[redacted]

Q1 What conclusions, if any, do you draw in respect of the three short-listed options?

The conclusion I draw is that the process has been fatally flawed in a number of areas and is a total masquerade designed to provide credibility to a pre-determined outcome. The options provided are a disgrace as there is no option to say no to your suggestions based on the information provided. You have not provided sufficient justification for additional capacity at all and totally underestimated the impact on the people and environment that will be affected. I am most disappointed that the commission appears to be another official body to have been taken in again by propaganda and lobbying from the airline industry.

I may agree that there is a strategic need for a hub airport to connect the country to the major cities of the world but if that is the case it should most definitely NOT be in the south east corner of the country. It must be somewhere more accessible to the whole of the country and which does not involve shipping vast numbers of people to the south east corner which is already greatly over congested. That would be to pander once again to the London lobby thus perpetuating the north south divide even further. It would also make a mockery of the Chancellor's plan to revitalise the north by upgrading the transport facilities to connect the cities between Liverpool and Hull. In addition, I most certainly do not agree that we should pander to the airline industry's desire for an ever increasing number of flights to tourist areas and indeed from a strategic point of view for the country as a whole it would be much better for people to holiday in the UK and spend all that additional money in the UK economy.

The claims for economic benefits to the area are equally absurd taken at a national level, which is what you should have done. Recently it was reported that there were more vacancies than people wanting a job in the Crawley area near Gatwick. It is therefore ridiculous once again from a national perspective to propose such a development in the south east when the vast number of unemployed people are not in this region, there is no spare housing, limited land on which to build, vast swathes of green belt that would be put under threat, it is already impossible to get children into local schools because there are not enough places, people can't get appointments with the doctor because there are not enough of them, the roads are all full to overflowing with traffic and constantly teetering on the edge of gridlock, etc. etc. For all of these reasons to site any additional capacity in this area forcing even more prople to relocate here on a temporary and permanent basis is outrageous.

You state there is a demand for additional capacity but do not prove it. You are gracious enough to concede it is based on estimates at best. There is a demand for free care for the elderly, roads without potholes, free child care and lots of other things but I see no evidence of any of those demands being met so why should the airline industry be singled out for special, advantageous support? If public money is to be spent and it appears from the documentation that that is proposed, then the public should have a right to say no to this as the case is not proven.

Furthermore, if public money is to be spent for the benefit of foreign owned companies, as is the case here, there needs to be a detailed study of how much they have contributed to those funds, especially in terms of corporation tax. Do not be fooled by their employment claims as domestic businesses have to pay all those costs in addition to substantial corporation tax amounts and it is time these large corporations and foreign owned businesses were obliged to do the same for many years before they are eligible for any public funds to be used to their benefit, directly or indirectly.

Your case for a "demand" for additional capacity appears to be based on previous trends and estimates for GDP growth. This is a most flimsy basis on which to devastate the lives of a vast number of people for that is surely what the proposed expansion would do. You appear to have taken no account whatsoever of changes in demographics and geopolitical changes to name but two obvious ones. We are constantly being told how many old people are going to be clogging up our health service in the coming years and how there will be a vast number of them in relation to the number of working people, yet you have taken no account of all these people dropping out of demand for flights as they age, their health declines or they are refused travel insurance when they reach 70. They cannot both clog up the health service and go flying round the world and we are told the numbers are so huge in the coming years as to make a significant impact, yet you appear to have not taken any account of this at all. We also see vast areas of the Middle East and Africa subject to regimes inconsistent with any desire to travel there and growing political instability in a number of other areas. This also does not seem to have figured in your calculations. Nor does any account appear to have been taken of a possibility of withdrawal from the EU which could drastically reduce the demand for flights to Europe. I am sure there are many other considerations which should have been taken into account rather than the extremely limited focus you appear to have taken. For these reasons I say again, you have not made the case for expansion.

