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# Report : Horley Town Council’s Survey of Views on the Gatwick 2nd Runway

## Introduction and Background

This survey on Horley residents’ views on the Gatwick 2nd runway was commissioned by Horley Town Council (HTC) and carried out by Horley councillors and HTC staff. This report has been provided for Horley Town Council’s EGM on 11th November, 2014.

1,096 questionnaires were submitted, as follows:

* 67 questionnaires were completed on St Georges Day (26th April 2014)
* 16 questionnaires were completed at the Public Meeting on 18th July, 2014
* 745 questionnaires were completed by Horley residents (September/October 2014)
* 268 questionnaires were completed online by Horley residents using Survey Monkey

Abbreviations:-

GAL: Gatwick Airport Limited

LGW: London Gatwick Airport

RW2: Gatwick 2nd Runway

LHR: London Heathrow Airport

## Conclusions

* 1. Out of the 1,096 questionnaires, 368 (34% of total) were in favour of RW2, 615 (56%) were against, and 113 (10%) were not sure. Viewed in aggregate, therefore, a clear majority of respondents were Against RW2.
  2. However, while Horley’s population breaks down fairly evenly across the six age bands ( as Fig 1 below illustrates), the responses were significantly skewed, with 44% of submissions from elderly people, most of whom will have passed away by the time the 2nd runway is up and running. By contrast, the youngest age group (16-25), which will be affected, were minimally represented with only 1% of submissions. The respondent profile is shown at Fig.2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

* 1. We also found that respondents over 65 years old were more likely than all the other age groups to vote ‘Against’. By contrast, the youngest respondents were more likely to vote ‘For’, although it must be acknowledged that the results for this group, comprising only 15 respondents, are insufficiently representative and therefore suspect. For details, see Fig.3.
  2. If the responses are weighted in line with the estimated Horley population in each band, the difference between the ‘Fors’ and ‘Againsts’ narrows, with 36% For, 52% Against and 12% Unsure. Whilst the margin for the ‘Againsts’ remains substantial, it is not overwhelming.
  3. The data also shows that women were much more likely than men to vote Against. The following charts show both the aggregate unweighted participant data (Fig.4) and the data weighted in line with the estimated population of Horley in each band (Fig.5). The weighted data shows that, while men are marginally more likely to be For RW2, many more Women voted Against than For (with a ratio of 2.7:1). We are unable to explain the reasons for this apparent “battle of the sexes”.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

## Reasons Given in Favour of a 2nd Runway for Gatwick

The reasons given in the chart at Fig.6 are amplified below with points made by respondents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Enhanced local prosperity, especially for Horley** | RW2 is the key to Horley's future economic vitality, as it will increase local infrastructure investment, promote town centre development, with more businesses and homes, bring benefits to business & commerce (including shops, guest-houses, tourism & airport related firms), lift depressed areas (e.g. parts of Court Lodge & Langshott), ensuring long term growth & prosperity for Horley & surrounding areas, with more visitors, benefitting existing and new residents. |
| **New jobs created, plus job security** | Will create new jobs and secure existing ones for local people. Huge opportunity for young in our area to drive growth at airport & local firms. |
| **LGW is the logical cost/effective choice for RW2** | Clearly the obvious choice for the Davies Commission, being cheaper, quicker to build, and providing more choice and a better service. Will optimise value of 2nd London airport, justifying competition conditions set out by Government's civil aviation policy (reason for breaking up BAA Group). Will ease the burden on LHR and cause the least disruption to local residents and housing than LHR, or Estuary (OTT on cost). Will damage local jobs & economy if it goes elsewhere. |
| **Road/rail and infrastructure improvements** | Gatwick already has quite good transport links. RW2 will induce government, SCC and MoT to introduce further improvements to local road network (e.g. upgrade M23 to 4 lanes) and public transport, especially the stretched rail networks (ideally, a Heathrow/Gatwick rail link), a bonus to all. Will also provide basis for funding new community facilities (including drainage, health) by local/ central authorities. RW2 will reinforce pivotal position of Horley in 'Coast to Capital' LEP partnership. |
| **RW2 will bring benefits for UK, especially in SE** | Country & the SE needs all the business, jobs, trade and tourism it can get. Or it will fall behind competing countries. Existing capacity over-stretched. Extra capacity has to go somewhere. |
| **Operational, environmental & safety benefits** | RW2 will cause less disruption & environmental damage than at LHR. Noise contours & visual impact will move South away from Horley. Money will also be available to sort out existing environmental problems, including flooding. Land is available. The runway is parallel to the existing one. In any case, noise is not an issue for Horley as it is not under the flight path (arrivals or departures), which goes in a pattern around the town. With 2 runways, planes will spend less time on taxiways throwing out emissions before take-off. Also, planes will spend less time in holding patterns at busy times, speeding up landings and reducing emissions. New tech will make aircraft more fuel-efficient, safer, quieter and less polluting. RW2 is a valuable safety feature for LGW. |
| **More holiday/business routes/ destinations** | The extra capacity will reduce need to travel to LHR, encourage competition, improve customer service, and offer cheaper fares, all of which are good for customers. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Work(ed) at LGW** | I, or my family work (or worked) on airport related jobs, like many Horley residents. Expansion will secure our jobs and create new opportunities. |
| **Improved housing availability, lower prices** | More housing will be available. House prices will increase, as will county/borough revenues. |
| **Sundry** | 10 years too late & should be built ASAP (3 respondents); Most people have either moved here knowing the pitfalls of living near an airport or have grown up with it (3); Like seeing aeroplanes (1); Because I built a new runway in my previous career (1); My husband is a plane spotter (1); New opportunities for training, apprenticeships and career development for school/ college leavers (1); Easier access routes (1); Improved health and support services for Horley residents (1); RW2 will give us a 21st century airport connected with its historical past (1); Less confusion to existing air lanes than new site, as pilots already know where it is! (1); Nobody wanted the M25, but now we cannot do without it! It’s the same with an enlarged LGW (1). |
| **Antis are luddites, Nimbys or hypocrites** | The anti-brigade are misguided individuals living in the past. They object even where RW2 doesn't affect them personally. Horley is a forgotten town, full of people who like it that way and think only of themselves. Can't allow them to affect future of town. |

