

London Airspace
Consultation

NATS

YOUR LONDON AIRPORT
Gatwick

Appendix D1 London Airspace Consultation Responses from members of the public: online response form 1st April 2014

This document shows final topline results from members of the public made to the London Airspace Consultation, carried out on behalf of National Air Traffic Services

All responses shown in this document were made through the online response form during the consultation period of 15 October 2013 - 21 January 2014.

Findings reflect the view of all members of the public who submitted a response to each question
Responses are shown in the form of numbers not percentages

		Total
Q11_A	Base size:	492
	Making best use of Gatwick Airport Runway 26	
	Strongly support	29
	Tend to support	40
	Neither support nor oppose	64
	Tend to oppose	54
	Strongly oppose	269
	Don't know	36
	Support	69
	Oppose	323
	Base size:	440
Q11_B	PartB Please state the reasons why you support or oppose this objective to realign all Gatwick Airport Runway 26 departure routes below 4,000ft to help make best use of the existing runway.	
	REALIGNING RUNWAY 26 DEPARTURES	89
	Support for Realigning Runway 26 departures	19
	Support with caveat for Realigning Runway 26 departures	15
	Oppose realigning Runway 26 departures	55
	REASONS TO SUPPORT THE OBJECTIVE TO REALIGN ALL GATWICK AIRPORT RUNWAY 26	48
	Noise (NoI)	21
	Best use of new aircraft performance / use of PBN to minimise effects of noise	2
	Introduction of narrower NPRs will minimize noise impact to more people along a flight route	3
	Realigning Runway 26 departures will help areas affected by aircraft noise by sharing the impact across a wider area	9
	Realigning Runway 26 departures will lessen the noise impact at night	1
	The increase in noise will be negligible	1
	Uninterrupted / steeper climbs / descents will reduce the number of people affected by aircraft noise	7
	Air Traffic (AiT)	18
	Likely that there will be only a small increase in overhead flights due to the re-alignment of Runway 26	1
	Proposals mean fewer flights will pass over my home	1
	Proposals mean more predictability for residents	1
	Proposals will result in reduced flight times	1
	Realignment of routes will improve efficiency	10
	Support the proposal so long as there is no increase in flight numbers	2
	Proposed flight paths are beneficial to residents of Bletchingley	1
	Although below 4000ft the planes over Westerham are high enough not to be a nuisance	1
	Flight Paths (FiP)	6
	Support the positioning of routes away from populated areas / to less populated areas	2
	Support for Continuous Descent Approach	3
	DVR, CLN, LAM departures from R26 are not economical to operators due to geometry and speed restrictions	1
	Airports (AiR)	6
	Expanding Gatwick could attract airlines to operate more connections / flights	1
	Gatwick airport needs to grow / expand / best use of Gatwick should be made	3
	Making best use of the existing runway may eliminate the need for a second runway	2
	Quieter aircraft will make it easier for Gatwick to expand	1
	Visual (ViS)	1
	Realignment will increase aircraft visibility in / around Dorking / Boxhill	1
	Rural/Countryside (RC)	1
	Southern alternative departure route will reduce air pollution in Coldharbour	1
	Proposals for steeper climbs / tighter curves will reduce impact on Leith Hill	1
	Air Pollution (AiP)	1
	Aircraft air pollution above Horley was greater in the past	1
	REASONS TO OPPOSE THE OBJECTIVE TO REALIGN ALL GATWICK AIRPORT RUNWAY 26	295
	Proposals need to be better thought out / planned / re worked	4
	Realigning Runway 26 will affect new areas	1
	Proposals will have a greater negative impact on the residents of East Grinstead	2
Noise (NoI)	201	
Areas that are more elevated above sea level will suffer more impact from aircraft noise	7	
Concerns about the way noise / increases in noise have been measured	5	
Flight paths over hills will accentuate noise / noise pollution	4	
Increased noise will have an adverse impact on schools in the area	5	
More flights means more noise / disruption / disturbance	8	
More frequent noise from low flying aircraft will impact local villages	2	

New departure swathe on a westerly wind will subject us to more noise	1
Noise from aircraft affects peoples health / well being / quality of life	11
Proposals / narrower flight paths will lead to noise / noise pollution being concentrated into a smaller area	5
Proposals will not reduce the noise from older aircraft / older aircraft are louder than modern equivalents	2
Realignment of Runway 26 departures will affect trade for local businesses that rely on the peace of the local area	9
Realignment of Runway 26 departures will have a negative noise impact on National Trust properties / woodland / countryside areas	16
Realigning Runway 26 departures will mean that residents who chose not to buy property under / near existing flight paths will be penalised with noise / disruption	33
Realigning Runway 26 departures / lowered flight paths will cause more noise pollution	68
Realigning Runway 26 departures will bring noise to new areas	24
The increase in aircraft noise affecting local residents from the Realignment of Runway 26 is unacceptable	4
There should be no increase in noise levels / noise levels should remain as in previous years	10
Proposals will enable an increase in departures and therefore an increase in noise	4
Noise measurements are inaccurate	1
Arrivals on Runway 26 cause considerable noise over my home	1
Objections to continuous descent due to increased noise	1
Proposals will increase noise spoiling Chiddingstone AONB's	1
Aircraft noise should not increase over Alfold	2
Realigning Runway 26 departures will affect noise levels for the residents of the Bewbush area	1
Proposals will lead to an increase in aircraft noise over Alfold Bars	1
Proposals will increase noise over Bletchingley	1
Opposition to the plans if it means Bucks Green will suffer more noise	1
Proposals will increase noise spoiling Chiddingstone AONB's	1
Concerns about noise from aircraft at night	1
Proposals will increase noise spoiling country life in Chiddingstone	1
Proposals will lead to increase in noise pollution in Copthorne	1
Proposals/new flight paths/respice routes could increase noise over Crawley and neighbouring areas like Pease Pottage	3
Cranleigh is affected by aircraft noise / proposals will increase the disturbance to Cranleigh	1
Increase in flights over GU6 / Cranleigh will lead to an increase in noise	1
Crockham Hill will be affected by aircraft noise due to high location	1
Proposals will increase noise over Dormansland	2
Aircraft noise over East Grinstead has increased/is unacceptable/proposals will increase noise	8
Concerns that proposals will lead to an increase in noise over East Surrey Hospital	2
Proposals will increase noise over Edenbridge/oppose plans if more noise for Edenbridge	3
Noise levels in Greensand Ridge could rise to over 100DB / unacceptable levels	2
Hever Castle is affected by aircraft noise	1
Concerns about increased noise from additional flights affecting Horsham and surrounding areas such as Faygate / Colgate	4
Realigning Runway 26 departures will cause noise disturbance to Ifield Mill Pond wildlife	2
Higher areas in Nutfield will suffer greater effects of increased noise	1
Realigning routes will increase noise in / around Nutfield	2
Realigning Runway 26 will increase the level of noise disturbance in Newdigate	1
Concerns about the noise / detrimental impact caused by low level flying over Redhill	1
Proposals will increase noise over Redhill/oppose any increase in noise in Redhill that proposals might cause	5
Any increase in noise pollution could jeopardise regeneration plans for Redhill	1
Proposals will add to the noise from Redhill aerodrome	4
An increase in noise will have a negative impact on tourist levels to Reigate	1
Any increase in noise pollution could jeopardise regeneration plans for Reigate	1
Proposals will lead to an increase in noise / noise pollution over Reigate	2
Proposals will greatly increase noise over Sevenoaks	1
The proposed changes will result in more noise for the residents of Weald	6
Opposition to the plans if it means Southwater will suffer more noise	1
Concerns about the current high levels of noise in Tonbridge	1
Wildlife is affected by aircraft noise in Tonbridge	1
Proposals will lead to an increase in aircraft noise over Tunbridge Wells	1
Changes to flight path will increase noise disturbance of Warnham Village	1
Air Traffic (AiT)	95
Time window for departures / arrivals is too wide / hours of operation should be reduced	1
Airspace restrictions east of Gatwick are unnecessary due to performance improvements with modern aircraft	1
Concerns about night flights / impact of night flights	6
Concerns about safety risks of increased air traffic in already overcrowded airspace	9
Concerns regarding the accuracy of departure / arrival swathe	2
Concerns that proposals will conflict with VFR traffic to / from other airports	2
Concerns that the changes will concentrate air traffic over a smaller number of people	3
Concerns that the proposals will lead to an increase / double the number of flights to / from Gatwick	9
Proposals mean that flight paths will go over AONBs / SSSIs / areas of conservation / Greenbelt land	11

Proposals will increase number of flights over my / our house / area	7
Realigning Runway 26 departures will increase the volume of air traffic / it is unacceptable	12
Realigning Runway 26 departures will result in more flights affecting a wider area	3
The current system works well offering residents predictability	1
There has already been an increase in the number of overhead flights	3
Allowing planes to fly lower is unacceptable	2
An increase in overhead flights is unacceptable	3
The current proposal is strongly opposed due to the increased controlled airspace especially to the north of the current CTA boundary	1
Proposals will mean an increase in air traffic over Beare Green	1
Oppose any reduction in altitude for aircraft flying over Bidborough	1
Oppose any increase in air traffic over Bidborough	1
Proposals will lead to the over flying of Billingshurst village and surrounding schools	1
Oppose any increases in air traffic over Capel	1
An increase in air traffic will have a negative impact on the historical buildings in Chiddingstone	1
Increased low level flights will have a negative impact on Crockham Hill	2
Proposals will increase air traffic / low level air traffic over East Grinstead	3
Increases in air traffic over East Grinstead are affecting health / causing lack of sleep	1
Oppose any increase in air traffic over Toys Hill and its surrounding area	3
Horley should not be flown over / is exempt from any aircraft	2
Concerns about negative impacts of low level flights over Horsham	3
RH7 already suffers with air traffic there should not be an increase	2
Concerns about Gatwick and Redhill air traffic congestion over South Nutfield	1
Oppose any increases in air traffic passing over Oxted	1
Proposals will lead to an increase in aircraft flying 4000ft over Reigate	1
Concerns that proposals will lead to increased air traffic over Seaford	1
Concerns about an increase in air traffic flying over Sevenoaks	3
Concerns about/objections to increasing flights over Sidlow	1
Proposals will lead to lower flying aircraft over Tandridge	1
Concerns that proposals will lead to an increase in night flights over Tonbridge	2
Higher locations will be affected by lower flights / minimum clearance of 3000ft will not occur over higher ground	4
Concerns about aircraft flying over Toys Hill	3
There should be no increase in air traffic over Tunbridge Wells	1
Proposals will lead to higher frequency of low flying aircraft over Tunbridge Wells	1
There should be no flight paths over Warnham	1
There should be no night flights over Warnham	1
Flight Paths (FIP)	37
Concerns that flight paths to the north are being widened	1
Proposals mean that flight paths will go over AONBs / SSSIs / areas of conservation / Greenbelt land	11
Narrowing of flight paths should be at higher altitude	2
Routes below 4000ft should avoid villages where possible	2
Concerns about arrival routes over Chiddingstone	1
Proposed flight paths need to be re evaluated / thought	1
Proposals appear to offer no respite from flights to my area	1
Oppose flights being below 4000ft far away from Gatwick	2
Respite routes need to be re thought out / are poorly located	1
Changes to runway 26 will mean that Horsham will suffer from over flying and the planned extension does not seem to take into account the ground features used by VFR pilots to navigate, e.g. the M25	1
Realignment will affect visitor numbers to Denbies vineyard	2
We already experience problems in Felbridge with aircraft not adhering to designated flight paths	1
Oppose plans to route flights over areas in Edenbridge	1
Current flight paths avoid Horley	1
Opposition to low flying departures over Imberhome Lane	1
Flight paths over the Kent Downs AONB will be visually intrusive / an eyesore	1
Flight paths over Nutfield will increase noise levels	2
Concerns about flight path interaction with flights from / to Redhill aerodrome	5
Proposed flight paths will have a negative impact on Sevenoaks wild life reserve	1
Changes to flight paths will affect areas in West Sussex	1
Airports (AiR)	3
A second runway will have less of an impact on the residents of Crawley	1
Gatwick airport infrastructure is already overloaded / would be better to expand other airports	1
Gatwick is currently operating under its traffic peak of 2007 / there is still capacity for growth	1
Greater passenger numbers will strain local infrastructure	1
Rural / Countryside (RC)	72
Aircraft should avoid Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	10
Concerns about the impact of low level flights / noise on farms / livestock	7
Concerns that proposed routes fly over environmentally sensitive areas	3
Concerns that proposals will increase flights over AONBs / rural areas / environmentally sensitive areas	4
Flight paths should not affect areas of peace and tranquility with noise	3
Proposals will lead to less visitors / tourists visiting the countryside	7
Realigning Runway 26 departures will blight the countryside / greenbelt / conservation areas	7

Realigning Runway 26 departures will harm / affect the tranquility of SSI sites	3
Realigning Runway 26 departures will harm / affect the tranquility of AONBs	38
Realignment will affect visitor numbers / put people off from visiting Boxhill	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on visitor numbers to Greensand Ridge	1
Greensand Ridge is made up of AONB's / SSI / conservation areas	3
Realignment of Runway 26 departures will have a negative impact on High Weald AONB	1
Realignment over the Kent downs will have a negative effect on its wildlife	1
Areas inside the Kent Downs are protected against development / has landscape protection	3
Proposed routes will have a negative effect on the Kent Downs AONB	6
Proposed routes over Sevenoaks Weald will negatively affect its / surrounding AONBs	11
Low flights over Weald will have a negative impact on the rural environment	2
Concerns that low flying aircraft will disturb the peace in Weald	2
Proposal will have a detrimental effect on the Surrey Hills AONB	2
Proposed routes over Tonbridge will negatively affect its / surrounding AONBs	1
Realigning flight will have a negative impact on historical woodlands of Toys Hill	1
Oppose flights over the Kent Downs AONB	3
Visual (ViS)	2
More frequent low flying aircraft will have a visual impact on local villages	1
Visual intrusion will be made worse for locations on higher ground	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	65
Concerns about the effects of pollution / fuel residues / other contaminants from low level flights	19
Concerns that EC air quality regulation may not be met near the M25 Westerham if flights are routed there	4
Proposals will increase air pollution/increase flight numbers and thereby air pollution	32
Realigning Runway 26 departures will affect the air quality of the residents of Bewbush area	1
Brasted village is subject to an air quality management order / proposed flight paths will add to air pollution in the area	1
Concerns about ongoing increase in pollution levels around East Grinstead caused by additional aircraft	1
Proposals will increase the pollution levels in East Grinstead	2
Concerns that increases in air traffic will add to air pollution in / around Edenbridge	1
Horley is already subjected to air pollution	3
Realigning Runway 26 departures will affect air quality for Ifield Mill Pond wildlife	2
Proposals will increase air pollution in Redhill	2
Proposals will increase air pollution in Reigate	2
The proposed changes will result in more pollution for the residents of Weald	2
Geological location of Tonbridge means that air pollution will be more difficult to disperse	1
Concerns about air pollution in Toys Hill	1
Changes to flight path will increase air pollution in Warnham Village	1
Quality of Life (QoL)	102
Proposals will affect / blight the lives of those in populated areas / communities	12
Realigning Runway 26 departures will affect people's health / wellbeing / quality of life	33
Realigning Runway 26 departures will devalue houses under these routes / make them harder to sell	31
Realigning Runway 26 departures will have a negative impact on my / others' home(s) / life	36
Realigning Runway 26 departures will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the wider countryside in this area	12
Respite days should be known in advance so can be planned around	1
The proposal may force people to move away from the area	5
Overflying causes stress / affects our health / well being / quality of life	3
Proposals will have a negative impact on quality of life in Alford Bars	1
Proposals will negatively affect property prices in Copthorne	1
Proposals increasing noise / disturbance will impact on quality of life in Cranleigh	1
Increasing air traffic over Horley will have a negative impact on the quality of life in Horley	1
Concerns increased noise levels will have a negative effect on Patients / staff at East Surrey Hospital	1
Proposals will have a negative effect on the quality of life in Weald	2
Concerns proposals will have a negative impact on quality of life in Tonbridge	1
Business / Economic (BuS)	3
Proposals are of no benefit to the economy / local economy	3
Towns/Residential (ReS)	10
Proposals to increase air traffic will harm the development / natural surroundings of Beare Green	1
Realigning Runway 26 departures will negatively affect the schools / colleges / hospitals of Bidborough	1
Concerns about the effects of noise / vibrations on grade II listed buildings in Cowden	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on grade II listed buildings in Greensand ridge	1
Concerns about old buildings in Leigh with poor sound insulation	1
Concerns about old buildings in Penshurst with poor sound insulation	1
Some properties in / around Sevenoaks cannot be changed / insulated due to listed status	1
Residents of Weald are restricted to the alternations they are perform to their properties to protect them against aircraft noise	1
Realigning Runway 26 departures will negatively affect the schools / colleges / hospitals of Southborough	1
Proposals will deter people from moving to the Tonbridge area negatively affecting its local economy	1
Realigning Runway 26 departures will negatively affect the schools / colleges / hospitals of Tonbridge	1
Realigning Runway 26 departures will negatively affect the schools / colleges / hospitals of Tunbridge Wells	1

