**Copy and paste the text below into an email and send it to**:

[gatwickairspacechanges@ipsos.com](mailto:gatwickairspacechanges@ipsos.com)

**[Insert your name]**

**[Insert your address]**

**[Insert your telephone number]**

**Question 1a:**

Which ONE of the SIX alternative proposed options, if any, do you believe provides the best balance of benefits for RWY26 departures?

1a ‘Don't know’

1b, 1c & 1d: I believe that as these proposals are not relevant to our area, they are best responded to by those affected.

**Question 2a:**

Compared with today’s routes, do you believe the proposed realignment for RWY08 departures to the east/northeast of Gatwick Airport is better or worse?

I’m inclined to support the alignment that has been drawn up on the basis of feedback from Kent County Council and others. This alignment is shown in Maps 26 and 27. My support is based on the 500m NPR indication that a negative population figure of - 3900 will be achieved against a 0 (zero) figure of those newly affectedon the understanding that there are real noise reduction benefits. However, some reports suggest Gatwick's population counts are invalid and that this change will not in fact reduce noise for most residents because of the noise cloud created by more concentrated flights. On balance, it is not really possible to assess the overall impact of this proposal from the data provided.

**Question 2b:**

Which, if any, factors do you believe to be the most important for us to consider when determining whether to realign the RWY08 departures to the east/northeast?

I believe that many factors should be taken into account including:

Noise that affects health

Noise at night that disturbs people’s sleep

Noise in the day that impacts people’s quality of life

Noise in the daytime that affects our schools and community facilities

Noise over Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, National Parks and historic houses and gardens

**Question 2c:**

If we were to implement the proposed route, what width NPR swathe do you think is most appropriate?

I support the most practical width that causes the least disturbance to those being overflown.

**Question 2d:**

If you answered question 2c, what were the reasons for your choice?

My support for this swathe is directly linked to the fact that there will be no increase in the population that is affected and no increased intensity of over-flying for any population. Conversely, there will in fact be a decrease in the nuisance caused. It is my submission that this fundamental principle (the need to ensure that there is no increase in the populations overflown or the intensity of over-flying on any population) should be central to any of the proposals

**Question 3a: (This applies to Superhighway in our area)**

Should we seek changes to the current DfT noise abatement requirements, so that the proposed night time arrival respite route for RWY26 could be implemented (as shown in Map 34 and Map 35)?

I do not consider that a single respite route is appropriate. My position is that a multi respite should be given priority through a tactically vectored broad swathe approach, as is currently operational. I bring to your attention that in the original consultation question ‘On Arrivals Based on Point Merge at Gatwick,’ of the online responses from the public only 8.5% strongly supported Point Merge, 17% tended to support but almost 75% did not support Point Merge.

**Question 3b: (This applies to the Superhighway in our area)**

Which, if any, factors do you believe to be the most important for us to consider when determining whether to seek changes to the current DfT noise abatement requirements, so that the proposed night-time arrival respite route for RWY26 could be implemented?

These changes should only be considered if they form part of a multi respite path option day and night across a broad swathe, as is currently operational. As it is stated that this proposal is purely for nighttime respite, then clearly the reduction of noise is primarily for a reduction in disturbed sleep.

**Question 3c: (This applies to the Superhighway in our area)**

What, if any, comments or suggestions do you have about the proposals for us to seek changes to the current DfT noise abatement requirements, so that the proposed night-time arrival respite route for RWY26 could be implemented?

I stand by my previous answer that this should not be about a single respite path. However, if it was part of a multi respite swathe it could be supported if it was proven that there would be a reduction in people adversely affected by noise nuisance and/or no increase in those newly affected.

**Questions 4a, 4b,4c**

Or in full via email:

Are not relevant to our area and are best dealt with by those affected.

**Question 5a:**

Should Gatwick Airport Ltd re-centre and narrow the published NPRs to take account of aircraft performance on the modern PBN routes in place at Gatwick Airport?

I have a neutral position on this given that the information suggests that it is purely a cosmetic exercise. However, if the narrowing of NPRs could lead to a higher concentration of noise for a minority of residents, GAL should NOT go ahead.

**Question 5b:**

Which, if any, factors do you believe to be the most important for us to consider with respect to re-centering and narrowing published NPRs to take account of aircraft performance on the modern PBN routes?

NPR swathes should indicate potential noise impact from over-flights of nearby areas.