## Reasons Given Against a 2nd Runway for Gatwick

The reasons given in the chart at Fig.7 are amplified below with points made by respondents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RW2 will increase noise levels** | Noise pollution has already increased since flight paths were changed last year. RW2 will increase them even further, given that there will be more flights (including more helicopters & night flights), traffic & ground noise. Flight paths are not yet known, but we will probably have tighter turning circles, with more aircraft flying low, going off the flight path and flying over Horley. |
| **Vast increase in traffic and associated road congestion** | M23, M25, A23, A217 & local roads are at choking point NOW. Even after improvements (such as re-routing of A23), RW2 will greatly increase traffic congestion & pollution, blocking access to & from the airport, esp. when road repairs needed. LGW lacks acceptable East/West access. Road traffic injuries will increase. Problems exacerbated as GAL & its caterers, contractors, etc., will have to bring in staff from afar. More trucks & freight sheds. Bus service inadequate. Major road improvements needed which may not happen. |
| **Will increase air pollution and impact health** | Air Pollution & carbon/ particulates emissions worse, up to or in excess of HSE (Health & Safety Executive) limits, exacerbated by more jettisoning of fuel. Negative impacts include:- increased carbon footprint, worse fuel smell, impact on climate and health (causing asthma, cancers, dementia, strokes, heart disease). |
| **Area will be stuffed with more people, houses and infrastructure** | The area already is already over-developed with big schemes such as the Acres, with building in the North West sector still to come. RW2 will ruin Horley and surrounding areas, with years of upheaval, massive inward migration, business displacement, plus disruptive construction (including more dirt and dust) from more houses, hotels, warehouses, car parks (long and short term) & other infrastructure, often on flood plains, without any compensating benefits. Destruction of houses (incl. listed buildings). Attracting more workers to SE will exacerbate housing shortages & other problems we already have. Results: lower quality of life, Horley lost as a peaceful small town, due to LGW's needs coming first. |
| **Increased urbanisation and loss of green spaces** | We would end up with Gatwick City, a concrete jungle extending from Redhill to Crawley, losing:- green spaces (incl. Green belt), ancient woodland, rural feel, wildlife & natural habitats. An ecological disaster. |
| **Massive extra demands on all medical facilities** | No plans for more doctors, surgeries, dentists, or extra capacity and ambulances for East Surrey Hospital. All these are inadequate NOW, with insufficient parking. Given increased spread of infectious diseases, RW2 will exacerbate the situation, and hamper access to facilities. Hospital would be overwhelmed in the event of a bad accident at the airport. |
| **Build extra capacity at LHR or elsewhere** | How can LGW, so far from London, be the right place for a hub airport? LHR (as the existing global hub) should be expanded, as it is preferred by worldwide carriers & overseas passengers. Alternatively, we should improve Stansted, Luton, Manston and airports in the North, where development is really needed, or build in the Thames Estuary. |
| **Extra travel will overwhelm railway, under pressure now** | Railways full to capacity NOW. More trains passing through Horley, downgrading our station. When they do stop, tourists with umpteen wheely cases take up the space and commuters have to stand. Horley has failed to persuade the authorities that It should be transformed into a major joint railway hub with Gatwick Airport. As a daily commuter, it's clear that RW2 will require huge extra capacity (preferably an additional line) if rail travel into London is to be viable. Appalling queues to buy tickets at LGW and conditions at Gatwick Station will get worse. GAL's proposals for 1 new platform at LGW + two at London Bridge won't suffice. Victoria Station, a nightmare now, will be overwhelmed. |
| **Huge pressures on already overcrowded schools** | No plans for more schools which are over-crowded NOW. Nursery schools likewise, given that two more nurseries in perimeter will be knocked down. The rapid development of primary schools in the town is not being supported at secondary school level for the town's current capacity, never mind the forecast increases. Travel to schools outside Horley will be hampered. |
| **Increased flood risks** | LGW has been closed several years running for days due to floods and snow; these problems would be exacerbated by RW2. Extra buildings, hard covering & water diversion plans will cause sink holes, and push the flood risk elsewhere. |
| **LGW is underutilised & RW2 is not needed** | Peak times apart, LGW is under-utilised, with planes going up half empty, as is the case at Stansted and Luton. Current LGW Capacity will suffice till 2040. |
| **Supposed new jobs & commercial benefits are illusory** | The area does not need regenerating as the economy is thriving & there are plenty of jobs. Most of the financial benefits and new jobs will go to Crawley and Sussex, as will business taxes. Also, most jobs will be transient (seasonal, zero hours, temporary, minimum wage), going to people who won't buy houses or contribute to area's future. Local spending from LGW users less than reported. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **More “Gatwick Parking” in Horley** | Holiday parking in Horley's residential roads will get worse, as will illegal airport parking on roads and fields. More land will therefore be needed for parking. |