On the other side of the coin, your assessments of the likely impact appear to be so constrained as to be absurd. You may have used internationally agreed definitions of acceptable levels of noise, but I can categorically prove that those definitions are not the ones those affected by the noise would use. The definitions of what is acceptable that you have used are totally ridiculous. The impact of much lower levels of noise on people's health and wellbeing is vast. It is time night flights were banned, not more introduced. You need to completely change the criteria for noise impact. Limiting it to the airport periphery is also far too restrictive. Any aircraft below 10,000 ft causes an incredible amount of disturbance, particularly in rural areas. Based on the fact that NATS can route any aircraft anywhere once they reach 3000 ft, the whole of the south east could be impacted by any increase in flights at either of the proposed airports. Any monetary compensation, even of the incredibly limited amounts proposed is derisory and can in no way compensate for the disturbance. Many will be forced to leave the region or face devastating impacts on their health and way of life. I implore you to completely look again at this issue and talk to people newly affected by noise and what they think causes a problem, not what the airline industry and international bodies with vested interests would have you believe.

You also do not appear to have considered the impact to other industries of the proposed changes, The M25 in particular and many of the other routes in the region spend much of the day in gridlock or close to it. Any change, however minor, causes a knock-on effect causing the whole road network to grind to a halt. This already happens on a regular basis, three times in one week on a recent occasion, and we have staff unable to get into work or journeys taking hours longer than they should, unable to make customer meetings on time, significantly reduced time on site necessitating further visits to complete the work and additional expense etc. Some of the changes proposed to accommodate the wishes of the airline industry will have a major, devastating impact on all the other companies trying to trade in this area as the proposed changes to the road network, particularly the M25 will create absolute chaos. I can see no evidence that this has been properly weighed against the proposals.

Furthermore you call it a demand for additional capacity. I would call it a desire in some quarters only. Some of us think the airline industry is totally out of hand already and it is time they were subject to constraints equivalent to those for ground based industries. A number of things need to be done before any expansion of any kind is allowed. For example:
a): aircraft should not be allowed to stack over land
it should only be done over the sea. Aircrat going round and round repeatedly from 10,000 to 7,000 ft over the same properties is ridiculous particularly as the vast majority of aircraft will have passed over the sea at some point. It is time the aircraft industry put a stop to stacking over land once and for all.
b) Currently NATS can route any aircraft absolutely anywhere once they reach 3000ft. This is outrageous as the noise from aircraft, even at 10,000 f,t is totally debilitating for those living in a rural area below them..
c)The direction to fly over the minimum number of people, whilst understandable in principle, must be rescinded immediately, as it unfairly penalises people in rural areas where peace and quiet are to be expected, the impact is worse and it has had the effect of re-routing aircraft from greater London over the previously peaceful rural areas around it. This is outrageous when those living in London are statistically more likely to be flying in the planes than those in the rural areas and it is time the polluter pays the price was attached to them as it has been for other industries.
d)Use of a 1km variance in flight paths with the new RNAV flight paths must be rescinded immediately as this has had the effect of moving the previous flight paths by 1 km causing blight to new people. The planes should be forced to fly where they are supposed to be with penalties for deviation unless as a result of severe weather. The government has gone overboard penalising motorists with a whole raft of regulations, sanctions and penalties and it is time the same was applied to the airline industry. I understand that this used to be the case but now there are no sanctions at all.
e) All aircraft should be made to fly where they used to fly many years ago until they have been subjected to a planning process equivalent to that for land based individuals and companies as the noise and disturbance they generate would not be allowed if any other industry wished to set up in a rural area, especially conservation ones. Even a dog barking is subject to controls and

interventions for causing a nuisance but aircraft can currently be flown directly overhead several times a minute, making far more noise than a whole pack of dogs ever could, at any time of day or night with no redress whatsoever, totally blighting the lives of those affected with a severely detrimental effect on their health. Please do not argue that this is only done after consultation as a vast number of residents in this area will categorically tell you that has not been the case.
f) Anyone affected by ANY noise from aircraft from one airport should not be subject to ANY noise from another. Those affected by departing traffic from an airport should not be subject to noise from arriving aircraft.
g) There needs to be a single point of complaint for all aircraft noise, that is independent of any airport and is properly reviewed and some action taken. It is ridiculous that on a cloudy day individuals must use flight data sites to find out which airport to complain to, only to have their complaints totally ignored.
h) There must be a group of people, totally unconnected to any part of the airline industry to oversee and police their activities in the interests of the general public to provide any degree of credibility as so far we appear to have a cosy cartel with psuedo independent government agencies too intrinsically tied in with the airline industry or so easily bamboozled by them as to have no credibility left.

