



THE REIGATE SOCIETY

The Civic Society for Reigate, Redhill and Merstham

President: Nicholas Owen

Chairman: Alan Mortlock, 3 Gatton Close, Reigate, RH2 0HG. Tel: 01737 244407

Hon. Secretary: Michele Damer, Heathfield Stables, Reigate Heath, RH2 8QR. Tel: 01737 243513

Hon. Treasurer: Charles Wragg, 3 Weald Way, Reigate, RH2 7RG. Tel: 01737 210640

DRAFT No.3

LA REPORT No. 50.2e (A document for discussion) 20.09.2013.

GATWICK EXPANSION & SUSTAINABLE ENERGY;-

(Attention is drawn to The REIGATE SOCIETY (RS) letter and report dated 23 June 2003)

1.0. National Policy

Sir Jeremy Heywood Government Cabinet Secretary in a statement to senior Civil Servants at the end of June 2013 is reported as stating;—

That the cuts made to public services to date were not sufficient and austerity measures would have to continue for 10 years and might extend to a 20 year generational battle to beef up the economy in a way not seen for many decades. The ONS committee reported that output is now 3.9% below the prerecession 2008 peak. The financial deficit was still rising and ministers have told Government to look at waste and tackle inefficiency. Despite all our efforts our **Debt / GDP** ratio is still rising rather than falling.



2.0. The Gatwick Scheme No.1.

This proposal involves the construction of a second runway parallel to and approximately 760m to the South of the Existing facilities. The site is either on or immediately to the South of the A23 London Brighton Road. This road locally connects Crawley, Horley, Redhill and has a Southern access to Charlwood.

The Surrey County Council as Highway Authority in 1963/4 strengthened and provided a new dual carriageway between Tinsley Lane and Lowfield Heath; all these works involved a substantial expenditure from public funds.

The new Gatwick scheme proposes to write off this capital asset and developers will no doubt be required to provide an alternative route for the projected traffic growth within the LEP area.

A previous Airport expansion scheme proposed the construction and provision of tunnels for the A23 under the airport expansion area, the underground section of the road terminating South of Lowfield Heath that is at a point to the North of Crawley.

3.0. Scheme. No. 2.

This proposal is similar to scheme 1 above but makes possible an increase in air movements from 70 per hour to 75 per hour.

The scheme proposes that the new runway be located more than 760m to the South of the existing landing/takeoff flight path but has the disadvantage of the Easterly end of the runway being located closer to the London Brighton Railway line whilst the Southwestern end is closer to Crawley housing development.

4.0. Scheme. No. 3.

This proposal is to move the new runway further to the South that is more than 1035m from the existing runway but closer to new developments at Crawley this extra space enables 95 to 100 air traffic movements per hour and can be expected to produce the associated noise and air pollution problems.

4.1 Schemes 2 and 3 and A23 Road diversion Options;-

In both schemes 2 and 3 there is no alteration proposed or shown to the A23 London Brighton Road which will in effect run through the center of the enlarged GATWICK airport.

- a. Is this an acceptable solution as far as site security is concerned?
- b. Should it be decided to leave the A23 as at present, new aircraft taxiway bridges over the roads will be required. Does the difference in levels between the runway and the road bridge deck present a taxiway gradient problem for large aircraft?
- c. If vehicles stop on this A 23 road to view aircraft. Will this involve the police in time and expense in keeping the road clear and safe from obstruction and accident risk?

4.2 In the previously submitted Gatwick expansion scheme it was proposed to divert the A23 into tunnel. Is this still an option?

a. If this option is to be implemented how will the funding be provided for the construction and subsequent maintenance of these transport structures?

b. Should an application be made by the owners of Gatwick for the closure of the A23 dual carriageway on the grounds that the estimated costs could not be justified or funded for either the road diversion or the construction and maintenance of the underground length of this road.

Is such an application likely to be agreed?

c. Does the proposed population and industrial expansion within the London/Brighton corridor of development opportunity conflict with any such closure application for the A23?

d. The recent Berkeley Hanover Consulting report is quoted as saying that space will be required for an additional 45,000 homes if the Airport expansion is to go ahead.

If this is accepted where will the new town be located and how will the infrastructure be funded?

What effect will there be on the Metropolitan Green Belt and other recreational areas South of Crawley?

5.0 Drainage;-

The rainfall run off and reduced time of concentration of storm water produced by the new paved areas, car parks, industrial and other buildings makes it necessary to consider the increased risk of flooding within the River Mole flood plain and adjacent housing areas. Provision needs to be made within the development scheme for new drainage systems, water holding ponds and balancing lakes so that storm water flows can be safely held until the risk of flooding has passed.

6.0 Road Transport Connections;-

6.1. The town of Crawley has the benefit of a ring road that may need to be provided with increased transport capacity. However other sections of the local Highway network have existing transport bottlenecks that will need major revision and attention if the **economic viability of Gatwick** within the LEP area is to keep pace with the population and the associated industrial traffic growth.

6.2. Roads to London from Gatwick pass through various Towns and villages that do not have the benefit of Ring Roads or Bypasses.

The outer London Boroughs present almost continuous urban development that is scheduled to grow in population density with all the associated problems of inadequate road capacity, cycle and pedestrian safety, air and noise pollution and where good communications are essential for low cost export growth. Part of this problem has been addressed in previous RS Reports.