| **Reduce house prices** | A reduction in Horley’s house prices is bound to happen, especially where houses are under flight path. Residents may have problems in future selling their homes. |
| **Business case for RW2 is poor as is GAL’s track record** | Site too restricted. Demand not proven and forecast exponential in air travel growth won't happen. Cost projections unrealistically low. Investment in local services not included, so no financial benefits will accrue to Horley. There is already airport over-capacity nationally. GAL can't manage one RW, let alone two (with baggage problems, security holdups, charter flight delays & support companies struggling to cope). Aprons full, causing taxiway delays. GAL are mean and rapacious, e.g. with no normal facility for picking up or dropping off passengers by car without paying several pounds. Facilities are inadequate and overcrowded. GAL has failed to improve the customer experience and is not fit for purpose. |
| **Sundry** | Unfair that votes against RW2 have been discounted as part of organised campaign, when GAL has run a huge, expensive campaign to justify it (3 participants); Conflicts with Gatwick Master Plan (2012) and local housing plans, e.g. in Horley & Crawley (3); Area we live in is lovely & I don't want it spoiled (2); Even more unwanted residents (2); Proposed plans not sent out to individual residents (2); Alistair didn't say (at the public meeting) how RW2 would benefit Horley apart from a few jobs (2); The Beehive (listed building) will have to go (2); Damage to local climate, with weather in area worse due to blocking out of sunshine (2); LGW will be bigger than LHR (1); Already lost our farm to Master Plan. We are Surrey's dustbin. What does Horley get out of it? (1); Throw the peasants a few bread crumbs. Keep them quiet. The usual contempt….History:- we had the stone age, we had the bronze age, we had the iron age, welcome to the waste age (1); Town/GAL have failed to take advantage of tourist & business opportunities created by the airport (1); GAL have made access to local bus services a complete mystery for non-regular airport visitors (1); GAL's advertising in relation to noise and air pollution has been inaccurate, which suggests that their reassurances about minimal impacts from the proposed runway will also prove to be wrong (1); If RW2 goes ahead, the Crawley North (Town Centre) shopping/hotel development proposed by Grosvenor will proceed, resulting in further demise for Horley Town Centre (1); LGW airport's runway consultation showed that 85% of people (6,200 out of 7,294) voted NO for a new RW (1); RW2 would reduce aircraft parking area (1); As an elderly person, after holidaying from LGW many times, another RW would be too confusing (1). |
| **It’s all about GREED** | Only GAL (owned by overseas shareholders) and business will benefit. They don't care what happens locally. GAL just want to make big profits from landing/ parking fees and talk up the selling price before they walk away in the next 3 or 4 years, paying little UK tax, but blighting thousands of lives. Most support for RW2 comes from businesses, which are interested primarily in growth & profits, not residents' quality of life or safety. |
| **Mass air travel causes global warming and has no future** | I'm anti new runways per se, not just at Gatwick. RW2 would make a complete nonsense of any pretence by the Government that they plan to limit carbon emissions. They've imposed environmental taxes on us, claiming green credentials, without first insisting on more efficient and quieter engines. Mass air travel doesn't have a long term future as it is contributing to global warming and we will run very short of oil before long, so few planes will fly in 30 years, leaving nothing for future generations except acres of concrete & dereliction. European visits should be by train. Use internet or video-link instead. |
| **Demands on police, with more immi-gration and crime** | Policing is already inadequate, with no police station in Horley. More immigration, crime, terrorism, rif-raf on the streets, alcohol abuse, and rubbish. RW2 would increase pressure on police and fire brigade. |
| **Increased safety risks** | Skies in SE are crowded enough, causing air traffic control problems. There will be more fuel leaks and falling parts. With near misses often being reported around Gatwick, why would putting even more planes into the same space be considered safe? Problem compounded by Redhill upgrade. |
| **Water & sewage** | Where will the extra water and sewage come from, for this large population increase? |
| **Will have to move** | If RW2 comes, will probably have to move away, disrupting education & friendships. |
| **Light pollution** | More night-time light pollution. |
| **More local taxation** | Us local tax payers will have to pay more. |
| **Difficult for residents in Charlwood, etc** | It will be difficult for my job in Charlwood/ Lowfield Heath, and disruptive for residents in those areas |
| **Exporting more cash** | LGW is a bucket and spade airport, which will be exporting even more cash, adversely impacting the UK’s balance of payments. |