We must also take note of the previous history of the companies involved in this process. There has been a series of previous promises and "commitments" that have been subsequently broken. The disgraceful campaign by Gatwick inundating the Underground with posters calling on all Londoners to vote for Gatwick so that they would have fewer flights over them shows the calibre of the companies involved here. The fact that they were allowed to do this does not reflect well on you or the bodies that should have had some control over them. As they have repeatedly lied in the past I can see no justification for believing anything they say in their proposals, particularly in relation to any "commitments" they are allegedly going to make. I, like many others have come to understand that they cannot be believed and they are prepared to adopt many underhand and despicable tactics to further their own ends with no concern whatsoever for the people they affect and the lives they devastate. I should like the committee to take their disgraceful behaviour in the past into full account before you proceed any further.

For the reasons above, I do not consider the impact on either the residents of the south east region or the environment to have been adequately considered by your activities to this point. I also see no attempt to counterbalance the gain to the airline industry that they claim with the many and wide-ranging consequences for the the vast number of people who would be affected so devastatingly and other industries whose trade would badly affected as a result of pandering to the wishes of the airports and airlines. I can see no way you can possibly justify your decision to move forward with further runways under these circumstances.

Once again it appears the airline industry is being given amazing advantages not available to other companies or individuals.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Q2 Do you have any suggestions for how the short-listed options could be improved, i.e. their benefits enhanced or negative impacts mitigated?

The nearest we have to a hub airport is currently Heathrow. If we accept for a moment that we need to have a hub airport in the South of the country, then all tourist flights should be moved from Heathrow to other airports to allow Heathrow to provide this function. The people elsewhere in hte country are obliged to travel considerable distances to access an airport so it is more than reasonable to expect Londoners to do the same. With the electrifcation of the rail line to Bristol, due for completion shortly, I understand that it should be possible to travel to Bristol in an hour from London. I cannot believe that the combined flights available at Stansted, Luton, City airport, Gatwick and Bristol could not provide a sufficient number of tourist flights to cater for any reasonable amount of holiday traffic in he South. If that is not the case, then I would seriously consider it is time for a total re-think and some form of restrictions on price, tax or otherwise has become overdue.

There should be positive programmes to ensure that more flights are provided from the more northerly airports so that no-one living north of Watford is obliged to travel to any of these airports for tourist purposes. Mancehster, Birmingham, Newcatle, Leeds/Bradford and East Midlandsairports should cater for all the tourist traffic from other areas of the country.. No-one should be travelling down to Gatwick from these regions.

The other way to significantly imporve the proposals is to ban all night flights between 11pm and 7am to ensure that the majority of people are able to geet a good night's sleep. Under no circumstaces should any increase in night flights be considered.

Full compensation for anyone who considers their lives have been detrimentally affecteed should be available no matter where they live, rather than the extremely limited range right next to the runway and they should be based on the individual's idea of what constitues a problem not hte ridiculous international standards you have used so far.. This should compensate them for the full cost of relocating to another area. This program should be overseen by an external group but oaid for by the airport/airports benefitting from any changes.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Q3 Do you have any comments on how the Commission has carried out its appraisal?

The approach has been far too constrained. The noise levels you have been obliged to use have no relevance to the perception of disruption experienced by people on the ground. The disruption from aircraft noise extends far beyond the boundaries you have considered. If you do not extend the criteria of what constitues an issue to the general populace you lose all credibility. You need to condsider the effects until the aircraft reach at least 10,000 ft not just on immediate take-off and landing. Only then can you begin to measure the impact of your proposals. The current statements on who will be affected would be joke if this did not have such serious consequences for those involved. The uproar at the changes to flight paths last year should have taught you that the criteria you use are totally nonsensical.

The basis on which you have decided there is a demand for further flight capacity has also been far too narrow. As previously mentioned a vast number of other economic, political, demographic and geographic considerations should have been taken into account.

Even if on futher examination of these other considerations, you still decide there is a "demand", you still need to make the case for this to the general population and in my view this has not yet been done at all.

The consequences of what you are proposing do not seem to have been considered in any detail at all. This is not a valid stance. A full consideration of all cons must be made as well as the pros. You appear to have focussed totally on the pros as perceived by the airline industry. People must be given a proper choice including the option of saying no to all of the above because they consider the effects are so detrimental that they do not justify moving forward on the basis of any of the proposed options.. Your whole approach seems to have been this must be done at any cost so you are limited to thinking of minor mitigating measures within a very tight range. I consider this approach gives your committee no credibility at all.

Q4 In your view, are there any relevant factors that have not been fully addressed by the Commission to date?

