

CAGNE

Communities Against Gatwick

Noise and Emissions

CAA Consultation document CAP 1465

The biggest concern is that there is no appeal mechanism apart from the CAA, who continues to play both judge and jury over airspace changes whilst supporting the growth and aspiration of aviation. The community concerns are not yet balanced with that of aviation's desires. There is a genuine need for an Ombudsman that can oversee and adjudicate in disputes, such as that used by local authorities and other public service sectors.

1.2 The consultations largest response came from residents - 38% with point 1.4 - 75 respondents identified based in the southeast. Sadly CAGNE was not listed as responding, but did respond.

Point 9 - 68% residents and 63% councils responded, but it was the industry (20) that disagreed with a third party facilitator. This would seem an imbalanced result. There is no allowance for a third party facilitator and the industry can be seen to be dictating policy here.

From the responses to this consultation the majority have come from residents concerned about aircraft noise and airspace consultations.

We must welcome the off line consultations, and long may this continue, so as not to discriminate against the elderly, disabled or those without easy access to the internet or slow broadband connections, since airspace consultations are inevitably large documents.

Level 1 – the Public evidence is reliant upon residents with aviation knowledge and does not seem to detail how this will be promoted. It is therefore asked what documentation or seminars are to be held prior to the public engagement with the CAA in Level 1?

Noise metrics are still a major concern and until these are changed to record noise events, the PIR review of airspace changes is not adequate to provide a true record of the impact of aircraft on communities. No consultation can be a true indication to residents of what is being actually proposed and will simply lead to more anger from residents and the forming of more residents groups opposing airspace changes.

It is questionable who the stakeholders are; if these are purely councils, or selected community individuals, or aviation representatives, this would be

imbalanced since again you are reliant upon councillors/ officials understanding of airspace changes and the implications of what is being proposed. There must also be a mechanism by which one community individual cannot dictate policy over other communities.

It is therefore necessary to have an independent panel outside of the CAA that has no vested interest in aviation expansion.

3.30/3.38 Communities have to seek appeal on human rights and have to provide documentation for a Secretary of State appeal 3.34.

This is totally unacceptable due to lack of aviation knowledge, data available to the layperson and the understanding of airspace changes. Experts would have to be employed at the cost of the communities to defend them from commercial aviation desires, seemingly endorsed by the regulator.

3.37 Transparency is detailed but seemingly as a tick box exercise; transparency must not become the new word for consultation as with transparency has to come change of aviation plans to pre-empt issues with noise on the ground before they are implemented eg simulation of noise of routing, or CAGNE's noise mapping for flight paths.

If there is no appeal mechanism the transparency stops as anger grows towards aviation and increased noise impact grows. Only to detail the actions and the outcome with little understanding of impact on the ground vs saving fuel, time and aviation profits would be the wrong methodology to move forward in a constructive way.

4.6 Details benefits of saving fuel and time but not reducing noise.

www.cagne.org

Seeking a fair and equitable distribution of arrivals and departures to the west and east for West Sussex and Surrey
cagnetatwick@gmail.com

www.facebook.com/gatwickcagne

Twitter @cagne_gatwick