**Question 5c:**

What, if any, comments or suggestions do you have about the proposals for Gatwick Airport Ltd to consider re-centering and narrowing published NPRs to take account of aircraft performance on the modern PBN routes (please provide any views you have on what the optimal width for NPR swathes should be)?

The optimal width should reflect the effects on the population below. However, I have seen no environmental metrics used in this consultation process that would fill this objective and reliance is purely made on population count within the NPR 4000ft ceiling.

**Question 6a:**

Should we implement shortened NPRs to take account of the observed climb performance of the flights at Gatwick Airport?

‘Probably not’

**Question 6b:**

Which, if any, factors do you believe to be the most important for us to consider when determining whether to implement shortened NPRs to take account of the observed climb performance?

Although I am not in agreement with the proposal on balance, NPR swathes should always indicate potential noise impact from over-flights of nearby areas.

**Questions 7a, 7b and 7c**

Are not relevant to our area and are best dealt with by those affected.

**Question 8a:**

Should Gatwick Airport Ltd consider NPR swathes with variable widths, dependent on sharpness of turns on each route, as a more accurate portrayal of where aircraft actually overfly?

Yes probably.

**Question 8b:**

Which, if any, factors do you believe should be the most important for us when considering NPR swathes with variable widths, dependent on sharpness of turns on each route, as a more accurate portrayal of where aircraft actually overfly?

NPR swathes should indicate potential noise impact from over-flights of nearby areas.

**Question 8c:**

What, if any, comments or suggestions do you have about whether we should consider NPR swathes with variable widths as a more accurate portrayal of where aircraft actually overfly?

Nothing further to add.

**Question 9:**

What, if any, additional comments do you have that are relevant to this consultation and that you would like to make?

Specific Point Merge arrival corridors were not shown in the original consultation documentation, nor was there any room for debate: only the existing broad swathes were shown. The original consultation process made it clear that GAL was not going to publish the flight paths from Point Merge. The follow-up consultation dated 1 May 2014, to which I am now responding, also fails to give me the opportunity to address this issue, as there is no specific question on this point. I therefore question the fairness of the “consultation”, and whether it can on any analysis be considered a true consultation process.

The proposed concentrated flight path approaching Runway26 from Point Merge has been positioned so that it overflies ‘noise sensitive areas,’ in particular the village primary schools of Bidborough, Langton Green, Speldhurst, Fordcombe, Penshurst, Chiddingstone and Hever. These quiet local schools, so important to the early development of children in learning, personal and social development - will be bombarded with noise. Much of this potentially disruptive disturbance can be avoided if a sensible and responsible approach is taken by Gatwick Airport. I advocate retaining the broad swathe approach to Runway 26, which is currently in operation as I believe this is the fairest way to spread the nuisance and environmental damage of noise from aircraft movements.

Penshurst is now shown in the epicentre of the proposed concentrated flight path for arrivals to Runway26, as are other listed villages. Our local economy relies on tourist attractions of internationally important buildings and grounds such as Hever and Chiddingstone Castles and Penshurst Place could be irrevocably damaged.

With the proposal of one concentrated flight path these historically important sites could be irrevocably damaged. Gatwick Airport seems in total denial of the collateral damage of its proposals to the West Kent tourist and leisure industries.

What is missing from this consultation are options that could give rise to a fairer approach to sharing the burden of air traffic. Surely with the massive benefits of the Precision Navigation it should be possible to vary approach routes easily with little or no inconvenience to pilots as they would just input the new route instructions into their navigation systems. I strongly advocate a policy of spreading the load over many routes so there are no “big losers” and ensuring that other linked policies are progressed to get steeper descent angles and point merge over the sea.

I, like many others, believe the environmental metrics used for airspace consultations in the United Kingdom are seriously flawed. Once again the discredited ANCON Leq 57dBA sound energy contours and their equivalents have been used. These have not been subject to the scrutiny of modern-day scientific analysis. Noise contours and footprints do not take into account of the vast majority of residents like me who are affected by aircraft movements at Gatwick Airport.

In addition to this, aircraft noise disturbance from airports in the UK is not adequately monitored. This has allowed Airbus A319/320/321 aircraft, which dominate aircraft movements at Gatwick Airport, to cause severe annoyance with a high pitched whine particularly noticeable along the low approach to touchdown from at least twenty-five miles away causing day and night time misery from aircraft noise. The industry has known about this design flaw since 2005.