Please refer to my comments in the previous sections as I consider that there are many issues not fully addressed. You have not covered the downsides in anything approaching a full and valid way, The case for demand for further capacity has not been made adequately. The justidication

for going ahead with any ot the proposed solutions has not been made.

The lack of available employees, housing, schools, health care, transport systems and other facilities in the areas concerned to cope with an influx of the numbers proposed has not been adequatley addressed. The consequent knock-on effect on other employers in the area competing for staff and the consequences of a further influx of people from elsewhere in the country or abroad on the regions they leave does not appear to have been addressed or weighed against the perceived benefits. The case for how these proposals are of benefit to the whole country rather than just Londoners has most certainly not been made and needs significant further thought.

The contribution to the country's coffers by the companies concerned in these proposals does not appear to have been considered at all. I think it is vital that you do this and review all their previous promises and commitments over a number of years to see if these were honoured fully in the spirit of what was implied. There must be far more transparency in these matters to begin to justify to the public at large any further action for their benefit. That must be done. The consultation last year which was done by Gatwick showed maps of flight paths which are very far removed from those actually used subsequently. Such grossly misleading and downright mendacious activities must be considered in your deliberations.

In relation to the Gatwick proposals in particular, you need to look much further into the issues of drainage. The river Mole is notorious for high variance in flow rates with frequent floooding down river. The run-off from the runways at Gatwick were considered to be a substantial additional contributing factor to the floods in the Surrey/ Sussex area last year. The storage facilities employed by Gatwick were considered to be totally inadequate. Furthermore there have been recent reports of animals drinking water from the river downstream being killed by antifreeze in the water from Gatwick de-icing operations. This is totally unacceptable. Gatwick must be obliged to hold and process any run-off from their facilities to ensure only potable water is returned to the river system in measured quantities.

Q5 Do you wish to comment on how the Commission has appraised specific topics (as defined by the Commission's 16 appraisal modules), including methodology and results?

Strategic fit

The strategic value to the country as a whole of the proposals has not been delivered.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Local economy impacts

I can see no eveidence of a full appreciation of the impact on local residents or businesses. The noise impact on the wider population, not just those living immedaitely next to the new runways has not been explored at all. As the uproar when flight paths were changed last year showed, it is not just those next to the runway that are affected and there seems t be no understanding whatsoever of the full effects on the lives of those affected.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Noise

As I have repeatedly pointed out. aircraft noise is far louder than any other industry would be allowed to make in a rural and conservation areas in particular. There must be more control over this in the hands of local people. The noise from aircraft causes a debilitating effect on people's lives and health and destroys their quality of life. There appears to be no appreciation of how wide-ranging the blight caused can be. The levels used in your deliberations thus far are totally wrong. you need to completely re-assess this matter.

In relation to Gatwick's proposals in particular their suggestion of diverting all night flights to the northernmost flight path is fundamentally flawed on every level. They have repeatedly accepted that flights invvolving tight turns create more noise than straight flight paths. So why on earth would you allow them to propose using the flight path requiring a tight turn when there is a perfectly good one with a straight line profile. This is purely vindictive on those who had the temerity to complain about their changes last year to this northerly flight path which was done with no consultation whatsoever in contravention of all the supposed rules. it also highlights again their mendacious conduct claiming on the one had that they do everything to improve things whilst doing the complete opposite. Night flight should be banned not increased as they cause so much disturbance and prevent people getting a decent night's sleep which is vital for their functionality and productivity the following day. Yet another example of the airline industry getting all the benefit whilst other companies and individuals pay the price.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Water and flood risk

I beliver there are serious issues with flood risk of the Gatwick proposals. There appears to be inadequate controls of the quality of water entering the river systems from their site and the storage facilities need significant improvement. The river mole cannot cope with additional water run-off from further tarmac areas or the loss of agricultural land in the area which currently absorbs excess water. Many communities down-river are already at serious risk of flooding on a frequent basis and significant flooding occurred last year with some people only jsut returnign to their homes a year later.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Quality of life