6.3 Transport bottleneck problems exist on the A23 at **Redhill**, on the A217 at **Reigate**, on the A25 at **Dorking** and on the A24 at **Epsom**. Debottlenecking these urban areas may prove to be very expensive unless economic alternative routes are identified and constructed.

6.4. On the route to the Counties of East Sussex and Kent, the A264 has a serious transport bottleneck at the town of **East Grinstead**, with additional bottleneck problems further to the East.

To the West the A264 terminates at Five Oaks. The proposed extension of this A264 road was revoked in 2013.

6.5 Gatwick has a good access to the M23 London / Brighton Motorway with the exception of the length of the M23 North of Merstham which remains to be completed at some date in the future. In the meantime London bound traffic transferring from the M23 to the A23 is frustrated by the bottlenecks at **Coulsdon**, **Purley** and **Croydon** all within the Coast to Capital LEP area.

Traffic using this route to Greater London usually transfers via the M25 to the A217 and the bottleneck at **Banstead**.

The improvement and widening of the Road to Brighton South of Crawley has been funded for construction.

7.0. The Department for Transport “ORBIT REPORT”: TRANSPORT SOLUTIONS AROUND LONDON

States that transport growth in the SE will present a serious Motorway problem;-

Land-Use Policies (an extract from the Orbit Report)

We consider that developments in the vicinity of the M25 which generate large volumes of car trips should be controlled so that the benefits of the newly provided road capacity are not eroded. We recommend that a review of current controls on land-use development adjacent to the trunk road and motorway network should be undertaken.

8.0 Rail transport Connections;-

8.1 Gatwick Rail Transport connections to London and Brighton appear to be satisfactory but with a commuter overload on most working days, rail connections to Stansted appear to be in need of improvement as journey times might be reduced if the rail line capacity can be provided.

Connections to Heathrow are poor when compared with the car options via the M25. **Please see the Society Report No. 49 for details of rail problem**, delays and lack of long term capacity that need to be considered.

8.2 The potential for an improved and faster Rail services to Ashford (Kent) with the London to Europe HS1 service are good. It is also noted the **Kent International**, long runway, **Airport at Manston** is on an extension of this rail line.

Reports indicate that this Manston Airport has substantial reserve capacity and landing slots that might be put to more economic use in the future.

9.0. Economics and Sustainable Energy;-

9.1. David MacKay Professor in the Department of Physics of Cambridge in his publication “Sustainable Energy” has produced information and numbers as an aid to thoughtful discussion.

9.2 Some comparable but approximate figures have been produced below to show the relative energy consumption of various forms of transport.

Energy consumption in kilo-watt hours to carry one ton a distance of one kilometer;-

Air freight ---- 01.6

Road freight ---- 0 1.1

Rail freight ---- 0 0.1

Shipping freight ---- 0 0.05

Electric car ---- 0 0.1 When considering the future interests of public mobility cannot this vehicle be recharged in part from the Solar energy source?

9.3 **Air travel and the Fossil fuel price;-** It has been estimated that low cost fuel will not be available within a life time, say less than 100 years. It is likely that the population growth and energy demand combined with this declining resource may cause fuel prices to rise more quickly than anticipated even if Fracking Gas becomes available to meet some of our growing needs

. Air travel prices are low at present but may rise rapidly if world growth improves and fossil fuel prices increase. In the longer term it is suggested that essential air travel will continue but growth in passenger numbers will decline as costs rise.

9.4 The low cost of financing new Airports;-

There is little doubt that interest rates of 1/2 % and the availability of finance from the Quantitative Easing programme will encourage Banks, Insurance Companies and others to invest funds, but this has happened before and resulted in nonperforming loans and the disruptive capital write off.

9.5 It is suggested that the current trend towards the demolition of structural and building assets whilst those assets still have value presents a serious waste of resources when there is a need for more productive long term export oriented investments.

10,0 Airport Options;-

10.1 Much is made of the need for large airport hubs to be able to transfer passengers between flights to ongoing destinations. It is suggested that none of the airport proposals are large enough to meet this transfer target and the objective may have the additional risk and security problem of putting all of the ”eggs in one basket.”

10.2 In what is now a growing air transport market moving in the longer term to a static or declining industry it is suggested that air transport developments at Gatwick and the provision of such a large housing estate based on employment within one industry may prove to be a poor investment with little or no return on the capital employed, this prospect could lead to the write off of the sums invested and the associated social problems.

10.3 **It is suggested** that before embarking on a substantial capital expenditure on any airport it should be necessary to consider the low cost and underutilized alternatives that are available in other airports available for short term passenger growth.

11.0. TRANSPORT HUBS;-

It is suggested that The London Hub administrators might concentrate, like the Manchester hub managers, on securing finance for the improvement of the transport services, including **all rail services** to selected Airport and other Port areas where an improved rail route can provide a relatively carbon efficient transport system as set out in paragraph No. 9.2 above.

The objective should be the long term economic benefit to the exporting community even if the air transport industry faces a future of decline rather than that of continuous growth.

11.1 Some UK Airports / Airfields;-

Bristol, Boscombe Down, **Doncaster** (Robin Hood Airport) Cotishaw, Fairford, **Gatwick, Heathrow** , Honington Lakenheath, Liverpool, Luton, Lydd, Manchester, **Manston** (Kent International Airport), Mildenhall, Northolt, Redhill, **Stansted**. etc etc.

All Reigate Society Transport Reports are available on the Society web site
Particular attention is drawn to Reports Nos. 42 to 49

J.M.Chittenden

For and on behalf of the RS Transport Committee