Dear Sir / Madam

Having read the commissions reports into the Estuary Airport, the conclusions are that there are no fundament problems preventing the construction of the airport, but there are many challenges that would need to be addressed. We must bear in mind the politics and vested interests in airport expansion when arriving at a decision on this issue.

My feeling is to include the provision of a larger Hub airport to be built in the South East, along side the Heathrow and Gatwick proposals , providing for both the short and longer term options.

This is based on both Boeing and Airbus expecting the civil aviation market to double by 2033, driven by economic growth in Asia.

This information means that the current working assumptions of the Airport Commission of a single runway by 2030. should be re-evaluated, and a 4-5 runway hub airport option, to be sited in the South East, should be left on the table. It is in the longer term interests of the UK to allow for the option of a 4 runway hub and hence I will support allowing this option to be part of the commissions short list, along Heathrow and Gatwick.

A new airport site must be scalable i.e future proofed to be able to expand with future demand, again something that isn't possible at existing sites such as Heathrow and to a lesser extent Gatwick. A 4-5 runway solution simply isn't possible at Heathrow or Gatwick due to the constraints on both sites, we can't destroy West London, and build runways on some of the most expensive property in the UK, nor can be do large scale developmented at Gatwick, effectively destroying the South Downs National Park and AONB. An extra runway, maybe. A 4/5/6 runway superhub, No.

A few solutions to some of the operating challenges faced by the Estuary airport not picked up on by the reports could be :-

1) Closure of London City and Southend Airports.
This would free up airspace restrictions for the much larger IEA. Closure of Southend would also free up land for housing allowing Southend to expand to acomidate new workers airport workers, as part of a larger redevelopment of the town.

2) Cut and cover tunnelling for transport corridors to reduce impact on nearby AONB and urban centres, and loss of habitat of this part of the project.

3) A direct link between Crossrail and Kings Cross ? If so allowing direct access to HS1 from crossrail at Kings Cross, what impact on Journey times would this have on journey times from West London and Thames Valley ?

4) What wasn't included in the report was that :

a) the IEA would save Greenfield and Greenbelt development in the wider South East displacing habitat lost in the Thames Estuary.

b) The IEA is Key to unlocking the wider economical potential of the Thames Gateway.

c) An estimate to a solution for the SS Richard Mongomary was as low as £30m. This was from a respected bomb disposal expert who had worked on many WW2 Vessels previously. This is from Fellows International who have worked on HMS Vanguard, HHS Drake, and HMS Natal. This was reported in a press report in 2013.

Why wasn't this inculded in the reports

d) Growth in Civil Aviation between 2014 and 2033 predictions by Boeing and Airbus, expecting market to double

Boeing (36,770 new aircraft, 21,270 for fleet growth). This means many more destinations to be served by London. Surely this is the key to the entire study and underpins the whole exercise.

e) The environmental benefits on West London of replacing Heathrow with IEA.

The growth of demand predicted by Boeing and Airbus, must also undermine the current assumptions of the current reports, as if both the IEA and Heathrow could operate independently, much as Heathrow and City airports do today, due to market strength, then again many of the costs and risks attributed to the IEA site fall away. With an enhanced Crossrail, with link to HS1 at Kings Cross, linking the 2 airports together. One option may be that IEA is given the Hub role and Heathrow becomes a larger version of the current City Airport in its operation.

There are no easy solutions for this, so it is important that at this stage policy options are not limited, considering that the politics of UK aviation could change depending on the outcome of the UK general election in 2015, and that in practical terms any decision made is based on the most current information at the time, providing policy makers in the next Parliament the widest range of choices in 2015, when a final decision is to be made.

The views and options in the above text are my own and don't represent those of [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]