Aircraft overhead on a frequent basis devastate lives. If people have chosen to live under flight paths they have done so with the full knowledge of what they would face and in benefitted significantly in reduced costs as a result. Some people are not troubled by such noise and are happy to do so. However, the vast majority of people who previously lived in an area with only the occasional iarcraft passing overhead are outraged when the situation changes. They are no longer able to work or enjoy their leisure outside due to hte noise. Even withall the double-glazed windows and doors closed, the noise is still very disturbing. This is particularly relelvant in quiet, rural areas where the aircraft noise comes as stark contrast to the perfect silence previously enjoyed. No-one should subjected to such a change as it is life-changing for the worse. It impacts people's health as well as their wellbeing. This is further exacerbated by the fact that there appears to be no redress whatsoever and no sanctions wahtsoever on the ailines. iarports or NATS causing hte problem. This situation should never have been sanctioned and cannot be allowed to continue.. If you look at a flight radar map of hte South East, you will see that a vast number of people are affected by aircraft noise. Some may not notice, others most certainly do and face losing their health or moving at vast cost in both monetary and emotional terms and losing their employment, home, friends and community and quite possibly everything they have worked for. All this for the commercial benefit of a foreign company that pays hardly any tax in this country. This is outrageous!

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Cost and commercial viability

The companies involved have failed to deliver on earlier commitments and provided incorrect figures in the past. Their figures and promises can have no credibility. The costs are bound to be wrong and the commercial viability suspect. If given the go-ahead for an additional runway, I am quite certain that they will expand the number of flights to gain additional revenue but fail to fulfill all their obligations and commitments. They have a bad record on such matters so I do not understand why on earth anyone would take any notice whatsoever of ttheir costs and vviability assessments.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Operational risk

With Gatwick I think there is every risk that they would build the additional runway but fail to build the additional terminal space. Their suggestion of using buses in the manner described to ferry passengers from the existin terminals to the planes on the furthermost runway is ridiculous. This is in no way a reasonable customer experience and should not form part of any plan.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Economy impacts

The impact on local businesses from the disruption to the existing transport systems and the additional load that these proposals would create is very significant. This appears to be unwarranted favouritism of one industry over all others. It would also cause a lot of people ot be displaced from their current locations and the impact of their departure appears not to have been assessed on those regions and possible other countries. The economy in the local area is doing better than elsewhere in the country already and to add further people to this area would place unwarranted further strain on an already over-stretched area. It would further enhance the divide between the London area and the rest of the country when we should be doing the reverse. it is not in hte interest of people to travel long distances down the country to reach these airports when they could and should have flights availalbe from their regional airports that more than cover all

tourist needs. To subject them to travelling to London with luggage, forcing them to the underground or a taxi to the next station to get a train to either of these airports is not in the interests of anyone in their right minds. I am led to belive that hte train lines used to reach Gatwick are already at capacity. The road in the area are already full and overflowing. To even consider adding more people to this mix is downright ridiculous. Neither the road nor rail infrastructure can cope with any more even just for trave purposes and the hospitals, doctors, schools, housing etc can most certainly not absorb any more. Any further load on any system in this region will impact the economy in hte area and both businesses an individuals will suffer as a result.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Surface access

it is not in the interest of people to travel long distances down the country to reach these airports when they could and should have flights availalbe from their regional airports that more than cover all tourist needs. To subject them to travelling to London with luggage, forcing them onto the underground or a taxi to the next station to get a train to either of these airports is not in the interests of anyone . I am led to belive that the train lines used to reach Gatwick are already at capacity. Heathrow is not accessible by train for a lot of people. The only option for most is to take an already crowded commuter train to London, change stations via the underground or taxi and then take another train to hte airport. From where i live it would take me at least three hours when I live less than 30 miles from the airport. The alterntive involves the biggest car park in Eurpoe otherwise known as the M25. neither ot these can cope with additionla traffic. As our staff have to use this road to get to the office and to reah our customer's sites, any additional load on this infrastructure has a major effect on our staff, cusomers and the business. The proposed road changes to accommodate these proposals will have a major impact on the roads in this region and transit times are likely to increase not by a factor of a few minutes or tens of minutes but hours of productivity lost in traffic jams. Ths whole road infrastructure in this region teeters on the edge almost constantly and only the slightest incident, speed restriction or lane closure can cause total gridlock and does so on a frequent basis. Three times in one week shortly before Christmas. The propsals for Gatwick are likely to have a major detrimental effect on the villages in the area as people cut throughusing the B roads to avoid the M23/M25 congestion.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Air quality