Aircraft flying over Warnham will impact the historic village	1
Proposals will reduce visitors to Sevenoaks Weald having a negative effect on local businesses	2
Wildlife (WiL)	17
Low flying aircraft will have a negative impact on local wildlife	16
Concerns about the impact of noise on wildlife in Leigh	1
Flight Altitude (AiH)	2
Penshurst is in an elevated position and is more affected by over flying at low altitudes	1
Disagree with low altitude flying / reduction in flight heights over Tonbridge	1
Historical buildings (HiS)	1
Listed buildings with no double glazing in Weald will be affected by noise	1
GATWICK RUNWAY 26 DEPARTURES - SUGGESTIONS	100
Noise (NoI)	24
Rural areas will be more affected by increases in noise compared to towns due to the current low / quiet conditions / background noise levels	2
Aircraft should meet quieter noise regulations / operate more quietly	4
Any changes that are likely to increase noise should be avoided	6
Departure routes should be above 4000ft to reduce noise pollution	1
Primary concern should be to reduce aircraft noise for people below	5
Proposals need to allow for the topography of the landscape / effects can be magnified by hills and should be taken into account	3
Should be a ban on higher noise aircraft at night	1
Proposal will make no real difference to the levels of noise in Dormansland	1
Reduce air traffic / noise over Dormansland	1
Arrivals over Hever cause excessive noise which needs to be curtailed	1
Proposals could affect plans for housing development in Horsham	1
Residents in Upminster should not suffer any disturbance	1
Air Traffic (AiT)	41
Airlines should use more fuel efficient aircraft to save fuel as opposed to re routing	1
Air to ground communication should be improved to better coordinate arrivals / reduce waiting in holds / stacks	1
Air traffic control should have flexibility in routing	1
Any plan should incorporate a reduction in night flights	1
Holding / stacks should be over the sea	1
Improvements in aircraft technology will benefit the environment more than flight path adjustment	1
Leave it as it is / no need to change	1
More needs to be done managing hold areas / stacks	1
More use should be made of aircraft technological advances / improved capabilities	1
Proposals should not be geared towards allowing an increase in departures in the morning	1
Reduce the days which we have overflying aircraft	1
Shortening the final approach would spread out approaching traffic more/allow aircraft to remain high as long as possible	2
Should consider implementing a possible 3rd stack	1
Should factor in reducing delays	1
Should factor in reducing pollution	2
Rotate the airspace used / spread the load over a wider area / widen swathe	8
There should be no night / early morning flights	6
There are alternative routes / solutions which could be adopted	1
The existing system for aircraft management should be improved / no need for changes	2
Technological benefits of new / modern engines are exaggerated	1
There should be no increase in flights	2
There should be no increase in air traffic over Beare Green	1
Aircraft should be routed away from East Grinstead at higher altitude before 09.00	1
Horsham District Council need to be fully aware of the potential significant change	1
Migratory birds flying over Kent Downs AONB could pose a risk for low flying aircraft	2
Existing flight paths over Newdigate should not be changed	1
Aircraft heading towards Seaford should avoid high throttle climbing to reduce noise impacts below	1
Should consider routing more aircraft over Tonbridge as properties are better insulated against noise	1
Flight paths should avoid Bletchingley	1
Airports (AiR)	1
Runway 26 should not be in operation / closed down	1
Use of Runway 26 should be for day flights only	1
Flight Paths (FiP)	43
Flight paths should be over the countryside / uninhabited areas	2
New alternative routes should be sought	1
A one week on one week off system would be better for local residents	1
Aircraft departing eastward should follow same flight paths as eastward landing aircraft	1
Aircraft should maintain maximum height for as long as possible though each controlled area of airspace	2
Aircraft taking off to the east should turn south sooner	1
Allow as many routes as possible so impacts (noise / visual) can be minimised across a larger area	2
AONB's / National trust areas should be allowed greater respite periods	2
Arrival / departure flight paths into Gatwick should be steeper to reduce the size of areas impacted by noise	4
Aviation authority should enforce flight paths / fly zones / ensure routes are adhered to	5
Departing aircraft should climb to 3000ft before making any turns to minimise noise impact below	2

Exact flight paths should be published so people can see how they will be affected	1
Flights shouldn't leave 4000 ft area until they have reached its most easterly point	1
Flight paths should avoid areas of high population	5
Flight paths should be chosen that avoid environmentally sensitive areas	1
Flight paths should be moved incrementally / each day across the swathes / on a 30 day cycle to offer better respite	2
Flight paths should be over areas which are used to air traffic	1
Flight paths should be routed causing minimum disruption / having minimal effect below	3
Landing / approach flight path should be kept as far north as possible away from high population centres	1
Merger point between aircraft on westerly landing approaches / easterly take-off should be moved further east away from Dormansland	1
New navigation technology should be used to enable an alternating flight path	1
Night air traffic should be routed over London	1
PRNAV flights should be routed over less populated areas to reduce effects of noise	2
Realignment should use existing flight corridors	1
Westerly arrivals should join the glide path no further east than Edenbridge to minimise disruption caused below	1
Should consider routing aircraft over more rural areas / countryside	1
Bidborough needs to be included in respite proposals	1
Flight paths should avoid the densely populated areas of Felbridge by flying over open fields	1
Westerly approaches should pass higher over Felcourt to reduce any noise below	1
Aircraft heading towards Seaford should turn away from East Grinstead earlier reducing the number of people affected by noise	1
Should route flights over less inhabited areas south of Sevenoaks	1
Flights should be routed away from Weald	1
Flight paths should avoid Surrey Hills AONB and surrounding areas	1
Should route flights over less inhabited areas south of Tonbridge	1
Should route flights over less inhabited areas south of Tunbridge Wells	1
Flight path should be routed further north of Warnham village	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	8
There should be no increase in air pollution levels / effort should be made to reduce air pollution	1
Flights at higher altitude spread pollutants over a wider area / are not as concentrated	1
Main aim should be to reduce CO2 emissions	1
Research is needed into the effects of aircraft pollution on health	1
Elevated areas in the Kent Downs will be more exposed / vulnerable to noise / air pollution	4
Towns / Residential (ReS)	8
Communities should be engaged with about aircraft noise that affects them	2
Proposals should aim to reduce/minimise the impact / effect of aircraft disturbance on residential areas	6
Environment (EnV)	1
Need more information into possible environmental effects from noise and emissions	1
Concerns that the respite routes over agricultural land could affect produce	1
Wildlife (WiL)	2
Concerns that respite routes will have an adverse effect on the bee population	1
Realignment of Runway 26 departures will have a negative effect on wildlife in the Abinger area	1
OUT OF SCOPE	162
Airports (AiR)	24
A new airport should be built elsewhere to bring economic growth to a new area	1
Stansted / other airports north of London airport should be expanded	2
Access to Gatwick is better than Heathrow	1
Heathrow airport should be reduced in size	1
Gatwick should be reduced in size/handle fewer flights	2
Concerns that growth of Gatwick airport will increase pressure to use greenbelt land for housing / commercial purposes	1
Expansion of Gatwick will help the economy	1
Expansion of Heathrow will help the economy	1
Expansion of Gatwick will provide needed employment in the area	2
Gatwick airport should not be expanded / it is large enough	1
Gatwick must grow / change is inevitable	1
Gatwick should charge higher levies / fees instead of trying to increase flight numbers	1
Mentions of Boris Island / airport in Thames Estuary	4
Other airports to the north of London should be expanded instead of Gatwick	1
Our area is affected by Gatwick / Heathrow airports	1
Previous complaints to Gatwick have been ignored	1
Concerns that proposals will make a stronger case for a second runway at Gatwick	3
Proposals will make it easier to implement / manage a second runway	1
Additional runway at Gatwick not needed / bad idea / will bring more noise pollution	2
Should build a second runway in the South East	1
There is insufficient runway capacity in the South East	2
There is insufficient terminal capacity in the London airport region	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	7
Passenger growth at Gatwick has led to increased level of air pollution	1
Proposals will help keep pollution to a minimum should a second runway be built	1

We / people in the area are already affected by air pollution from aircraft	2
Use of aircraft increases climate change	1
I/ We already suffer air pollution from road / rail traffic	2
Redhill already suffers from high levels of air pollution	1
Reigate already suffers from high levels of air pollution	1
Air Traffic (AiT)	43
Aircraft take off in an easterly direction constantly	1
Airlines / pilots allowing aircraft to deviate from flight paths should be fined to compensate communities affected by noise	3
An increase in aircraft movements at Gatwick will have a negative effect on the surrounding area	1
Arrivals are more of a concern	1
Concerns that night flight rules are being ignored	2
Concerns that proposals will lead to a concentration of air traffic closer to my / our home	1
Despite the NPR planes fly over / near our property	1
Flights should continue to be allowed the flexibility of their flight path into Gatwick	2
General concerns about low flying aircraft over built up / residential areas	2
London airspace / LTMA is overcrowded / density of airways should be reduced	1
Need to look at other countries to see how better to manage air traffic	1
Overflying began in 2012 / started within the last few years / increased last year without consultation and has continued	7
Planes fly over our house regularly / every 1-2 minutes	7
Should consider a similar plan to Heathrow at Gatwick - No flights from late night to early morning	3
There are a greater number of flights than suggested in the document	1
Charges / fines to airlines operating older aircraft should be applied	1
There has been a recent increase in air traffic over Alford	1
Dorking has seen an increase in air traffic passing overhead	2
East Grinstead is already over flown a lot	2
Area already overflowed by aircraft from Heathrow / Biggin Hill / Redhill	1
Departures over Hever are not a problem	1
Air traffic has steadily increased over Chartwell	1
Areas above Kent already have a lot of air traffic	1
There has been a recent increase in air traffic over Redhill without warning	1
Air traffic has increased over South Holmwood in recent years	1
South Holmwood is already affected by aircraft noise	1
Wotton suffers from overhead flights	1
Compensation	20
Properties under / affected by flight paths / noise should have their council tax reduced	1
Anyone affected by the proposals should be suitably compensated / incurred costs should be covered / paid for	20
Flight Paths (FiP)	15
Realignment would be unnecessary if flights followed centre of current NPR route	1
Questions about the WIZAD flight path	2
Concerns that flight paths haven't been / will not be adhered to	8
New flight paths were introduced without consultation of East Grinstead Council	1
We believe routes have changed despite being told they have not	2
East Grinstead suffers from aircraft veering off their designated flight paths resulting in a negative impact on	1
We already experience problems in Horley with aircraft not adhering to designated flight paths	2
During the summer RH7 was constantly on the direct departure path	2
Flight Altitude (AiH)	2
Tonbridge is currently over flown at low altitudes	1
Tunbridge Wells is currently over flown at low altitudes	1
Noise (NoI)	95
Noise pollution is a scandal	1
Aircraft noise has continued to increase recently / over several years	5
Aircraft noise is a nuisance during the day in Southborough	1
Concerns that CAA is unable to monitor aircraft noise accurately	1
Continuous descent will increase pollution levels further from the airport	1
Noise levels are louder than portrayed	1
Noise pollution in the south east has increased in the last 10 years	1
Proposals will be more acceptable to those who already live with aircraft noise / low flying aircraft	1
People are already affected by aircraft noise at night / early morning	25
I am / we are already affected by aircraft noise / it is already unacceptable	54
People are already affected by aircraft noise during the day	7
People are already affected by aircraft noise at the weekend	2
Residents on existing flight paths bought their property with the knowledge of the potential noise / disruption from aircraft	3
There is little noise disturbance from aircraft currently	1
I/ We already suffer noise from road / rail traffic	2
Aircraft noise is worse in the summer	5
Chiddingstone is already affected by aircraft noise	1
Domewood is already affected by noise pollution from aircraft	1
Horley is already subjected to aircraft noise	3

	Residents of Hurst Green already suffer with noise pollution from airliners operating out of Gatwick	1
	Aircraft noise in Leigh has increased recently	1
	Leigh is already affected by aircraft noise	1
	Lindfield is affected by aircraft noise / aircraft stacking	1
	Proposal will make no real difference to the levels of noise in Lingfield	1
	Lingfield is already affected by noise pollution	3
	Newdigate is already affected by aircraft noise	1
	Penshurst is affected by aircraft noise	2
	In Southborough aircraft noise prevents me from sleeping during the night	1
	Tunbridge Wells is already affected by aircraft noise	2
	Point Merge (PM)	6
	Conditional support for Point Merge system	2
	Opposition to Point Merge	2
	Moving away from the use of aircraft stacking is a welcomed move	1
	The merge point should be identified	1
	Point merge should not be used as a way for Gatwick to increase passenger numbers	1
	Support for point merge system if aircraft noise levels will be reduced for communities below flight paths	1
	Support for Point merge system if improvement in pollution levels are made	1
	Quality of life (QoL)	3
	Consideration should be given to the residents on approach / departure routes with regards to noise	2
	Public health and quality of life should take a higher priority than that of profits / needs of the airport	2
	Rural / Countryside (RC)	1
	The countryside is already ruined by too many flights	1
	Towns/ Residential (ReS)	4
	An increase in air traffic / busier airport will mean more congestion on the roads	3
	Passenger number growth at Gatwick has led to more congestion on roads	1
	COMMENTS ABOUT THE CONSULTATION (GeN)	146
	Proposals potentially affect a wide area and needs careful consideration and review	1
	Questions about the effects of proposals	5
	Mentions of inaccuracies in the consultation information	2
	All residents / businesses who are likely to be affected should be informed and consulted	8
	Benefits of proposals are false / empty promises / untrue	1
	Commercial priorities should not be allowed to be placed before those of the communities	6
	Consultation document is too complicated / confusing / difficult to understand	12
	Criticism of the consultation process (incl not enough time)	10
	Further / more / independent research regarding the impact of the proposals is required	6
	Further route planning is required	1
	I am not fully aware of the proposal	4
	London airports future capacity issues need to be addressed first / airport commissions review of airports	6
	More information is required on reduced environmental impacts / emission reductions / fuel savings	2
	Not enough information to make a decision / lack of information on proposed flight paths	49
	Online maps provided lack detail / quality / are unclear	10
	Proposals are to help increase flights / capacity / increase revenue for Gatwick	14
	Proposals will not affect me / change little for me / I live out of the area	7
	Realigning departure routes below 4000ft is unnecessary	1
	Response relates to issues outside of the consultation (second runway / airport expansion)	8
	Safety must be main priority of any changes	2
	According to comments made by Chiddingstone parish council	11
	According to comments made by GACC	1
	There should be further consultation / after exact nature of proposals is established	13
	Consultation is a foregone conclusion / a done deal	7
	Duplicate response	2
	See previous / other response	4
	Other	26
	Base size:	495
Q12_Aa	Respite Routes for Gatwick Airport below 4,000ft	
	Strongly support	123
	Tend to support	94
	Neither support nor oppose	43
	Tend to oppose	38
	Strongly oppose	163
	Don't know	34
	Support	217
	Oppose	201

