any true calculation to the impact it will have with 2 runways and FASIS.

The details are limited and lead on subjects that Gatwick hope will convenience residents to support them, whilst ignoring the impact of aviation on the planet and the lack of alternative fuels.

As the emergency runway cannot **currently** be used in unison with the main runway due to safety issues it is therefore not in keeping with government policy of 'making best use of **current** facilities'.

Est Feb 2014

[www.cagne.org](http://www.cagne.org)

[cagnegatwick@gmail.com](mailto:cagnegatwick@gmail.com)

#pledgetoflyless

[www.cagnepcforum.org.uk](http://www.cagnepcforum.org.uk)

Twitter @cagne\_gatwick

Facebook CAGNE

Instagram @CAGNE