Where there are planes overhead the population below is subjected to the smell of aircraft fuel. . There is no doubt a lot of other implications for air quality that are not so easily noticed. In the area around Gatwick much of the land is rural where the people reasonably expect to breathe clean air. The density of flights proposed would destroy the air quality in large swathes of the region.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Operational efficiency

Before any proposal for ay increase in capacity, the airline industry should be obliged to put heir own house in order. The arrivval of planes needs to be managed much efficiently. It is ridiculous to have planes circling round waiting to land, particularly when they have known they were on the way for hours and travelled over the sea at some point to reach our shores. If they cannot have a clear route in to land they should be held over the sea to do any circling required. Better yet, the airports should not overcomit in the first place. Flight paths in a straight line should be used whenever possible to reduce the noise impact of aircraft turning. Much more need to be done to improve the noise created by aircraft at all stages. All available improvements should be obligatory. I have been told that Easyjet in some countries has been olbliged to fix a very annoying whine caused by some of its planes but it has not been obliged to do so in this country so needless to say it hasn't. The airline industry has a lot to do to improve its reputation and I am sure there is a lot it could do the improve things for everyone else but unless they are obliged to do it they do nothing. Both the airports in question claim to do everything they can to improve things but these are just empty words and their actions tell a very different story.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Delivery

I do not doubt that either of the airports concerned could build the additional runway space as it is in their comercial interests to do so. Beyond that I have my doubts on anything else they say and no confidenc whatsoever that they will fully meet any and all requirement placed on them beyond that.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Q6 Do you have any comments on the Commission's sustainability assessments, including methodology and results?

It is not sustainable to cave in to the demands of the airline industry every time they wish to expand their empires and generate more cash for themselves at the expense of everyone else. At some point the elephant in the room must be addressed and some limits placed on their ambitions until such time as they can be accommodated without impact to everyone else because at the moment the costs to everyone else are jsut far too high.. To continue down this route would involve building over the whole of the South East and turning it into a vast suburb of London. At some point the desire for ever more cheap tourist travel must be restricted as the impact on the environment and the people unlucky enough to be in the way is far too great and the people doing the polluting at the moment are not paying the true cost of their enjoyment. It is other innocent people who are bearing all the cost in terms of their health, wellbeing and lifestyle being ruined. At some point we must say the balance must be changed in favour of the sufferers not the enjoyers and I would argue we have already reached that point. One look at a flight radar map shows you that this region already has far too many planes. Even the CAA//NATS has been known to complain that they cannot route planes where they want or cause them to climb to higher levels as fast as they would like beacuse there is so much congestion here already and the two airports in question here already interfere with each other.

The further roll-out of high speed broadband giving everyone high speed internet access could significantly reduce the requirement for business travel with videoconferencing systems now so good. The airports do not represent any benefit to our business as imports always travel through airports in the north of the country and then by road They never come through either of these airports even though we are located close to both of them. All our business with contacts abroad

is done by telephone, webinars etc so the vital thing for us is internet speed and availability, not airports. As the super fast broadband expands across the country it should reduce the demand for business travel and although you make passing mention to such matters I am not sure they were fully considered. We already have access to such systems in this regions but in order to benefit the whole country perhaps the money earmarked for these proposals could be better spent in providing superfast broadband to other areas of the country and focus on recducing the demand for air travel instead of focussing on adding capacity which may or may not be needed or desirable.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Q7 Do you have any comments on the Commission's business cases, including methodology and results?

I can only re-iterate previous comments that your focus has been far too narrow and concentrated totally on what the airline industry would like you to consider not what is important to the people who will suffer the consequences. You were given a ppisoned chalice by the government so that they could wash their hands of an unpalatable decision, conveniently times to be announced after a general election. This consultation has done nothing to convince me that the whole process has beenanything more than window-dressing to look as if the mattter has been considered properly and the pros and cons weighed when in reality it iwas a foregone conlusion all along. We are going to get one or more of these whether we like it or not and whether it makes sense for the country as whole or not. Ii would very much like you to prove me wrong and that you would re-think your current conclusions, re-assess what is right for everyone and for the country as a whole and that sense would prevail but I see no evidence to suggest this is a possibility.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

Gatwick Second Runway

Heathrow North West Runway

Heathrow Extended Northern Runway

Q8 Do you have any other comments?

You must give people the option to say no to all your current proposals. A choice between three bad options is no choice at all.

Which of the shortlisted runway options, if any, do your comment(s) relate to?

No Airports Selected.