Q12_Ab	Base size:	215
	Respite Routes for Gatwick Airport between 4,000ft and 7,000ft	
	Strongly support	53
	Tend to support	45
	Neither support nor oppose	22
	Tend to oppose	24
	Strongly oppose	56
	Don't know	15
	Support	98
	Oppose	80
	Base size:	467
Q12_B	PartB Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the objective of providing respite routes below 4,000ft and/or between 4,000ft and 7,000ft.	
	REASONS TO SUPPORT RESPITE ROUTES FOR GATWICK AIRPORT	195
	Respite routes are a good idea / fair / reasonable / support for Respite Routes	82
	Support for Respite Routes below 4000ft	8
	Conditional support for Respite Routes	21
	Noise (NoI)	116
	Respite routes will help people by sharing the impact and disturbance across a wider area/reducing the concentrated impact	76
	Respite routes will help reduce / give relief / respite from noise / noise pollution	30
	Lower level of flight and sharp manoeuvring generate louder noise levels on current flight paths	1
	Support Respite routes providing there is little or no increase in noise levels	1
	Support Respite Routes subject to agreeable time periods of reduced noise	1
	Constant noise below 4000ft is draining / annoying / unfair	3
	A good idea providing there is no way to completely avoid all noise impacting a populated area on approach	1
	Occasional noise is more acceptable than constant noise	1
	Local residents should be given respite from aircraft noise	5
	Accuracy of Performance Based Navigation means noise can be spread over a wider area	1
	Respite routes will help reduce noise pollution over Hever	3
	Proposals should reduce noise impact on Tonbridge	1
	Agree with respite routes providing Dormansland suffers less noise	1
	Air Traffic (AiT)	19
	Respite Routes will reduce the intensity of aircraft flying over concentrated areas / especially for easterly arrivals	4
	Sensible providing plans for increased capacity are not compromised	1
	Agree there should be no flights north of Horley	1
	Agree with respite routes providing Dormansland suffers less air traffic	1
	Flight Paths (FiP)	12
	Respite Routes will help alleviate any overflying of towns / residential areas as a result of Point Merge	5
	Should have as many routes as possible	3
	Aircraft are able to fly much narrower flight paths / thereby confining disruption to a smaller area	1
	Realigning the approach route to Gatwick east of Edenbridge will help alleviate the noise disturbance	1
	The Hever beacon has pushed approach paths further east	1
	Support for the use of new route running to the east of Horsham	1
	Business / Economic (BuS)	1
	Respite routes will help the economic impact of reduced house prices	1
	Quality of life (QoL)	19
	Respite routes will help people's health / well being / quality of life	5
	Constant noise from aircraft can / does affect people's health / well being / quality of life	9
	Respite routes would give us a break from regular flights over our house	2
	Respite routes would be especially useful in the summer when outdoors / enjoying rural areas	5
	Air Pollution (AiP)	1
	Proposals should improve air quality in Tonbridge	1
REASONS TO OPPOSE RESPITE ROUTES FOR GATWICK AIRPORT	209	
Respite routes are a bad idea / unfair / disagree with respite routes	28	
Oppose Respite Routes between 4000ft and 7000ft	1	
Oppose Respite Routes below 4000ft / at low altitudes	7	
Noise (NoI)	122	
Concerns about the accuracy of noise measurements	3	
Respite routes may / will increase the areas / people affected by noise pollution / will impact new areas / people	48	
Noise concerns from an increase of flights as a result of the respite routes	18	
Providing respite routes merely emphasises the unacceptable burden of flights / aircraft noise	6	
Low flying aircraft / noise detract from the peace of the countryside	5	
Spreading aircraft noise over a new / wider area will have a negative impact / should be avoided	8	

Aircraft noise pollution is affecting / will affect people's health / wellbeing / quality of life	9
Any increase in noise is unacceptable / there should be no increase in noise levels	12
Narrowing the flight paths may increase noise to the area below	2
Respite routes are not the answer to the problem of noise levels	5
Some will get more noise so that others get less	1
Occasional noise is sometimes more noticeable than routine noise which you become accustomed to	1
Proposals will mean constant noise on residents	1
Mentions of noise (nsf)	3
Ashdown Forest should be protected from any increase in aircraft noise	1
Aircraft noise has had a negative impact on quality of life in Bidborough	1
Bidborough is in an elevated position and therefore more affected by aircraft noise	1
Bidborough is a quiet / tranquil village and aircraft noise is much more noticeable	1
Light aircraft to / from Biggin Hill add to the disturbance	1
East Grinstead will suffer more due to the changes in this proposal	2
High Weald AONB is in an elevated position and will therefore be affected more with noise from aircraft than other low lying areas	1
The village of Leigh already suffers from aircraft noise / it is unacceptable	2
Leigh is in a tranquil area and aircraft noise will be felt much more	1
Sevenoaks Weald would suffer from noise pollution if flown over below 4000ft	1
Respite routes will increase noise over Weald village	3
Weald is in a tranquil area and aircraft noise will be felt much more	1
Should be no increase in noise disturbing overflying of Tonbridge	1
Residents in Upminster should not suffer any disturbance	1
There should be no increase in noise levels over Upminster / noise levels should remain as in previous years	1
Chiddingstone is in a tranquil area and aircraft noise will be felt much more	1
Air Traffic (AiT)	57
Oppose any increase in air traffic	2
Respite routes are about putting more flights in the air rather than providing respite for residents	9
An additional three flights per hour at peak times does not warrant the blighting of a new swathe of residents	1
Respite routes are not needed below 4000ft	1
Disagree with changes to flight paths	2
Respite Routes will not make any difference	1
Respite Routes mean people suffer more at one time to get respite at other times	3
An increase in flights has safety concerns / could result in a mid air crash	1
An increase in flights has Public Health hazard implications	2
Aircraft are quieter now so do not need to be vectored to different areas to give respite	1
Certain aircraft cause disturbance by deviating from the traditional flight path	1
Oppose any increase in air traffic over Bidborough	1
Crockham Hill / Ide Hill / Toys Hill communities would be affected by over flying due to their elevated locations	2
Opposition to any more traffic over Imberhome Lane	1
Concerns that Rusthall will suffer from an increase in air traffic	1
Introduction of a respite route over Sevenoaks would increase an already high level of air traffic in the area	1
Respite route plans will increase flights over Weald village	2
There should be no increases in air traffic over Warnham	1
Aircraft Height (AiH)	5
If the new routes are used areas with an elevated position will suffer more due to their increased proximity to the noise	2
An increase in flights under 7000 ft will impact on noise levels	2
An increase in flights under 4000 ft will impact on noise levels	3
An increase in flights under 4000 ft will impact on air quality	2
Flight Paths (FiP)	27
Current flight paths/holding systems are good enough/no need for change	13
Respite Routes seem to be an attempt to appease objections to concentrated flight paths	1
Respite Routes simply transfer the problem somewhere else	1
Proposed Respite Routes are just to appease concerns	1
Concerns that Respite Routes will be used more as flights increase	3
Certain areas should not suffer increased overflying due to tighter funnelling of air routes	2
Flight paths over new areas will cause disturbances	2
Current flight paths are already known / predictable	1
Aircraft do not stick to current flight paths / corridors	1
Respite Routes would affect Bletchingley	1
The village of Leigh will be detrimentally affected by the proposed routes	1
Opposition to implementation of Respite Routes over Toys Hill in Kent Downs AONB	1
Flights below 7000ft destroy the tranquillity of West Sussex	1
Airports - (AiR)	7
Proposals appear to be about increasing profit for the airport / airline operators to the detriment of local residents	6
Respite Routes are a poor alternative to finding a solution for overcrowding of airports	1

Rural / Countryside (RC)	13
Respite routes should avoid Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) / SSSI	4
Proposed respite routes will increase air traffic over/blight AONBs/National Trust properties	9
Towns / Residential Areas (ReS)	2
Use of proposed Respite Routes will impact populated areas	1
Crockham Hill is in an elevated position which will suffer more if the new routes are used	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	25
Respite routes will spread pollution over a wider area / increase those affected by pollution	12
We are already affected by air pollution / it is a concern	2
Concerns that Respite routes will increase air traffic and in turn increase air pollution	5
Concerns of increase in air pollution from overflying / overflying at low altitudes	4
More research is needed into the effects of aircraft pollution / noise / fuel residue over respite areas	1
Re routing flight paths will have a negative impact on air quality in Westerham	1
Kent Downs is in an Air Quality Management Area to protect against emissions	1
Concerns proposals will lead to an increase in air pollution in Weald village	1
Concerns of increased air pollution in Tonbridge	1
An increase in flights under 7000 ft will impact on air quality	2
Quality of life - (QoL)	53
Concentrating air traffic will impact the health / wellbeing of residents	5
Respite routes will negatively affect people's health / wellbeing / quality of life	17
Residents who chose not to buy under / near flight paths will be penalised if the respite routes are utilised	23
Respite routes will devalue property / amenities under these routes	9
An increase in low altitude flights will impact on quality of life	2
I don't want planes flying over my home / at any time	4
People do not want their recreation time spoilt by aircraft noise	1
Quality of life should take precedence over business interests	1
Quality of life of the residents of Crockham Hill will be affected if the new flight plans go ahead	1
Business / Economic (BuS)	3
Respite routes will have a negative financial effect on those below them	2
Proposals will have a negative impact on tourism in Kent Downs	1
Wildlife (WiL)	7
Respite Routes may impact wildlife	4
Bough Beech has various nature reserves and will be blighted by aircraft noise if flown over	1
Re routing flight paths will have a negative impact on wildlife in High Weald	1
Proposed flight path will have a negative impact on wildlife in Kent Downs	1
RESPITE ROUTES FOR GATWICK AIRPORT - SUGGESTIONS	127
Noise (NoI)	20
Respite routes should be used to minimise the impact of noise to residential areas	1
Should consider Respite Routes providing there is a reduction from current noise exposure	1
Respite routes should be used to minimise the impact of noise to high ground areas	1
Impact of increased flights over countryside should be examined to determine noise tolerance levels	1
A known schedule of Respite Routes would allow people to plan around noisy periods	3
Keep disturbance to limited areas so as to allow people to escape it if they wish	1
Noise is the main issue / should address noise pollution foremost / reduce noise impact	5
Should strike a balance between current noise disturbance and spread of the disturbance over a wider area	2
Minimising noise in rural areas should be a priority	1
New measures should be used for measuring aircraft noise taking account for tonal change / ambient noise	2
Raise the level of flight over residential areas to 4000ft to reduce the level of noise	1
A reduction in noise at the weekend / when people are outdoors would be preferable	1
Measures should be in place to protect Bough Beech from noise	1
Proposed Respite Routes will affect aircraft noise over Dormansland	1
Air Traffic (AiT)	101
Respite routes should be used to alleviate the concentration of aircraft from the narrowing of flight paths	2
Respite routes should be used in conjunction with limiting the final approach to 10 miles	1
Should consider adjusting aircraft vectoring 800 metres to the east over agricultural land rather than populated areas	1
Should consider a respite route for runway 08 departures along the western edge of the NPR to reduce the noise impact on local areas	1
Should consider a similar plan to Heathrow at Gatwick - No flights from 12pm to 6am	1
Should consider a variety of routes for dispersal of air traffic	3
Should consider existing flight corridors / paths / stacks / density from Heathrow	1
Should consider existing flight corridors / paths / stacks / density from Biggin Hill	1
Should have maps showing proposed routes so we can make a decision / before we make a decision	3
Should require airlines to invest in quieter / newer / modern aircraft	2
Questions regarding if there will be fewer flights over people's houses	3
Aircraft should have steeper climb and descent/respite routes are unnecessary with steeper climb and descent	5
Should not have too much traffic over one area / it is unfair / intolerable / should be reduced	6

Use of airspace below 4000ft should be discouraged	2
There should be no increase in flights	2
Concerns that proposals will increase the amount of flights at shorter intervals	1
Aircraft Height (AiH)	5
Aircraft should be kept higher for longer	3
Low level flights will cause more pollution (nsf)	1
Low level flights will have a negative impact on rural areas / AONBs	1
Night Flights (NiF)	6
There should be no night flights	5
Should consider the effects of Respite Routes during the night	1
Flight Paths (FiP)	66
Having such wide flight paths negates the new navigation technology enabling greater route accuracy	1
Flight paths should be chosen which will have the least / minimal impact on people below	2
Flight paths should avoid environmentally sensitive areas/have the lowest possible environmental impact	3
Should consider a shorter steeper final approach into Gatwick to reduce the area affected by noise	2
Flight path should be routed further south of Billingshurst to fly over more open land	1
Should publish flight path timetables/will help planning	5
Should consider changing Respite Routes on a daily / weekly basis / regular rotation of flight paths	8
Respite Routes should not cover new / clear areas	9
Respite Routes should be far away from the main route / other route	2
Planned routes should provide the optimum for both operational and environmental impact	1
Should consider weekends when planning Respite Routes	2
To vary the flight paths will adversely affect those who have sought to avoid them	3
Should organise respite routes for easterly descents	1
Changes to flight paths will benefit some but disturb others	2
Should use the least populated route for the majority of the time	3
Flights should be routed over the more populated areas as they already have increased levels of background noise	2
Should test / demonstrate the routes first before asking for public opinion	1
Routes should go through narrower areas/be concentrated in fewer areas in order to lower noise disturbance	3
Low overflying of aircraft should only happen for short intervals at a time	1
Should consider alternative routes over open fields	1
Should consider alternative routes over commercial areas	1
Spreading the routes over an area rather than alternating two routes will ensure that areas will not suffer high frequency of overflight	6
Aircraft should continue climbing before diverging over populated areas	1
Descents over the sea are less likely to cause damage in the event of an accident	1
Dispersal of approaches from the east would be welcome	1
Respite Routes will depend on aircraft destination	1
Continuous Descent Operations (CDA) should be enforced	1
Approach flight paths to Gatwick should not be over extended	1
Residents who live near the airport should be prioritised when deciding on respite routes	3
Aircraft should join the glidescope nearer to the airport to reduce fuel burn and emissions	2
Opposition to the new routes / deviation from centerline	1
Tonbridge should be included in the respite plans	1
Should fly over Ashdown Forest at higher altitude to cause less damage to built up areas	1
Should split departures so that aircraft are not all directed over Dormansland	1
Should consider moving the easterly departure flight path further west to avoid the populated area of Felbridge	1
Existing flight paths should not change below 4000ft over Newdigate	1
Proposed route over Sevenoaks / Sevenoaks Weald / Ide Hill should be avoided	1
Aircraft should be re routed to avoid Tunbridge Wells	1
Respite routes should be considered for Tunbridge Wells to reduce aircraft disturbance on residents	1
Airports (AiR)	5
Should look to other airports to find alternative solutions	1
Should build a new airport in the Thames Estuary	2
Should consider building airports on the coast so fewer people are affected	2
Should build a new airport (nsf)	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	5
Should be a reduction of emissions / fuel wastage	5
Rural / Countryside (RC)	6
Respite routes over farmland / agricultural land will contaminate areas for food production with emissions	1
Routes should comply with government policy of avoiding overflying heavily populated areas wherever possible	1
Should protect heritage sites from aircraft disturbance	1
Rural areas / AONBs should be considered when planning respite routes	2
AONB's / NT property should qualify for greater respite	1
Towns / Residential Areas (ReS)	11
There should be respite below 4000ft over towns	1
There should be respite below 4000ft over hospitals	1