## Questions raised by Respondents who were “Unsure” about RW2

The information needed by participants to help them make up their minds on RW2 (summarised in Fig.8) is amplified below with points made by “Unsure” respondents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Roads, traffic and parking** | How much extra traffic? Will road capacity suffice? And rail? Evidence that transport and parking arrangements will (1) be adequate and (2) prevent parking in Horley's residential roads. Will LGW taxi services be able to cope? More details on road/rail improvements, & other communications elements. |
| **Noise and pollution** | Exactly how much extra noise and air pollution will result from RW2 ? Impact on our health/ environment? What restrictions will apply, e.g. on night flying? Source of this data? |
| **Can Horley’s infrastructure cope?** | Evidence that Horley's infrastructure can cope with residents' needs, including schools, doctors, hospitals, main services (electricity, water, gas). If not, what investment in town to attract business? What commercial and other benefits will accrue to Horley? What are the positive and negative effects of RW2 on the environment around Horley? |
| **Full details of aircraft and flight paths** | Size of aircraft and decibel ratings? Frequency and destinations? More night flights? Effect of RW2 on flight paths, holding patterns, flying heights, and time to reach them? Can I see the planned aircraft routes? |
| **Locations of runway & linked buildings + map** | Will RW2 be to the North or South of existing RW? Could we have final map/ plans showing locations of runway, buildings, roads (including motorway junction), surrounding infrastructure and delivery schedule? Data needs to clarify how access to airport will be improved for Crawley and Horley residents. |
| **Extra houses?** | How many? And where will they all go? Will they be built on flood plains or green belt? |
| **Property values?** | Will RW2 increase, or reduce, the value of my home? Will rents increase? |
| **Impact on flood levels** | Expert evidence that extra hard covering for RW2 + management/ rerouting of streams rivers will not increase flooding & sink holes in Horley. |
| **Numbers and demographics of extra people** | What will the population increase be? Can the demographics, employment type (transient workers etc) & associated crime increase be quantified? What increase in school places is involved? Border control improvements? How much more illegal immigration? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Employment implications** | How many additional jobs will be created? Are more jobs actually needed? (Analysis needs to reflect actual unemployment levels in the area.) What commercial benefits will new jobs bring to local community? Footfall increase in Horley? |
| **GAL’s investment** | What is the expected investment in RW2 (amounts, timescales, and who will benefit)? How much of this money will benefit Horley Residents? Will there be a fixed long term ROI (return on investment) preventing unreasonable short term profits to investors to the detriment of ordinary people and the interests of Horley residents? |
| **What compensation is available?** | What will be covered (e.g. triple glazing), and how much will people affected get? For how many years will this be valid? What support/advice from GAL on noise, barrier extension, double glazing? |
| **Necessity?** | Clear evidence that RW2 (1) is needed and (2) could attract an alliance to it as a hub. What would be the impact of LGW NOT getting RW2 and LHR getting it instead? |
| **Local taxation?** | How will local councils benefit? Are they receiving incentives from GAL? |