

GATWICK MASTER PLAN

GACC Response Guidelines

GACC, founded in 1968, is the main environmental body concerned with Gatwick Airport. In addition to individuals, we have as paid-up members nearly 100 councils and local environmental groups.

GACC will be producing a robust response to the Gatwick Master Plan which we will circulate to all our members including local County, Borough, District and Parish councils and to all our local MP's. We hope the content of our response will provide others with an evidence based statement that will help them produce robust objections to Gatwick's Draft Master Plan.

We appreciate many people will attend the exhibitions promoted by Gatwick and will feel inclined to answer the consultation questionnaire there and then.

To help and encourage people to respond in a way that reflects the negative impacts Gatwick's Master Plan will have on our communities, we have produced some suggestions for constructing your answers to the questionnaire.

But keep in touch with us and when we produce our detailed draft response please don't hesitate to use this to create your own robust objections to Gatwick's Draft Master Plan.

To access the consultation online use this link :-

<https://ipsos.uk/draftmasterplan>

If you're not already a member then contact us either by email to **membership@gacc.org** or via our website **www.gacc.org.uk**
or write to us at:

GACC Membership, 2 Glovers Gate, Glovers Road, Charlwood, RH6 0EG.

GACC Response Guidelines

QUESTION 1. Growing Gatwick further

- Strongly oppose

QUESTION 2. Please explain your view in Q1.

- Frequency of flights will increase further, this is a major noise issue
- Claims of reduced aircraft noise in the future are unsubstantiated
- More flights means more aircraft generated air pollution
- More flights means more road traffic causing more road congestion and pollution
- Insufficient local housing available to provide homes for more staff leading to more long distance commuting, congestion and pollution
- Insufficient local infrastructure for business or residents – roads, business parks, shopping centres, housing, schools, medical centres, hospitals etc
- Providing the infrastructure needed would destroy huge amounts of countryside and urbanise the rural area all around Gatwick

QUESTION 3. Continues safeguarding of land for an entirely new runway

- Strongly disagree

QUESTION 4.

Please explain your view in Q3

- The Airports Commission “unequivocally and unanimously” selected Heathrow
- The government agreed, and parliament has since overwhelmingly endorsed that decision
- Continuing to blight a large area by clinging to the hope of an entirely new runway is detrimental to communities all around the airport
- Placing the majority of the runway capacity in the South East disadvantages the rest of the UK

QUESTION 5. Maximising employment and economic benefit

- Gatwick already creates a skills shortage for other businesses locally, further expansion will worsen this
- Increasing dependency on the airport reduces resilience in a downturn
- The local area does not need yet further expansion at Gatwick to thrive

QUESTION 6. Minimising noise

- The most common complaint is that the noise occurs too frequently; further expansion will worsen this hugely. Fewer flights by quieter aircraft are needed
- The width of the arrivals swathe needs to be fully utilised without any concentration
- No new areas should be overflowed

QUESTION 7. Minimising further environmental impact

- Gatwick’s attempts to minimise its own environmental impact does not address the real issue that it facilitates – flying is hugely environmentally damaging and expanding the airport to increase flights will increase this damage.

QUESTION 8. Is community engagement adequate?

- No
- The longstanding inability of Gatwick to provide even a complaints telephone line illustrates its cavalier attitude to local communities
- The locations for the exhibition related to this consultation are where favourable views are likely be expressed – centres of population that are very largely not overflowed. This demonstrates the fundamental bias that Gatwick exhibits against communities adversely affected by its operations.

QUESTION 9. If you use Gatwick, how could it be improved?

- No Comment

QUESTION 10. Comment on surface access strategy

- Gatwick is handicapped by an overburdened rail connection north/south and a totally inadequate rail connection east/west
- Being accessible by means of only one motorway that reaches neither the Capital nor the coast
- Statements that suggest traffic growth is minimal are not reflected in local people’s experiences.
- Increases in HGV traffic are particularly noticeable in the villages around Gatwick.
- Gatwick’s Surface Access Strategy does little to support rural bus services.

QUESTION 11. Further comments

- All three runway proposals create huge negative local impacts and contribute dangerously to the national and international environment.
- Gatwick needs to consider how to reduce its impact caused by its current growth, let alone consider facilitating further growth.
- We cannot meet worldwide Carbon emissions targets with continued emissions levels
- We cannot meet our commitments under the Paris Agreement with further expansion of aviation