Should not fly over schools	2
Residential areas should be prioritised over AONB's with regard to spreading of aircraft disturbance	5
Alternative routes are available over London	1
Routes should avoid the heavily populated / historic village of Cowden	1
Respite Routes should be researched and designed in consultation with those affected	1
Local Infrastructure (LI)	1
Since the Olympics a lot of infrastructure is already in place to support a new airport in the Thames Estuary	1
Quality of life (QoL)	4
Respite routes would potentially benefit more people if used late night / early morning	2
Respite routes used during the day will not benefit many people as they would be at work	1
Should consider alternative options which will affect fewer people	1
Gatwick should do more to mitigate quality of life in affected areas	1
Historical buildings (HiS)	1
Should reduce overflight of Penshurst Place which is blighted by aircraft noise	1
OUT OF SCOPE	94
Noise (NoI)	75
We / people in the area are already affected by aircraft noise / it is unacceptable / unbearable	39
Residents on existing flight paths bought their property / moved to the area with the knowledge of the potential noise / disruption from aircraft	16
Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) are already affected by aircraft noise	1
Rural areas are already affected by noise	2
Noise from aircraft causes sleep disturbance	13
Aircraft noise impacts outdoor activities / when in the garden	4
Aircraft noise impacts us in the summer / when windows and doors are open	9
Aircraft noise affects the use of TV / radio / telephone	2
We / people chose to move here for the peace and quiet of the area / away from flight routes	8
Noise impacts for people under the final approach / take off of aircraft can be relentless	1
In previous years the aircraft noise levels were acceptable	1
Aircraft noise already affects a large / wide area due to variation of flight paths / wind direction / aircraft type	1
Bough Beech suffers from aircraft noise	1
Capel has suffered an increase in noise from the narrow flight paths used by aircraft	1
Chiddingstone is already affected by noise from low flying arriving aircraft / it is unacceptable	2
People in Crowborough are already affected by aircraft noise	1
Edenbridge suffers constant aircraft noise	1
Increased use of runway 08 affects noise pollution levels of the GU6 postcode area	1
Increased use of runway 08 affects noise pollution levels of the Imberhome area	1
Lingfield is already affected by noise from low flying aircraft	1
There is already noise from Redhill Aerodrome	1
People in Rusthall are already affected by aircraft noise especially in the summer	1
People in Tonbridge are already affected by aircraft noise	1
People in Tunbridge Wells are already affected by aircraft noise especially in the summer	2
Residents of Speldhurst Road in Tunbridge Wells are regularly affected by overflying aircraft	1
Air Traffic (AiT)	23
The number of flights should be reduced not increased	2
Policy of not flying over towns should be maintained	1
The increase in air traffic over the past years will affect property values	1
There has been an increase in air traffic in our area / especially in the summer	3
Criticism of noisy Easyjet flight operations / budget airlines	4
Air traffic disturbance occurred from June 2012 and has continued since	1
Ashdown Forest suffers from over flying	1
Capel has suffered from an increase in air traffic especially in the summer	1
Crowborough suffers from over flying	1
There could be safety issues with large airliners flying low over the Redhill Aerodrome	1
Aircraft Height (AiH)	5
Aircraft fly over the area below 1000ft	1
We experience disturbance from direct overflights between 1500m and 2500m	1
Aircraft fly over the area at low altitudes	1
Aircraft currently fly over Billingshurst at a much lower altitude than 4000ft	1
Tunbridge Wells suffers from over flying below 4000ft / at low altitudes	1
Night Flights - (NiF)	3
Flights are too frequent during the night from Gatwick	3
There should be restrictions on night flights / flights should not be allowed to fly over residential areas at night	1
Flight Paths (FiP)	3
People bought properties under current flight paths as they knew they would be cheaper	1
Support for Runway 08	1
Runway 26 flies too close to Crawley	1
Increased use of Runway 08 would provide respite for Dormansland	1
Airports (AiR)	10
Should decide on London's Runway capacity first	3
Should build a new airport	1

	This consultation is more about introducing a second runway	1
	Gatwick is unsuitable for expansion / is a bad idea / oppose 2nd runway	4
	Expanding Heathrow is a bad idea	1
	Should expand Manston Airport	1
	Comments regarding the construction of a hard runway at Redhill Aerodrome	1
	Air Pollution (AiP)	1
	We are affected by air pollution / aviation fuel	1
	Compensation (CoM)	6
	Anyone affected by an increase in noise levels should be suitably compensated	5
	Should buy out householders who are blighted	2
	GENERAL	137
	Support for GACC comments	1
	Information supplied does not conform to The European Noise Directive (2002/49/EC)	1
	Disagree with the entire proposal	3
	No view / preference	3
	See previous / other response	44
	Duplicate response	2
	Questions about the issues within the consultation	5
	There should be further / extended consultation once the proposed routes have been chosen	5
	Criticism of the consultation	53
	Proposal is just a stopgap / smokescreen to the main issue / a new runway	3
	Further / more research is required	23
	Proposals will not affect me	2
	Agree with / Support for Chiddingstone Parish Councils response	4
	Public opinion will not count in this proposal	1
	Criticism of the government / politicians	1
	Other	16
	Base size:	142
Q13A-G2:	Places or areas that may need special consideration	
	Leigh - xxx - uncertain - potential multiple areas/counties	2
	Pollution (nsf) - Leigh	1
	Environmental - Leigh	1
	KENT	51
	Health - Kent	2
	Health - Sevenoaks, Kent	2
	Health - Speldhurst, Kent	1
	AONB - Kent	10
	Area of outstanding natural beauty - Sevenoaks Weald, Sevenoaks, Kent	5
	Area of outstanding natural beauty - High Weald, Kent	1
	Area of outstanding natural beauty - Crockham Hill, Kent	2
	Area of outstanding natural beauty - Chiddingstone (Chiddingstone Castle), Kent	1
	Area of outstanding natural beauty - Toys Hill, Kent	1
	Pollution (nsf) - Kent	13
	Pollution (nsf) - Crockham Hill, Kent	1
	Pollution (nsf) - Hever (Hever Castle), Kent	2
	Pollution (nsf) - Kent (no specific area)	1
	Pollution (nsf) - Sevenoaks, Kent	4
	Pollution (nsf) - Sevenoaks Weald, Sevenoaks, Kent	2
	Pollution (nsf) - Speldhurst, Tunbridge Wells, Kent	1
	Pollution (nsf) - Tunbridge Wells, Southborough, Kent	2
	Pollution (noise)/Peace/Tranquility - Kent	6
	Noise pollution - Bidborough, Kent	1
	Noise pollution - Toys Hill, Kent	1
	Peace/tranquility - High Weald, Kent	1
	Peace/tranquility - Kent (no specific area)	1
	Noise pollution - Tonbridge, Kent	1
	Noise pollution - Chiddingstone (Chiddingstone Castle), Kent	2
	Pollution (Air) - Kent	8
	Air pollution - Bidborough, Kent	4
	Air pollution - Chiddingstone Hoath, Kent	1
	ir pollution - Tonbridge, Kent	4
	Air pollution - Toys Hill, Kent	2
	Pollution - Light	1
	Light pollution - Hildenborough, Kent	1
	Fuel/Emissions - Kent	9
	CO2/emissions - Mill Hill, Edenbridge, Kent	1
	CO2/emissions - Tunbridge Wells, Kent	1
	CO2/emissions - Ide Hill, Kent	2
	CO2/emissions - Westerham, Kent	2
	CO2/emissions - Sevenoaks, Kent	1
	CO2/emissions - Sevenoaks Weald, Sevenoaks, Kent	1

CO2/emissions on water quality - Bough Beech, Kent	1
Smell of CO2/emissions - Tonbridge, Kent	1
Community - Kent	4
Community consideration/disturbance of community - Bidborough, Kent	1
Community consideration/disturbance of community - Chiddingstone (Chiddingstone Castle), Kent	1
Community consideration/disturbance of community - High Weald, Kent	1
Frightening - Speldhurst, Tunbridge Wells, Kent	1
Visual/frequency of flights - Kent	2
Visual impact/sight of frequent aircraft - High Weald, Kent	1
Visual impact/sight of frequent aircraft - Poundsbridge, Kent	1
Heritage/Historical - Kent	2
National Trust Village - Chiddingstone (Chiddingstone Castle), Kent	2
Environmental - Kent	8
Environmental - Sevenoaks Weald, Sevenoaks, Kent	2
Climate Change Tunbridge, Southborough, Kent	1
Wildlife/animals/plants - Sevenoaks Weald, Sevenoaks, Kent	2
Wildlife/animals/plants - Tonbridge, Kent	1
Wildlife/animals/plants - Toys Hill, Kent	2
SSI Special Scientific Interest - Kent	3
Special Scientific Interest - Sevenoaks Weald, Sevenoaks, Kent	2
Special Scientific Interest - Tonbridge, Kent	1
Flight Paths - Kent	1
Unsure if flights from Manston will avoid CAS (Controlled Air Space) - Manston, Kent	1
Unsure if more flights on south side of Manston - Manston, Kent	1
Commercial/Economic - Kent	7
Commercial/economic consideration/loss of revenue - Bidborough, Kent	1
Commercial/economic consideration/loss of revenue - Speldhurst, Kent	1
Tourism area/attraction/will reduce number of visitors/affect the pleasure of visitors - Sevenoaks Weald village,	1
Tourism area/attraction/will reduce number of visitors/affect the pleasure of visitors - Chartwell, Kent	2
Tourism area/attraction/will reduce number of visitors/affect the pleasure of visitors - Chiddingstone	2
Tourism area/attraction/will reduce number of visitors/affect the pleasure of visitors - Westerham, Kent	1
LONDON	1
Sleep/rest disturbance - Upminster, London	1
Peace/tranquility - Upminster, London	1
SUFFOLK	2
AONB - Suffolk	1
Area of outstanding natural beauty - Felixstowe, Suffolk	1
Heritage/Historical - Suffolk	1
World Heritage status at risk - Dedham Vale, Suffolk	1
Miscellaneous - Suffolk	1
High population - Felixstowe, Suffolk	1
SURREY	34
AONB - Surrey	1
Area of outstanding natural beauty - Bletchingley, Surrey	1
Community - Surrey	1
Community consideration/impact on community - Reigate, Surrey	1
Environment - Surrey	1
Wildlife/animals/plants - Felbridge, Surrey	1
Visual/frequency of flights - Surrey	2
Frequency of flights - Dormansland, Surrey	2
Fuel/Emissions - Surrey	2
Fuel/CO2 residue on houses/gardens - Capel, Surrey	1
Smell of CO2/emissions - Redhill, Surrey	1
Health - Surrey	1
Health - Smallfield, Surrey	1
Heritage/Historical - Surrey	1
Historical village - Bletchingley, Surrey	1
Property - Surrey	2
Property value impact - Reigate, Surrey	1
House shaking/trembling - Smallfield, Surrey	1
Safety - Surrey	2
Safety considerations - Redhill Aerodrome, Surrey	1
Safety considerations - East Surrey, (East Surrey Hospital)	1
Pollution (nsf) - Surrey	9
Pollution (nsf) - Capel, Surrey	2
Pollution (nsf) - Coldharbour, Surrey	1
Pollution (nsf) - Lingfield, Surrey	1
Pollution (nsf) - Meath Green, Surrey	1
Pollution (nsf) - Nutfield	1
Pollution (nsf) - Redhill, Surrey	1
Pollution (nsf) - Sidlow, Surrey	1
Pollution (nsf) - Surrey Hills, Surrey	1

Pollution (Air) - Surrey	11
Air pollution - Bletchingley, Surrey	2
Air pollution - Dorking, Surrey	1
Air pollution - Felbridge, Surrey	2
Air pollution - Horley, Surrey	2
Air pollution - Newdigate, Surrey	1
Air pollution - Redhill, Surrey	2
Air pollution - Reigate, Surrey	2
Air pollution - Salfords, Surrey	1
Air pollution - South Holmwood, Surrey	1
Pollution (noise)/Peace/Tranquility - Surrey	1
Peace/tranquility - Newdigate, Surrey	1
Out of scope - Surrey	1
Mentions of traffic/traffic congestion/traffic noise - Brockham, Surrey	1
Miscellaneous - Surrey	3
Redhill Aerodrome - Redhill, Surrey	1
Too close to area of flights taking off from runway 8 - Redhill, Surrey	1
High population - Felbridge, Surrey	1
Community - Surrey	1
Community consideration/disturbance to the community - Alford, Surrey	1
EAST SUSSEX	8
AONB - East Sussex	2
Area of outstanding natural beauty - Ashdown Forest, East Sussex	1
Area of outstanding natural beauty - Sedlescombe, East Sussex	1
Commercial/Economic - East Sussex	3
Commercial/economic consideration/loss of revenue - Ashdown Forest, East Sussex	1
Tourism area/attraction/will reduce number of visitors/affect the pleasure of visitors - Ashdown Forest, East Sussex	2
Commercial/economic consideration/loss of revenue - Nutley, East Sussex	2
Heritage/Historical - East Sussex	1
Historical area/attraction - Sedlescombe, East Sussex	1
Out of scope - East Sussex	1
Mentions of already experiencing noise pollution - Nutley, East Sussex	1
Pollution (nsf) - East Sussex	2
Pollution (nsf) - Ashdown Forest, East Sussex	2
Pollution (Air) - East Sussex	2
Pollution to Special Scientific Interest - Ashdown Forest, East Sussex	1
Air pollution - Ashdown Forest, East Sussex	1
Pollution (Noise)/Peace/Tranquility - East Sussex	4
Noise Pollution - Ashdown Forest, East Sussex	3
Peace/tranquility - Ashdown Forest, East Sussex	3
Noise Pollution - Nutley, East Sussex	2
Fuel/Emissions - East Sussex	1
Fuel/CO2 emissions - Ashdown Forest, East Sussex	1
WEST SUSSEX	25
AONB - West Sussex	1
Area of outstanding natural beauty - Rusper, West Sussex	1
Community - West Sussex	2
Community consideration/impact on community - Copthorne, West Sussex	1
Community consideration/impact on community - Durfold Wood, West Sussex	1
Health - West Sussex	1
Health - Grinstead (East)	1
Heritage/Historical - West Sussex	1
Historical/heritage area/attraction - Warnham, West Sussex	1
Out of scope - West Sussex	3
Traffic noise - Haywards Heath, West Sussex	1
Miscellaneous - West Sussex	2
Perimeters - Ifield, Sussex	1
Early morning - Hayward's Heath, West Sussex	1
Pollution (nsf) - West Sussex	6
Pollution (nsf) - Copthorne, West Sussex	1
Pollution (nsf) - Grinstead (East), West Sussex	3
Pollution (nsf) - Horsham, West Sussex	1
Pollution (nsf) - The Mill Pond, Ifield, Crawley, West Sussex	1
Pollution (Air) - West Sussex	6
Air pollution - Grinstead (East), West Sussex	3
Air pollution - Horsham, West Sussex	1
Air pollution - Warnham, West Sussex	1
Air pollution - West of Crawley, West Sussex	1
Pollution (Noise)/Peace/Tranquility - West Sussex	3
Noise Pollution - Mare Hill, Pulborough, West Sussex	1
Peace/tranquility - Durfold Wood, West Sussex	1

	Morning noise pollution - Grinstead (East), West Sussex	1
	Property - West Sussex	5
	Property value decrease - Grinstead (East), West Sussex	1
	Property value decrease - Warnham, West Sussex	3
	Property value decrease - Loxwood, West Sussex	1
	Safety - West Sussex	2
	Safety considerations - Billingshurst, West Sussex	1
	Safety considerations - Grinstead (East), West Sussex	1
	ESSEX	4
	Community - Essex	1
	Lights through windows - Langdon Hills, Essex	1
	Environmental - Essex	1
	Wildlife/animals/plants - Colchester, Essex	1
	Pollution (noise)/Peace/Tranquility - Essex	1
	Peace/tranquility - Stock, Essex	1
	Pollution (Light)	1
	Light pollution - Boxted, Essex	1
	LOCATION given as a wide area	3
	Area of outstanding natural beauty - North of Nutley and South of Wych Cross	1
	Effect on wildlife - Seveoaks, Weald to Chiddingstone	1
	Air pollution - A25 from Sevenoaks to Redhill	1
	LOCATION given as figure reference from consultation maps	3
	Animal Farming - B8 B9	1
	Pollution (nsf) - partB	1
	Traffic - PartB	1
	Sleep / rest disturbance - B9	1
	Property value impact - B9	1
	LOCATION no specific area	1
	Extended hours of flights affecting sleep - Residential area	1
	Base size:	298
Q13_B	Please provide any additional information you feel is relevant in the space below	
	COMMENTS ON PLACES OR AREAS THAT MAY NEED SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	217
	Disagree with the proposed changes	6
	Concerns about impact caused on all affected areas	4
	Noise (NoI)	130
	Proposals will increase noise / noise pollution / concerns of noise impacts	7
	More research is needed looking at the effects of increased noise levels on AONB's / parks / open spaces	1
	Towns would be able to cope with aircraft noise better as they already have traffic noise / other noise	4
	Disruption from overflying aircraft impact our outdoor business activities	1
	Noise is the main issue / it should be reduced	18
	The effects of noise are felt much more in areas with low background noise / rural areas	17
	Any increase in noise will be intolerable	1
	Current departure routes put more of a burden on local residents	2
	Concerns of noise from Eastern Runway departures	1
	Concerns of noise on AONBs	1
	Proposals will increase noise in Alfold	1
	Ashdown Forest is already affected by noise and disturbance from Gatwick operations	2
	Ashdown Forest is in an elevated position and therefore aircraft are much lower and noisier than other surrounding areas	1
	Areas in and around Ashdown Forest are vulnerable to noise from Gatwick operations (Nutley, Wych Cross, Chelwood Gate, Danehill, Forest Row, Hartfield, Colemans Hatch)	2
	Measures should be in place to protect Ashdown Forest AONB and surrounding areas from noise	2
	Bidborough is in an elevated position and will therefore be affected more with noise from aircraft flying below 4000ft than other low lying areas	4
	Bidborough already suffers from Noise	2
	Re-routing flight paths to avoid Billingshurst would improve / reduce noise impact	2
	Bletchingley already suffers from noise from various sources	1
	Blindley Heath already suffers from aircraft noise due to the current flight paths	1
	Bough Beech suffers from aircraft noise	1
	Measures should be in place to protect Bough Beech from noise	1
	Burstow is affected by aircraft noise	1
	There should be no increase in noise levels at Charlwood	1
	Concerns of noise increases in Chiddingstone and the negative impacts it will cause	3
	Measures should be in place to protect Chiddingstone / Chiddingstone Castle from noise	3
	Current flight paths follow the River Eden / meaning any changes will result in increase in noise for people below	1
	Proposals will have a negative impact on the tranquillity of Dedham Vale AONB	3
	Measures should be in place to protect Dedham Vale AONB and surrounding areas from noise	3
	Aircraft should turn later when heading onto the Seaford NPR to minimise noise impact on Domewood	1

Dorking is already affected by aircraft noise	1
Dormansland has an ageing population and more likely to be affected by noise due to staying in their homes longer	1
Oppose any increases in aircraft noise over Dudwell Valley	1
Aircraft noise has increased in East Grinstead in recent years/proposals will increase noise levels here	4
Widening the flight path will affect the southern part of East Grinstead with noise from aircraft	1
Widening the flight path will affect the National Trust house at Standen with noise from aircraft	1
Tourism in East Grinstead will be affected by increased aircraft noise if the flight path is widened	1
East Grinstead suffers from noise from easterly departing flights	5
Concerns about increasing noise levels in Edenbridge if extra flight paths are used	2
Felbridge suffers from noise from easterly departures	2
Concerns of increases in noise on surrounding countryside / villages from Gatwick Airport	1
Groombridge is already affected by aircraft noise	1
Haywards Heath is already affected by aircraft noise	1
Residents of Hever will be affected by regular noise from low flying aircraft	2
Visitors to Hever Castle will be affected by noise from low flying aircraft	1
The Weald AONB will be spoilt by noise	6
High Weald AONB is in an elevated position and will therefore be affected more with noise from aircraft than other low lying areas	1
Measures should be in place to protect High Weald AONB and surrounding areas from noise	2
Horley is already affected by aircraft noise/proposals will increase noise in Horley	3
Noise levels have increased in Horley over the last 12 months contrary to Gatwick statements	1
Kent Downs are in an elevated position and will therefore be affected more with noise from aircraft than other low lying areas	1
Leigh is a picturesque village spoilt by aircraft noise/aircraft noise here is constant	2
Proposals will negatively affect the peace of Marsh Green	1
Newdigate is a peaceful/ tranquil village and will suffer with a great deal more noise	1
Noise increases will disturb the national trails and recreational paths running in / along the North Downs	1
Nutfield Ridge is in an elevated position and will therefore be affected more with noise from aircraft than other low lying areas	1
Proposals will negatively affect the peace of Penshurst	1
Redhill suffers with noise from the Aerodrome operations / concerns that proposals will add to the noise	5
Redhill already suffers from traffic noise/concern of more noise because of proposals	3
Reigate already has enough problems with noise from Aerodrome/proposals will make things worse	3
Reigate already suffers with noise pollution from road and rail traffic	2
An increase of low flying aircraft will increase in noise in Reigate	1
Proposals will increase noise in Rudgewick	1
Concerns of increases in aircraft noise over Sevenoaks Weald under 4000ft	3
Proposals will bring noise to Weald Village	1
Increases in noise will have a negative impact on wildlife in Shotley Peninsula	1
Narrowing southern departure NPR will reduce noise impact on Slinfold	1
Southborough is already affected by aircraft noise	1
Speldhurst is in an elevated position and will therefore be affected more with noise from aircraft than other low lying areas	2
Speldhurst suffers with noise	1
Measures should be in place to protect Stour Valley AONB and surrounding areas from noise	1
Godstone already suffers from aircraft noise due to the current flight paths	1
Oxted is in a green belt area and will be blighted by noise increases	1
Smallfield is / will be affected by aircraft noise	1
Concerns of noise increases in Godstone	1
Oxted already suffers with noise pollution from road / rail traffic	1
Oxted already suffers from aircraft noise/concerns this will get worse	2
Proposals will lead to an increase in noise in / around Tonbridge	1
Noise pollution will negatively effect Tonbridge/proposals will cause more noise over Tonbridge	2
Tunbridge Wells is already affected by noise pollution/has got worse/proposals will cause more noise here	7
Concerns about noise at night in Tunbridge Wells	1
Lack of noise monitors in Tunbridge Wells not being accounted for	1
Aircraft noise levels in Upminster should be reduced	1
Proposals will increase noise levels in / around Warnham	1
Wealden already suffers with noise pollution	1
Whitstable suffers from aircraft noise for Manston Airport	1
Air Traffic	99
Concerns of increases in air traffic	2
Ashdown Forest needs protection from constant overflying at low altitudes	2
There should be no increase in air traffic over Bidborough	1
Blindley heath is affected by easterly departures when turning north	1
There should be no increase in air traffic / low level air traffic over Cowden	1
Dedham Vale AONB already suffers from over flying / flights over Dedham Vale should not be increased	4
Oppose any increases in air traffic over Dudwell Valley	1
There should be no flights over East Grinstead between a time at night and a time in the morning	1
Air traffic has increased over East Grinstead in recent years especially with easterly departures	1

Air traffic has increased over Felbridge in recent years especially with easterly departures	2
No increase in air traffic over Haywards Heath/concern of increased air traffic over town	1
Overflying of the area around Westerham, Crockham Hill and Chartwell would spoil this area	1
Crockham Hill / Ide Hill / Toys Hill communities would be affected by over flying due to their elevated locations	5
There should be no increase in air traffic over Horley	2
Concerns of safety with the presence of the Redhill Aerodrome	1
Increased air traffic will have a negative impact on town of Reigate	1
There should be no increase in air traffic over Sevenoaks	1
Areas in and around Sevenoaks are used a lot for outdoor activities / any increase in air traffic will have a	1
Increase in aircraft over Sevenoaks Weald	1
Shotley Peninsula has seen an increase in air traffic over the last few decades	1
Narrowing southern departure NPR will reduce air traffic on Slinfold	1
There should be no increase in air traffic over Southborough	1
There should be no increases in air traffic below 4000ft over the areas in / around Surrey Hills	1
Concerns of overflying in Lingfield	1
Visitors enjoyment of the Thames Estuary is impacted by the volume of overflying aircraft	1
Areas in and around Tonbridge are used a lot for outdoor activities / any increase in air traffic will have a negative impact on this	1
Tonbridge is currently over flown	1
Tunbridge Wells is already over flown/should be no more air traffic over Tunbridge Wells	2
Flight Paths (FIP)	47
Concerns that not all aircraft adhere to continuous descent approaches / flight paths	1
Proposed flight paths should be made known / more information required on proposed flight paths	1
Concerns flight paths have not been adhered to	7
Aircraft should fly over low/ unpopulated areas	1
Creating more flight paths will affect more / new areas	2
Current flight path track the lowest land / any change will reduce the altitude from the ground	1
Concerns about aircraft ascending / descending over populated areas	2
Flight path should be routed to the east of Alfold positioning aircraft over open land	1
Respite routes should be introduced to mitigate impact on Alfold	2
Moving Easterly demerge point will have a negative impact on Ashdown Forest AONB	1
Flight Paths should not go over Billingshurst	3
Flight path should be adjusted/ re-routed to avoid village of Chiddingstone	1
Cowden is currently overflowed	1
Crowborough should be considered for a respite route for Tunbridge Wells	1
Flight paths over Dedham Vale AONB should be reconsidered / moved away from the area	1
Respite routes would improve noise impact on Dormansland	1
Oppose routes over Dudwell Valley	1
East Grinstead should not be overflowed/move flight path to sparsely populated area to the east of it	4
Edenbridge is already affected by flight paths/arriving and departing aircraft from both direction will make constant noise over Edenbridge	2
Respite routes would improve noise impact on Edenbridge	1
Flight path should be re routed west of Felbridge	1
Introduction of PRNAV has meant a reduction of overflying in Felbridge	1
Groombridge is under flight path/it should not be overflowed	1
Re routing flight path to the west of Groombridge would avoid the village	1
There should be an aircraft exclusion over the High Weald AONB	1
Moving Easterly demerge point will have a negative impact on High Weald AONB	1
Flight paths should not go over Horsham	1
Flight paths should be re routed around Leigh as area around is sparsely populated	1
In the current Gatwick north-west corner (near Leith Hill), moving the current boundary of the surface to 1500ft airspace south would allow GA aircraft to transit south of Leith Hill, increasing separation from terrain	1
Flight path should be re routed south of Redhill as is less populated	1
Increasing the current 1500ft shelf north of Gatwick to 2000ft would allow most GA traffic to obtain a Traffic Service from Farnborough increasing safety and lessen the impact of GA noise along the Redhill-Tonbridge railway	1
Impacts caused by routing flights over Rudgewick should be considered	1
Objection to any proposal increasing air traffic over Rusthall	1
Objection to the proposed route over Sevenoaks	1
Flight path boundaries need to be reviewed so to minimise the impact on Sevenoaks Weald / residents	1
Shotley Peninsula should not be flown over	1
Stour Valley should not be flown over	1
Aircraft should fly north / south of Oxted where areas are less populated	1
Oxted should not be flown over	1
Opposed to proposed route over Tonbridge/aircraft should not fly over Tonbridge at all	5
There should be an aircraft exclusion zone around Tunbridge Wells	3
Objection to the proposed route over Tunbridge Wells	1
Respite routes should be introduced to mitigate noise impact on Wealden	1

Point Merge (PM)	2
Point Merge could be detrimental to anyone / businesses located under a concentrated flight path	1
Holding stack should be moved from over Ashdown Forest	1
Holding stack should be moved from over Horsted Keynes	1
Holding stack should be moved from over Lindfield	1
Aircraft Height (AiH)	38
Topography of some areas means aircraft will be much closer to ground level / will be more visible / loud	9
More consideration for areas affected below 4000 ft / at low altitudes is needed	4
Proposals will mean that more aircraft will fly below 400ft / low altitudes	1
Planes are flying lower than 3000ft as specified in the consultation	1
Aircraft should fly higher over Bidborough to minimise impacts	1
Concerns of overflying in Billingshurst at low altitudes	1
Dorking currently has low level flights overhead	1
Oppose any over flying at low altitudes over Dudwell Valley	1
Concerns of over flying at low altitudes over Dunsfold / Dunsfold Aerodrome	1
Concerns of overflying in East Grinstead at low altitudes	1
Haywards Heath already suffers with overflying at low altitudes	1
High Weald AONB is in an elevated position and will therefore be affected more by aircraft at low altitudes than other low lying areas	3
Ifield should not be flown over	1
Leigh is already overflown too often at low altitude/flights over Leigh must be higher	1
Leigh suffers from overflying at variable altitudes	1
Concerns of overflying at low altitudes over / near to North Downs	1
Nutfield is in an elevated position	1
Low flying aircraft will have a negative impact on the lakes / commonland in Redhill	2
Low flying aircraft will have a negative impact on AONB / lakes / heathland in Reigate	3
Sevenoaks suffers from overflying at low altitudes	1
A steeper take off / landing will reduce overflying on Slinfold	1
Concerns of overflying at low altitudes over / near to South Downs	1
Aircraft should fly higher over Southborough to minimise impacts	1
Tunbridge Wells is already overflown at low altitude/aircraft should fly higher over the town	3
Flights should not fly below 5500 ft when flying over Tunbridge Wells	1
Alfold suffers from overflying at low altitudes from easterly arrivals	2
Aircraft (AiC)	2
Concerns certain airlines are breaching the NPR routes	1
Improving navigation systems of aircraft may reduce noise pollution	1
Airport (AiR)	2
Proposals will allow a greater number of flight in / out of Gatwick airport	1
Should improve the transport links to Manston to create a cheaper and viable alternative airport site	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	20
Concerns about increased pollution	6
Measures should be in place to reduce fuel burn / CO2 emissions from air travel	1
Tunbridge Wells is already affected with air pollution	1
Bidborough already suffers from air pollution	1
Measures should be in place to protect Dedham Vale AONB and surrounding areas from air pollution	1
East Grinstead already suffers from air pollution/proposals will make air pollution worse in East Grinstead	3
Proposals will increase air pollution levels in Felbridge	1
Concerns of increases in air pollution on surrounding countryside / villages from Gatwick Airport	1
Proposals will lead to an increase in air pollution in Horley	1
Redhill is affected by air pollution	1
Reigate is affected by air pollution	1
Concerns about air pollution / contaminants from overhead flights	1
Concerns of air pollution in Shotley Peninsula	1
Southborough is already affected by air pollution	1
Measures should be in place to protect Stour Valley AONB and surrounding areas from air pollution	1
Air pollution will have a negative impact on town of Tonbridge	2
Air pollution will have a negative impact on town of Tunbridge Wells	1
Warnham already suffers air pollution from roads / it shouldn't suffer more air pollution	1
Concerns that proposals will lead to an increase in air pollution not meeting requirements of EU regulation	1
Rural / Countryside (RC)	39
National Parks / AONB / Other sensitive areas will be damaged / blighted if flown over below 5000ft / low altitudes	7
People live in AONB / rural areas for peace and quiet	3
Flying over AONBs spoils their very nature	6
Ashdown Forest AONB should not be overflown	3
Bough Beech is in AONB / is a SSSI (site of scientific interest)	1
Chiddingstone is in an area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB)	2
Cowden is in an AONB	1
Dedham Vale is in an AONB	6
Area around Westerham / Crockham Hill / Chartwell is an oasis of beauty / AONB	2
Proposals will blight High Weald AONB	2
Nutfield is to be considered as an AONB	1

Penshurst Place is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	1
Concerns about the impact of air traffic on local wildlife / ecology	2
Sevenoaks Weald is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) / should not be flown over	2
Shotley Peninsula is in an AONB / is a site of specific scientific interest (SSSI)	2
Minimise overall flight time across the South Downs	1
Speldhurst is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and should not be flown over	1
Stour Valley is in an AONB	1
Tonbridge is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and should not be flown over	1
Tunbridge Wells is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and should not be flown over	2
Wealden is in an AONB and should not be flown over	1
Measures should be in place to protect Dedham Vale AONB and surrounding areas from overflying	4
Towns / Residential areas (ReS)	14
Realigning flight paths will mean that residents who chose not to buy property under / near existing flight paths will be penalised with noise and disruption	3
People live in towns with an expectation of noise	1
Proposals reducing the height of aircraft over Alfold will double the disturbance	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on village of Chiddingstone / Chiddingstone Castle	3
Cowden should be avoided	2
Low overflying over Crockham Hill will have a negative impact on the value of properties	1
A buffer zone should be introduced to protect Horsham from overflying	1
If all existing Gatwick northern departures will be using the WIZAD/TIGER/DAGGA 1X or RNAV1 variation in the future, then this will need to be put to the Horsham District Council to provide a disincentive to allow housing development north of the A264	1
Concerns about negative impact of proposals on schools / amenities in Weald Village	1
Concerns that building in Weald Village are too old to be modified / insulated against noise	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on village of Sevenoaks Weald	1
Quality of Life (QoL)	19
Proposals will have a negative impact on people and communities	1
Noise will have / does have a detrimental effect on my / our quality of life	3
Proposals will have a negative impact on health	5
People visit Ashdown Forest for the peace and tranquility of the area	3
Proposals will badly affect the quality of life of East Grinstead residents	2
Re routing flight path to avoid Edenbridge will improve quality of life	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on quality of life in Leigh	1
Concerns that low-level flights will badly affect the health/quality of life of Tonbridge residents	2
Concerns about the impact on health low level flight will have on the population of Tunbridge Wells	2
Business (BuS)	37
Proposals will have a negative impact on / be damaging to business relying on peaceful / tranquil areas	2
Proposals will have a negative impact on / be damaging to our business	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on property values	5
Proposals will have a negative impact on businesses / tourism in the area	7
Tourism / businesses relying on tourism will be affected if Ashdown Forest is overflowed by aircraft	3
Bletchingley is already affected by quarrying activity	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on tourism for Chiddingstone	5
Chiddingstone Castle attracts a lot of tourism	4
Proposals will have a negative impact on businesses in Chiddingstone	4
Dedham Vale AONB attracts a lot of tourism	2
Proposals will have a negative impact on tourism to Hever Castle	2
Hever Castle attracts a lot of tourism	2
Area around Westerham / Crockham Hill / Chartwell attracts visitors which help fuel the local economy	5
Proposals will have a negative impact on businesses in High Weald	2
Areas around Horsham are used a lot for outdoor activities / Changes to Runway 26 Departure route will have a negative impact on this	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on property values in Leigh	1
Nutfield attracts a lot of visitors / tourism	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on tourism to Penshurst	1
Penshurst Place attracts a lot of tourism	2
Proposals will have a negative impact on tourism in Redhill	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on tourism in Reigate	1
Scotney Castle attracts a lot of tourism	1
Shotley Peninsula attracts a lot of tourism	1
Stour Valley AONB attracts a lot of tourism	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on property values in Oxted	1
Tonbridge Castle attracts a lot of tourism	2
Tunbridge Wells attracts a lot of tourism	1
Visual (ViS)	14
Concerns of visual impacts (nsf)	2
Visual impacts are much greater in AONBs / national parks / rural areas	1
Bidborough is in an elevated position and will therefore be more affected visually from aircraft flying below 4000ft than other low lying areas	1
Proposals will have a negative visual impact on village of Chiddingstone	3
Widening the flight path will affect the southern part of East Grinstead visually by being overflowed	1

Widening the flight path will affect the National Trust house at Standen visually by being overflowed	1
The Weald AONB will be spoilt by visual impacts	4
Nutfield Ridge is in an elevated position and will be more exposed to visual impacts	1
An increase in low flying aircraft have a larger visual impact in Reigate	1
Aircraft on flight paths over Weald Village will be a visual intrusion	1
Concerns of increase in visual impacts in Mayfield	1
Historic / Cultural Heritage (HiS)	8
Proposals could result in damage to heritage sites / heritage buildings	2
Chiddingstone Castle is a site of historical significance and should be protected from overflying aircraft	4
Hever Castle is a site of historical significance and should be protected from overflying aircraft	2
Speldhurst has historic sites and should not be flown over	1
Tonbridge has historic sites and should not be flown over	1
Tunbridge Wells has historic sites and should not be flown over	1
SUGGESTIONS	70
Noise (NoI)	20
Flights should be over more built up areas to minimise noise impact	2
Noise levels shouldn't be increased	2
Noise impacts should be spread / shared over a wider area	2
Should consider the impact of noise on health	3
Re-routing flight path would alleviate noise pollution on residential properties	2
Aircraft noise should be concentrated as close to the airport as possible	1
Introduce a 10 db noise allowance in AONBs / rural areas	4
More research needed into the effects of noise in rural areas	2
Proposals should look into flying over areas already affected by noise	1
Aircraft landing at Gatwick should use continuous descent to help reduce noise pollution	3
Towns / Residential areas (ReS)	9
Considerations should be given to areas which have high / growing populations / plans for growth	2
Minimise the impact of flights on seaside resorts	1
Aircraft should avoid overflying of populated areas	2
Aircraft should avoid overflying of schools / hospitals at low altitudes	2
Towns / villages / populated areas should be avoided / not flown over	3
Aircraft should avoid overflying of churches / at low altitudes	1
Rural / Countryside (RC)	13
Flights under 5000ft / low altitudes should be excluded from overflying National Parks / AONB / Other sensitive areas	4
Aircraft should avoid overflying Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) / national parks	6
AONBs/national park/tranquil areas should be protected from aircraft noise/get more consideration	7
Flight paths should go over farmland / AONBs to protect residential areas / towns / villages	1
Point Merge (PM)	1
Point merge arc should not be over AONB's	1
Point merge should occur over water to mitigate air pollution	1
Point merge should occur over water to mitigate noise	1
Air Traffic (AiT)	1
The South East is already over concentrated with aircraft / increasing it will make it worse	1
Flight Paths (FiP)	24
Flight paths should be over as wide an area as possible to minimise impact below	1
Flight paths through valleys would be better / should happen where possible	1
Aircraft should maintain alignment with the runway for longer after take off to gain more height and reduce noise impact below before turning	2
Gatwick arrival flight path should be routed to the west of the east Kent coast to reduce impact below	1
LCY departures should climb and join flight path from STN at 7000ft +	1
Aircraft should also turn south after departure from Gatwick Airport / as only turn north at the moment / to spread the impact	1
The boundary of low level flying should be moved West / closer to the airport	1
Flight paths should be re-routed to avoid Towns / Villages / residential properties	4
Flight paths should be re-routed to avoid national parks / Areas of Outstanding Natural beauty (AONB)	3
Any changes should ensure that any aircraft disturbance takes place over the sea	2
Introduce measures to ensure that aircraft do not deviate from their allocated flight path	2
Respite routes should be introduced to mitigate effect on rural areas	1
Respite routes should be introduced to mitigate effect on populated areas	1
Changes to the flight path on the easterly departure route will have an impact on residential properties	2
Flight paths should not be moved / changed / increased	1
Re routing flight path to the west of the proposed flight path in fig B9 will go over a mainly uninhabited area	1
Aircraft should follow the M25 Corridor as population is smaller	1
Aircraft should fly closer to the west side of the SID avoiding populated areas	1
Aircraft Height (AiH)	6
Aircraft should be higher over land than over the sea	1
Aircraft should descend / ascend at a steeper angle to maintain height for longer / gain height quicker / reducing noise impact below	3
Aircraft should climb to 3000ft before making any turns to minimise noise impact	1
Measures are needed to monitor aircraft ascent/descent	2
Measures are needed to monitor low flying aircraft	1

Night Flights	5
Concerns about night flights	1
Night flights should be flown over low density populated areas	2
Night flights should not be allowed to fly over Alford	1
Bidborough already suffer from noise of night flights	1
Airport (AiR)	4
New airport near the coast should be considered to alleviate air traffic on current flight paths	2
No additional routes should be created operating out of Gatwick	1
Should consider utilising Manston airport	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	2
Flying at low levels for longer will produce more CO2 / air pollution / burn more fuel	1
Should consider the impact of pollution on health	1
Business (BuS)	3
Operators should be fined if their aircraft fly outside guidelines/permitted flight paths/NPRs	3
Fines should be put in place for aircraft that generate high levels of noise	1
OUT OF SCOPE	64
Comments not related to this consultation	2
Agree with / support for Chiddingstone Parish Council's response	2
Noise (NoI)	41
Helicopter flights should not be made to hold over Horley due to noise impact on residents	1
We / people in the area are already affected by aircraft noise	26
People in the south east already suffer from excess general traffic noise	2
Aircraft noise at night is disturbing	9
Aircraft noise is worse in the summer	6
Residents who bought property on existing flight paths did so with the knowledge of the potential noise / disruption from aircraft	2
Aircraft noise has increased recently/last few years/since 2012	7
Noise levels should be reduced over this residential area	1
Air Traffic	3
There has been an increase in low level flights	2
Flight Paths	1
Nationwide airspace should be looked into / better utilisation of airspace is required	1
Airport	2
Mentions of Thames Estuary airport	2
An alternative new modern airport should be built	1
Air Pollution	2
I / We are currently affect by air pollution from aircraft	2
Quality of life (QoL)	4
Overflying aircraft have a negative effect on our health / well being / quality of life	3
Increase in number of flights during 2013 summer made outside activities uncomfortable/ intolerable	1
Business / Economic (BuS)	2
Concerns that the only beneficiaries of the proposals efficiencies are the airlines / airport	2
Visual (ViS)	1
Aircraft already have a visual impact on my / our area	1
Population (PoP)	16
The South East already suffers from excess pollution	1
Billingshurst is a populated town with an increasing population	2
East Grinstead is densely populated and flight path route should be reviewed	1
Felbridge is densely populated and flight path route should be reviewed	2
Population in Horley is growing	1
Redhill is a densely populated town	2
Reigate is a densely populated town	1
Sevenoaks is a densely populated town and should not be flown over	1
Godstone is a densely populated town	1
Oxted is a densely populated town	3
Tonbridge is a densely populated town and should not be flown over	3
Tunbridge Wells is a densely populated town and should not be flown over	4
Compensation (CoM)	2
Financial savings made by airport / airlines should be passed onto those impacted / affected by proposals	1
There should be a compensation scheme for affected businesses / business losses due to proposals	1
GENERAL	96
Wildlife (WiL)	9
Wildlife in Ashdown Forest is being affected due to the number of low flying aircraft over the area	1
Bough Beech has various nature reserves and will be blighted by aircraft noise if flown over	4
Dedham Vale has various wildlife and nature reserves	1
Routes proposed will cause disturbance to wildlife in Fellbridge	1
Shotley Peninsula has various wildlife and nature reserves	1
Wildlife on the Thames Estuary is disturbed by the volume of overflying aircraft	1
There are various nature reserves in and around Tunbridge Wells	1

	General	92
	Any changes / proposals should wait until the outcome of the government review of airport capacity	1
	See previous / other response	23
	Criticism of the consultation	34
	Referenced more than one location	16
	Further research required	6
	Other	16
	Proposals are all profit related / money orientated	4
	Criticism of the Government / MPs / Local Authorities	1
	Strict planning controls limiting development of the Ashdown Forest area should apply to aviation too	1
	Base size:	204
Q14_A	In what, if any, geographic locations should options be considered for altering routes for respite purposes?	
	EAST SUSSEX	12
	Ashdown Forest	4
	Ashdown Forest and town/villages close to its boundaries	1
	Crowborough	2
	East Sussex	1
	Eridge	1
	Frant	1
	Hartfield	2
	North Crowborough	1
	Wadhurst	2
	Chiddingshurst	1
	HAMPSHIRE	1
	Bramley	1
	HIGH WEALD	3
	High Weald AONB	3
	KENT	83
	Area around Tonbridge	1
	Away from Hever & Chiddingstone	1
	Bidborough	11
	Chartwell	2
	Chiddingstone	8
	Chiddingstone Causeway	2
	Chiddingstone Hoath	1
	Chiddingstone Village	1
	Cowden	4
	Crockham Hill	2
	Edenbridge	1
	Ewehurst Lane, Speldhurst	1
	Fields to east of Cowden Village	1
	Fields to the north of Edenbridge	1
	Fordcombe	2
	Groombridge	1
	Hever	7
	Hever Castle/Gardens	2
	Ide Hill	2
	Knole, Sevenoaks	1
	Lamberhurst	1
	Langton Green	3
	Larkfield	1
	Leigh	7
	Maidstone	1
	Manston	1
	Mark Beech	2
	Mill Hill, Edenbridge	1
	Not Toys Hill	1
	Pembury	1
	Penshurst	12
	Penshurst Place	2
	Pootings	1
	Rusthall	2
	Sevenoaks Weald Area	1
	Sevenoaks	3
	Sevenoaks Weald	3
	Sevenoaks Weald school	1
	Shernden Wood, Marsh Green	1
	Southborough	9
	Speldhurst	6
	Poundsbridge	1

Roundabout Wood	1
Area to N.W. of Sevenoaks	1
Tonbridge	11
Tonbridge and Malling	1
Toys Hill	3
Tunbridge Wells	20
Weald	4
Weald Village	1
Westerham	1
West of this postcode to Ashurst/Blackham	1
LONDON AREA	4
Forest Row	1
Old Coulsdon	1
Plaistow	2
SOUTH DOWNS	3
South Downs	2
South Downs national park	1
SUFFOLK	1
Holbrook	1
SURREY	44
Charlwood	2
Unpopulated areas between Dormansland and Lingfield	1
Evelyn Close, Felbridge	1
AGLV adjoining Reigate's Priority Park	1
AONB to the north of Reigate	1
Beare Green	1
Bletchingley	2
Blindley Heath	1
Crockham	2
Byers Lane Brickhouse Lane junction	1
Chiddingfold	1
Coldharbour	1
Dorking	1
Dormansland	3
Dunsfold	1
Epsom Downs	1
Felbridge	5
Hascombe	1
Hayes Walk, Smailfield	1
Leigh	7
Lingfield	2
Nutfield	1
Oakwoodhill	1
Redhill	3
Redhill and Reigate	1
Reigate	2
Reigate - historical town	1
Salfords	1
Sidlow	1
Smallfield Surrey	1
Walliswood	1
Westcott/Dorking/Redhill	1
Alfold	3
SURREY HILLS AONB	3
Surrey Hills	1
Surrey Hills AONB	2
WEST SUSSEX	51
Shillinglee	1
Alfold Bars	1
Alfold/Loxwood	1
Anywhere but East Grinstead	1
Billingshurst	2
Broadbridge Heath	1
Burgess Hill	1
Colgate	1
Crawley	3
Durfold Wood	1
East Grinstead	20
Haywards Heath	4
Horsham	3
Horsted Keynes	2
Ifield	1

Ilfold	2
Kirdford	1
Lambs Green	1
Lindfield	1
Loxwood	1
Loxwood/Alfold	1
New Domewood	1
On occasion over the town of East Grinstead	1
Roffey	2
Rudgwick	3
Rusper	3
Slinford	1
Southwater	1
Warnham	2
West Sussex	1
Wisborough Green	1
OTHER	28
A25/M25 Corridor	1
All	2
All AONBs	2
All areas within 5 miles of the airport	1
All local schools	1
All locations	1
All low flight paths	1
All rural areas in surrounding counties	1
All those under 4000ft	1
Along motorway routes	1
Any rural area of Surrey or Sussex where people do not live.	1
Below 4k feet	1
If you must have these then might I suggest following the motorway routes and major highways that already have been impacted negatively by the sound of cars and development of roads?	1
M20/M26 corridor	1
M25	1
No areas	1
Not over towns	1
Large towns/cities	2
Over farm land	1
Over forests	1
Places where people live	1
Residential areas	1
Runway 26 arrival below 4000 ft	1
Rural locations	1
See below.	1
SFD 08 departure	2
Stansted	1
Take off areas	1
Thames corridor	1
Thames Estuary	1
REFERENCE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT	4
Part B	2
Part B RH19	1
Part B: north-east swathe through Crockham Hill and beyond.	1
Base size:	277
Q14_B	Please state what you think the criteria should be in the space below
Noise (NoI)	85
Concerns about noise / increases to noise levels	32
Impact of aircraft noise can be increased by geographic features/is greater on areas of high ground	3
Impact of aircraft noise is greater in quieter / rural / tranquil areas	4
Impact of aircraft noise is lesser in densely populated / built up areas / areas of high traffic	2
Noise pollution can be reduced by a minor route change approach at Gatwick	1
Noise pollution can be reduced by placing noise filters on aircraft	1
Noise pollution can be reduced by restricting noisier aircraft to certain times	1
Reduce / minimise / eliminate / respite from aircraft noise	31
Research is needed to understand the impact of noise pollution in urban / rural areas	1
Respite routes should not impose increasing / constant noise at certain times	3
Aircraft noise over Tonbridge should not change / increase	1
Concerns about noise that respite routes would create near Redhill Aerodrome	1
Reduce current noise levels in Dormandsland	1
Concerns about noise pollution in Beare Green	1
Concerns about aircraft noise over Bidborough/particularly intrusive here in the evenings	2
Concerns about noise over Billingshurst	1

Bramley is a sensitive rural quiet town meaning noise is felt more than in suburban areas	1
Concerns about aircraft noise over Chiddingstone/sensitive quiet town in which noise is felt more than in suburbs	3
Dunsfold is a sensitive rural quiet town meaning noise is felt more than in suburban areas	1
East Grinstead should be protected from aircraft noise	1
Regular noise disturbance from Edenbridge War memorial Community Hospital	1
South side of Edenbridge is severely affected by aircraft noise	1
Hascombe is a sensitive rural quiet town meaning noise is felt more than in suburban areas	1
Concerns about aircraft noise in Hever	2
Concerns about noise caused by aircraft over Leigh	1
Loxwood is a sensitive rural quiet town meaning noise is felt more than in suburban areas	1
Marsh Green is severely affected by aircraft noise	1
Plaistow is a sensitive rural quiet town meaning noise is felt more than in suburban areas	1
Current flight paths over Rochester haven't caused any noise concern	1
Shillinglee is a sensitive rural quiet town meaning noise is felt more than in suburban areas	1
Concerns about noise from aircraft over Smallfield	1
Concerns about aircraft noise in Southborough	1
South Downs National Park is less sensitive to noise pollution during nights due to less visitors	1
Concerns about aircraft noise in Tonbridge	1
Concerns about aircraft noise in Tunbridge Wells	2
Air Traffic (AiT)	206
Concerns about air traffic levels at Gatwick	2
Concerns about early morning air traffic	5
Concerns about frequency of flights	3
Frequency of flights should be reduced / longer gaps between flights	2
Frequency of flights should not be increased / no additional flights	6
Strict controls over aircraft type permitted during night / early morning flights	1
Restriction on timings for flights / air traffic / periods of low / no air traffic	4
There should be periods in the day where greater number of flights can depart to cope any increase in flights	1
Alfold / Alfold Bars suffer from significant number of low overflights on approach to landing on runway 08 during easterly winds	1
Concerns about high levels of air traffic over Bidborough	1
No early morning flights over Blindley Heath	1
Consider respite for Crowborough	1
Reduce overflights in Dormansland	1
Avoid overflight in Forest Row	1
Avoid overflight in Groombridge	1
Concerns about frequency of overflights in Hever	1
Air traffic during evenings and weekends could effect local attractions such as Hever Castle	1
Weekend air traffic should be avoided to allow visitors to pursue their recreational interests	1
A track extension for the further southern loop to the south of Horsham before turning to Dover would be prohibitive to operators.	1
Consideration for Kent AONB when planning respite routes	2
No early morning / late evening flights in Redhill	1
No early morning / late evening flights in Reigate	1
No changes to existing air traffic over Reigate	1
Consider respite for Crowborough	1
Despite CAA guidelines stating flights begin at 7am, Slinfold has suffered from frequent disturbance from 6am	1
Reduce day flights to less than 6 per day over Speldhurst Village	1
Surrey is highly populated residential area, therefore increase in flights should be dealt with at an alternative airport away from built up areas	1
All air traffic in the South East should be based around the expansion of the new airport in Thames estuary	1
Consideration for Toys Hill when planning respite routes	2
Concerns about high levels of air traffic over Tunbridge Wells	1
Should avoid Tunbridge Wells with low flying aircraft	2
Reduce the number of planes on easterly operations flying over Wisborough Green	1
No early morning / late evening flights over Smallfield	1
Aircraft Height (AiH)	34
Aircraft should climb to 3000ft at full throttle power	2
Concerns about aircraft height	2
Keep flights at higher altitudes / reduce low altitude flights	11
Keep higher altitudes for longer prior to landing from the east	1
No low level flying during weekends	1
No low level flying in late evening / at night / early mornings	2
Aircraft at altitudes of 4000ft for longer	1
Aircraft should descend at sharper angles when on approach to Gatwick	2
No flights below 4000ft	1
No flights below 10,000ft	1
Low flying should be restricted to 5 miles around the airport	1
Concerns about the impact caused by low level flying	4

Should be no low level flights below 4000ft in Blindley Heath	1
Avoid low level overflights in Crawley	1
There should be no low altitude flights over Crockham Hill	1
Avoid low level overflight Ide Hill / negative impact on tourism / local economy	1
Avoid low level overflights in Sevenoaks Weald	1
Avoid low level overflight Toys Hill / negative impact on tourism / local economy	2
Tunbridge Wells should not be designated for low altitude flights	1
Night Flights (NiF)	38
Concerns about night flights	4
No night flights guaranteed on certain days of the week	1
No night flights / early morning flights over residential / populated areas	3
No night flights / early morning flights over rural / tranquil / quiet areas	1
No increase in night flights / early morning flights	3
No night flights / early morning flights	14
Avoid overflights at night in Chiddingstone	1
Avoid overflight at night in Edenbridge	1
Avoid overflight at night in Groombridge	1
Avoid overflight at night in Hever	2
Avoid overflight at night in High Weald	1
There should be no early morning flights over Blindley Heath	1
Concerns about the frequency of night flights over Penhurst	1
Avoid overflight during late evening / night / early morning in Southborough	1
No night flights over South Downs national park	1
Avoid night flights over Speldhurst Village	1
No night flights over Surrey Hills	1
Avoid overflight during late evening / night / early morning in Tunbridge Wells	4
Avoid overflight at night in Warnham	1
Avoid overflights at night	1
No departures in late evenings	1
Flight Paths (FIP)	140
08 arrival routes are disruptive / affect residents	1
08 departure routes work fine / no change	1
Avoid flight paths over schools / hospitals	5
Consider flight paths over busy major roads / motorway routes	6
Consider flight paths over densely populated / built up areas with background noise	8
Consider flight paths over industrial areas	1
Consider flight paths over rural areas / fields / countryside	6
Consider flight paths over the sea	2
Current system works fine/no need to change/change would have bad effect on surrounding population	7
Departures / take offs should be varied / need greater variety	3
Flight paths should avoid residential / populated areas / towns / villages	17
Flight paths should be strictly enforced	1
Flight paths should be varied / spread equally / fairly / share impact over wider area	25
Flight paths should not be varied / spread out / impact just disrupts wider area	4
Respite routes are a bad idea / against / disagree with respite routes	15
Early morning flights should have alternating take off flight paths	1
Minimum altitude before deviation from the line of the runway	1
Utilise west of Gatwick airport more on arrivals	1
Reduce frequency of overflights	1
All areas should have respite	1
Approach into Gatwick should start much further to the east	1
Continuous descent approaches should be mandatory / adopted	2
Provide respite by alternative departures from west and east	1
Respite routes during the day/periods of the day	2
Provide respite during weekends	1
Provide respite during the summer / outdoor months	1
Consider respite to areas below 4000ft	1
Consider respite to areas below 5000ft	6
Utilise the latest navigation technology for respite routes	1
Respite routes should not affect people who have never previously experienced the detrimental effects of air traffic	2
Respite for evening and early morning flights/respite should consider areas affected by flights at these hours	4
Natural respite occurs from the operational switch of run use from east to west	1
Time is not a factor for Respite Route planning	1
Turn on the SFD SID of Runway 08 should be made earlier and a speed restriction imposed to reduce the radius of turn	2
A choice of PRNAV approaches should be available with minimum altitude restrictions	1
Two routes are not enough for respite purposes / need multiple respite paths on the existing vectored swathe to touchdown	2
Current flight path avoids Horsham which should be maintained	2
Provide respite in Alfold / Alfold Bars for late night and early morning flights	1

Avoid flight paths over Beare Green	1
Consider flight paths along fields near Beare Green	1
Provide respite over Beare Green	1
Avoid flight paths over urban areas of Bidborough	1
Provide respite from aircraft noise caused by low level flying over Bidborough	1
Avoid arrival flight paths over Bidborough	4
Flights paths should avoid flying over Billingshurst	2
Consider flight paths over open countryside or south of Billingshurst	1
The approach into Gatwick should avoid the main flight paths between Blindley Heath and Lingfield	1
Provide respite over Chiddingstone Hoath to alleviate sound and visual impacts caused by aircraft	1
Avoid overflight in Chiddingstone	1
Early morning and evening flights would disturb village residents in Chiddingstone	1
Avoid flying over Cowden Village	1
Avoid overflight of Coulsdon / Old Coulsdon	1
Avoid overflights in Crawley	1
Flight path should avoid Durfold Wood	1
Flight path should avoid Dunsfold	1
Avoid overflight in East Grinstead	2
Departure routes should not fly close to or over East Grinstead	1
Occasionally overfly East Grinstead	1
Consideration for East Grinstead residents when planning respite routes	2
Consider main flight paths over East Grinstead	1
East Grinstead is the only town chosen to be directly flown over at a low level	1
Consider main flight paths over Edenbridge	1
Avoid overflight in Edenbridge	1
Consider respite over Hever	3
Avoid arrival flight paths over Hever	3
Avoid overflight in Hever	1
Avoid overflight in High Weald at weekends	1
Avoid overflight in High Weald	1
Avoid overflights in Horley	1
Avoid low level overflights in Horley	1
Provide respite by flying east of Horsham	1
Horsham is well placed to suffer from large aircraft movements at low altitudes that result in noise and pollution	1
Avoid overflight in Ifield	1
Avoid overflight in Kent	1
Reduce the frequency of over flights between 8am and 8pm over Langton Green	1
Avoid overflying Langton Green before 8am or after 8pm	1
Flight paths should be varied / spread over Leigh	1
Provide respite over Markbeech to alleviate sound and visual impacts caused by aircraft	1
Provide respite over Penhurst to alleviate sound and visual impacts caused by aircraft	1
Avoid overflight in Penshurst	1
Respite routes must be kept well away from Redhill Aerodrome	1
Consider main flight paths over Sevenoaks	1
Avoid using Sevenoaks for respite	1
Avoid overflights in Sevenoaks	1
Sevenoaks is already subject to Heathrow holding stack	1
Avoid using Sevenoaks Weald for respite	2
Sevenoaks Weald is already subject to Gatwick approach route to the south	1
Provide respite by flying further west of Slinfold	1
Currently suffer from overflights over Smallfield	1
Provide respite from aircraft noise caused by low level flying over Southborough	1
Avoid overflight in Southborough	5
Flight paths should avoid Speldhurst/high ground in Speldhurst	2
Avoid overflight during late evening / night / early morning in Tonbridge	1
Avoid flight paths over Tonbridge	5
Consider main flight paths over Tonbridge	1
Should vector low flying aircraft to the east of Tonbridge	1
Provide respite from aircraft noise caused by low level flying over Tunbridge Wells	1
Avoid flight paths over Tunbridge Wells	5
Aircraft on final approach should should be diverted further to the west away from Speldhurst Road	1
Should vector low flying aircraft to the east of Tunbridge Wells	1
Respite routes which avoid Tunbridge Wells and its suburbs should be used at night.	1
Avoid overflight in Warnham	1
Avoid overflight in Warham to prevent air/noise pollution	1
At night there should be no low flying to avoid disturbance over Tonbridge	1
Should fine planes for missing departure flight routes and donate this to local communities	1
Airports (AiR)	5
Concerns about the detrimental impact of old / noisy aircraft	2
Runway direction	1
Expand airport / rail / transport links in Marston	1
Concerns about the safety implications that respite routes could have on Redhill Aerodrome	1

Environment (EnV)	44
Concerns about the environmental impact	1
Historic / Cultural / Heritage (HiS)	6
Areas of historic / cultural interest need tranquility to be preserved	1
Areas of historic / cultural interest need proper consideration	1
Hever Castle could be affected by proposals	1
Ide Hill is an area of historic / cultural interest / receives many visitors	1
Toys Hill is an area of historic / cultural interest / receives many visitors	1
Warnham is an area of historic / cultural interest	1
Consideration for impact of air traffic on gardens at Penshurst Place	1
Rural / Countryside (RC)	27
Avoid AONB / National Parks / environmentally sensitive areas	8
AONB / National Parks / environmentally sensitive areas need proper consideration	8
Provide respite during the day/at weekends for rural/quiet areas	1
Provide respite during summer / outside months for rural / quiet areas	1
Consideration for villages such as Charlwood affected by air traffic	1
Aircraft passing at lower altitudes will ruin visitors experience of Crockham Hill / impact on local economy	1
Bought Beech reservoir will be affected by proposals	1
Consideration for High Weald which is a tourist area with a number of historic villages	1
High Weald is an AONB	1
Ide Hill is a high area / area of raised terrain	1
Aircraft passing at lower altitudes will ruin visitors experience of Knole, Sevenoaks / impact on local economy	1
Sevenoaks Weald is an AONB	2
Avoid respite routes over Weald Village which is an AONB	1
Surrey Hills is not populated / can be overflown	1
Toys Hill is high area / area of raised terrain	1
Proposals could affect Westerham which has many gardens and houses which are places of peace and tranquility	1
Visual (ViS)	2
Concerns about the visual impact of air traffic	2
Air Pollution (AiP)	14
Concerns about pollution / impacts of pollution / fuel burn / CO2 emissions	9
Concerns about pollution / impacts of pollution at night	2
Concerns about pollution / increases / rises to pollution levels	2
Concerns about pollution / minimise / reduce pollution levels	1
East Grinstead should be protected from air pollution caused by aircraft	1
Towns / Residential areas (ReS)	34
There should be a permanent respite (exclusion zone) over urban and residential areas of high population	3
Inform residents on proposals	1
Concerns about residential housing below 4000ft	1
Could impact on house price	2
Consideration for night workers who live close to airport could affected by daytime flights	1
Consideration for / reduce impact on residents / residential areas / towns	18
All residential areas should be provided with respite overnight	2
Respite routes should provide a degree of predictability over the routes over a set period so that resident are aware	1
As little an impact as possible on people / residents / town in Bidborough	1
Crowborough is residential area / area of high population	2
Crowborough is a high area / area of raised terrain	2
Proposals will increase the detrimental impacts on residents of East Grinstead	1
As little an impact as possible on people / residents / town in Fordcombe	1
As little an impact as possible on people / residents / town in Langton Green	1
As little an impact as possible on people / residents / town in Penhurst	2
As little an impact as possible on people / residents / town in Rusthall	1
As little an impact as possible on people / residents / town in Southborough	1
As little an impact as possible on people / residents / town in Speldhurst	1
As little an impact as possible on people / residents / town in Tonbridge	1
As little an impact as possible on people / residents / town in Tunbridge Wells	1
Point Merge (PM)	2
Point Merge offers an unacceptable increase in fuel use	1
Support point merge if there is a reduction in air traffic and blight over central and west side of Tunbridge Wells	1
Safety (SaF)	2
Safety - Aircraft safety	1
Concerns about accidents	1
Quality of Life (QoL)	26
Concerns about disturbances to sleep	15
Concerns about health / well being of the population	15
Time of day	2
Concerns about disturbances to sleep caused by night flights over Chiddingstone	1
Concerns about disturbances to sleep caused by night flights over Leigh	1

	OUT OF SCOPE	9
	Air Traffic	9
	Salfords is already subject to overflight from Gatwick	1
	Airports (AiR)	9
	Building of a new airport on the South East Coast	2
	Compensation for areas affected by proposals	3
	Maximising landing fees for airport operators and minimising operating costs	1
	Mentions of additional runways being built	3
	GENERAL	60
	Consultation is based on improving finances / financial greed	1
	Criteria should remain unchanged	1
	Long term resolutions should be considered instead of cheap short term solutions	1
	More research is needed / further studies required	7
	Reference to County Council documentation (nsf)	1
	Reference to ERCD Report 1208 Title:Aircraft Noise, Sleep Disturbance and Health Effects: A Review	1
	Reference to ERCD Report 1205 Strategic Noise Maps for Gatwick Airport 2011	1
	Response in relation to Chiddingston Parish Council / Support Chiddingston Parish Council comments	3
	Suggestion of public enquiry regarding further air traffic in a heavily congested south east region	2
	Support GACC comments	1
	Too complicated / confusing	3
	Not enough information to make a decision / need more information	17
	See previous / other response	19
	Have a independent body to monitor noise and toxic pollution levels over Speldhurst Village	1
	Other	11
	Base size:	263
Q15_A	Balancing local impact against increased CO2	
	Flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas should always have greater precedence than flying overhead on shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/ CO 2	132
	Flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas should generally have greater precedence than flying overhead on shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/ CO 2	48
	Flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas should be given equal weighting to flying overhead on shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/ CO 2	29
	Flying shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/CO 2 should generally have precedence over flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas	13
	Flying shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/CO 2 should always have precedence over flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas	15
	Don't know	26
	Base size:	211
Q15_B	What, if any, factors should be taken into account when determining the appropriate balance of flying around environmentally sensitive areas versus overhead (for instance the altitude, frequency or timing of flights may be a factor)?	
	FACTORS TO CONSIDER	198
	Noise (NoI)	64
	Aircraft noise pollution/increasing noise needs to be priority/top consideration	24
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft around smaller airfields	1
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft cannot be offset	2
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft causes environmental damage	1
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft could be reduced by having a rapid / steep rate of climb / descent	1
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft could be reduced by reducing the frequency of flights	1
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft could be reduced by noise restriction laws / rules	1
	Aircraft noise pollution over residential areas affects many people/needs to be minimised	8
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft is increasing / bigger problem in recent years	6
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft should be minimised / reduced	3
	Need to minimise/stop increase in aircraft noise pollution over AONBs/environmentally sensitive/ tranquil/rural areas	9
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft should be put before CO2 emissions	10
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft should be put before profits / cost savings / business considerations	1
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft should be restricted at night	1
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft should be restricted to a small area	2
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft should be spread over a wider area	3
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft should not increase	2
	Noise pollution / disturbance from aircraft is lesser in built up areas / greater in environmentally sensitive areas	1
	Air Traffic (AiT)	131
	Concerns about frequency of flights / frequency of flights needs proper consideration	24
	Concerns about safety / availability of airspace around smaller airfields	1
	Concerns about safety / safety is / should be the priority	4
	Concerns about timing / timing of flights needs proper consideration	20
	Flight frequency should be dictated by cost effectiveness / economic viability	2

No increase to / no additional flights / no additional airport capacity	7
No increase to / no additional flights over AONB / environmentally sensitive areas	3
No increase to / no additional flights over residential / built up areas	3
No increase to / no additional day time flights	1
Reduce the number of flights / cheap flights / people should pay the true cost / only fly when necessary	4
Reduce the number of flights / fewer flights	10
Reduce the number of flights / fewer flights by developing faster rail links	2
Reduce the number of flights / fewer flights over AONB / environmentally sensitive areas	6
Reduce the number of flights / fewer flights over / within the UK	1
Aircraft Height (AiH)	62
Concerns about rate of climb / steepness of ascent / descent needs proper consideration	6
Concerns about altitude / altitude needs proper consideration / altitude affects noise on the ground	34
Flying at higher altitudes / as high as possible at night	1
Flying at higher altitudes / as high / long as possible	6
Flying at higher altitudes / as high as possible over AONB / environmentally sensitive areas	9
Flying at higher altitudes / as high as possible to reduce environmental impact / CO2 emissions	4
Flying at lower altitudes on longer routes to avoid AONB / environmentally sensitive areas is preferable	4
Flying at lower altitudes over AONB / environmentally sensitive areas could be increased if respite times are in place	1
Flying at lower altitudes over AONB / environmentally sensitive areas should be avoided	7
Flying at lower altitudes over residential areas should be avoided	5
Flying at lower altitudes should be avoided	1
Night Flights (NiF)	18
No increase to frequency / no additional night time / early morning flights	1
No night time / early morning flights / flying at night time / early mornings	6
Reduce the frequency of night time / early morning flights	4
Reduce the frequency of night time / early morning flights over residential areas	5
Reduce the frequency of night time / early morning flights over AONB / environmentally sensitive areas	3
Flight Paths (FiP)	63
Flight paths should avoid towns / residential / built up / populated areas needs be priority / proper consideration	18
Flight paths should avoid AONB / environmentally sensitive / tranquil / rural areas	12
Flight paths should avoid AONB / environmentally sensitive areas at weekends / certain times / during Summer months	1
Flight paths should avoid narrow pathways / be spread evenly / fairly	11
Flight paths should stay as close as possible to existing routes/not be changed	4
Flight paths should be kept over areas of minimal population	1
Flight paths should be kept over the sea as much as possible	6
Flight paths should be kept over the South as much as possible	2
Flight paths should not avoid AONB / environmentally sensitive areas	7
Longer routes mean aircraft can stay higher over residential areas	1
Longer routes mean aircraft can stay higher over noise sensitive areas	1
Longer routes mean flight duration will increase	1
Longer routes mean minimal disruption to passengers / airlines but constant / greater nuisance on the ground	2
Longer routes / re-routing to avoid AONB / environmentally sensitive areas is justified / small CO2 price	4
Shorter routes flying in the evening could reduce impact from noise	1
Shorter routes flying over AONB / environmentally sensitive areas should be avoided	2
Shorter routes provide greater economic benefits / use less fuel / profits for airlines	2
Shorter routes provide greater environmental benefits / reduce CO2 emissions	1
Use the fastest/shortest routes	4
Airports (AiR)	11
Airports should be relocated to / built at the coast / coastal regions	2
Airports / airlines should be heavily taxed / fined for regulation breaches	3
Negative mentions of EasyJet activities	2
Support GAL / LGW using less fuel / offsetting extra fuel	1
Marston airport has excellent infrastructure links to handle additional flights / passenger demands / expansion	3
Aircraft (AiC)	11
Aircraft should not fly half empty / aircraft flying at full capacity would mean fewer flights	2
Aircraft should be quieter / A320 / Airbus jets make too much noise	2
Aircraft should be quieter / use less throttle / power when landing to minimise engine whine / noise	3
Aircraft should be quieter / use quieter engines / quieter engines need to be designed	3
Aircraft with quiet engines should be given priority on direct routes	1
Aircraft have quieter engines these days	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	52
CO2 emissions can be reduced by using more efficient engines	6
CO2 emissions can be reduced by using more efficient / alternative fuels	3
CO2 emissions can be reduced by promoting environmentally cleaner travel	1
CO2 emissions can be reduced by raising airport charges / fares	1
CO2 emissions can be reduced by reducing the duration of flights	1
CO2 emissions can be reduced by reducing the frequency of flights	6

CO2 emissions must be reduced / must not increase	3
Environmental impact of CO2 emissions / fuel burn / air pollution needs proper consideration	1
Environmental impact of CO2 emissions / fuel burn / air pollution needs to be reduced / minimised / no increase	3
Environmental impact of CO2 emissions is being used as an excuse to use less fuel / make more profit	6
Environmental impact of CO2 emissions is greater than the impact of noise	2
Environmental impact of CO2 emissions is minimal compared to the whole flight	8
Environmental impact of CO2 emissions is minimal from flying longer routes / avoiding AONB / environmentally sensitive areas	4
Environmental impact of CO2 emissions is minimal from flying longer routes / avoiding towns / residential / built up areas	4
Environmental impact of CO2 emissions on local areas needs to be prioritised	1
Environmental impact of CO2 emissions should not be a consideration / the priority	5
Environmental impact of fuel dumping / chemical trails needs proper consideration	1
Environmental impact of pollution on an already polluted area needs proper consideration	1
Environmental impact of pollution is lesser in built up areas / greater in environmentally sensitive areas	1
CO2 emissions can be offset / make the airlines offset CO2 emissions	5
Environment (EnV)	73
Environment / environmental impact cannot be repaired once damaged	4
Environment / environmental impact needs to be balanced against impact on business / the economy	2
Environment / environmental impact needs proper consideration	9
Environment / environmental impact of altered flight paths need to be considered	1
Environment / environmental impact of lowered flight altitude needs proper consideration	1
Environment / environmental impact of noise pollution is greater in rural areas / areas with low ambient noise	5
Environment / environmental impact on people not currently affected needs proper consideration	2
Rural / Countryside (RC)	60
AONB / environmentally sensitive areas are not densely populated and could be flown over at night	1
AONB / environmentally sensitive areas should be avoided / respected / need proper consideration / on NPR	35
AONB / environmentally sensitive areas should be preserved / prioritised over CO2 emissions	5
AONB / environmentally sensitive areas should each be considered on its own merits	2
AONB / environmentally sensitive areas should have the tranquility / peace / quiet preserved	11
AONB / environmentally sensitive areas should not be avoided if it means a considerably longer route	1
Crops / vegetation / plant life need proper consideration	2
SSSI should be avoided / need proper consideration	1
Ashdown Forest is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should be avoided / not be overflow	5
Ashdown Forest is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area / no increase to frequency of overhead flights	1
Ashdown Forest is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area / no lowering of altitude of overhead flights	1
Ashdown Forest is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should not have to suffer reduction in quality of life	1
Ashdown Forest is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should not have to suffer reduction in tranquility	2
Ashdown Forest is an area of varying height / higher area / elevated / needs to be avoided	2
Bidborough Ridge is a higher area / elevated / needs to be avoided / not be overflow	1
Dedham Vale is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should be avoided / not be overflow	5
Dedham Vale is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and noise pollution needs proper consideration	2
Felixstowe is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should only be flown over at maximum height	1
Forrest Row is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should be avoided / not be overflow	2
Forrest Row residents should not have to suffer additional noise from aircraft	1
Forrest Row residents should not have to suffer additional CO2 / air pollution from aircraft	1
Leigh is a tranquil / quiet area / should be avoided / not be overflow	1
Mark Cross should be avoided / not be overflow	1
Sevenoaks is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should be avoided / not be overflow	1
Shotley Peninsula is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should be avoided / not be overflow	2
South Downs National Park is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should be avoided / not be overflow	2
South Downs National Park is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area / no increase to frequency of overhead flights	1
South Downs National Park is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area / no lowering of altitude of overhead flights	1
South Downs National Park is sparsely populated and would be a better place to fly over	1
Tunbridge Wells should be avoided / not be overflow	1
Uckfield is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should be avoided / not be overflow	1
High / Low Weald is an AONB / environmentally sensitive area and should be avoided	1
Wildlife (Wil)	10
Wildlife / livestock should be given / need proper consideration / are more important than financial	7
Wildlife / livestock should be entitled to a stress free / noise free environment	4
Visual (ViS)	5
Visual impact cannot be offset	1
Visual impact / light pollution on AONB / environmentally sensitive areas needs proper consideration	4

Towns / Residential areas (ReS)	24
Towns / residential areas / densely populated areas should be avoided	5
Towns / residential areas / local impact needs should be the priority / needs proper consideration	9
Towns / residential areas / areas affected by aircraft should be considered as environmentally sensitive areas	7
Towns / residential areas should not have homes devalued / impact on property price	1
High / Low Weald is a residential area / should be avoided	1
East Grinstead residents should not have to suffer additional noise from aircraft	1
East Grinstead residents quality of life/problems with noise pollution should be more important than business consideration	1
East Grinstead residents suffering noise pollution needs proper consideration	1
Haywards Heath is a residential area / should be avoided / not be overflowed	1
Langdon Hills noise levels too high / unacceptable / unbearable	1
Sevenoaks is a residential area / should be avoided / not be overflowed	1
Uckfield is a residential area / new homes being built / rising population	1
Upminster noise levels too high / unacceptable / unbearable	1
Warnham is a residential area / should be avoided / not be overflowed	1
Local Infrastructure (LI)	1
Airports / local infrastructure cannot handle additional traffic / flights / passenger demands	1
Quality of Life (QoL)	39
People / their health / well being / quality of life is affected by noise / lack of / interrupted sleep	24
People / their health / well being / quality of life is affected by air pollution	1
People / their health / well being / quality of life is more important than CO2 emission reduction	2
People / their health / well being / quality of life is more important than profits / cost savings / business	5
People / their health / well being / quality of life should be priority / needs proper consideration	11
People / their health / well being / quality of life will suffer if flights are routed over AONB / environmentally	1
People should be entitled to an environment free of noise and stress/a peaceful/quiet environment	7
Population (PoP)	9
Population / the public / people on the ground needs proper consideration	9
Historic / Cultural / Heritage (HiS)	1
Historic landscapes / monuments need proper consideration	1
Business / Economic (BuS)	30
Business / economic concerns / profits should not take priority over issues affecting AONB / environmentally sensitive areas	8
Business / economic concerns / profits should not take priority over issues affecting ordinary people	7
Business / economic concerns / saving money / profits for airlines is important	1
Business / the economy / local economies benefit from air travel / airports	5
Business / the economy / local economies benefit from tourism / people visiting the countryside / AONB	7
Business / the economy / local economies suffer due to noise pollution / lack of sleep	2
Demand management should be part of the policy agenda for air transport	1
If people wish to fly they should be prepared to pay extra / the true cost in terms of fuel / CO2 emissions	4
Cost of wasted fuel should be priority	1
Compensation (CoM)	1
Support GALs compensation measure to offset extra fuel / fuel burn	1
OUT OF SCOPE	29
Noise pollution is dependent on background / ambient noise	1
Noise pollution is dependent on terrain / how built up the area is	1
Noise pollution is dependent on wind / weather conditions	2
Noise pollution is worse / louder at night / in the evening	3
Noise pollution is worse / louder in the morning / early mornings	2
Noise pollution is worse / louder during spring / summer months	6
Noise pollution / aircraft noise / overflying aircraft already affects us / people in the area	16
Noise pollution / traffic noise / busy roads already affects us / people in the area	3
People who buy houses near airports know there will be noise so cannot complain about it	1
Air pollution / vehicle emissions from busy roads already affects us / people in the area	2
Mention of additional runways / airport expansion	4
Mention of changes made in 2011	1
I / we live close to / around Gatwick Airport / Gatwick area	5
East Grinstead bypass is going ahead without consideration for local residents and wildlife	1
GENERAL	39
Criticism of the consultation / questionnaire / consultation is flawed	21
Not enough information to make a decision / lack of information / more information needed	1
Government should not support fracking if CO2 emissions are the issue	1
Oppose changes outlined in proposal	7
Questions about the issues within the consultation	4
Scientific evidence is flawed / further research required	4
Support for Chiddingstone Parish Council	2
Support GACC comments	1
See previous / other response	4
This is a matter for expert / specific / objective analysis.	1
Other	1

Q16_Aa	Base size:	211
	Arrivals based on Point Merge at Gatwick	
	Strongly support	18
	Tend to support	36
	Neither support nor oppose	39
	Tend to oppose	15
	Strongly oppose	60
	Don't know	43
	Support	54
	Oppose	75
Q16_Ab	Base size:	98
	Arrivals based on Point Merge for London City and London Biggin Hill	
	Strongly support	10
	Tend to support	16
	Neither support nor oppose	21
	Tend to oppose	2
	Strongly oppose	18
	Don't know	31
	Support	26
	Oppose	20
Q16_B	Base size:	173
	Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the objective of a system based around Point Merge.	
	REASONS TO SUPPORT THE OBJECTIVE OF A SYSTEM BASED AROUND POINT MERGE	52
	Point Merge is a good idea / makes sense / support for Point Merge system	13
	Strongly support Point Merge system	1
	Support with Caveat	15
	Neither support or oppose proposal/s	1
	Point Merge	15
	The Point Merge system is / appears to be safer than stacking	2
	The Point Merge system is more efficient	5
	The Point Merge system is more scalable	1
	Point Merge system will result in fewer delays	1
	Point Merge is an easier system to use for aircraft controllers	1
	Point Merge will mean that aircraft will take off / land at steeper ascents / descents meaning less impact on people below	2
	The Point Merge system appears sensible if it improves safety	1
	Point Merge will reduce environmental impacts (nsf)	1
	Point Merge will improve fuel efficiency	2
	Point merge system has more benefits than the one currently used	1
	Noise (NoI)	11
	Point Merge will reduce noise impact on people under it	11
	Point Merge should improve noise impact around Edenbridge	1
	Air Traffic	9
	Point merge will / should reduce the number of overhead flights for easterly arrivals	2
	Proposals should reduce air traffic over Brentwood	1
	Aircraft Height (AiH)	6
	Point Merge will mean that fewer areas are flown over at low altitudes	2
	Point Merge will / should mean aircraft will stay at higher altitudes for longer periods	4
	Airports (AiR)	3
	Point Merge may be necessary for the increase in runway use	1
	The Point Merge system should be located close to the airport	1
	Arrivals at Biggin Hill Airport are small and not affected by capacity issues	1
	Air Pollution (AiP)	6
	The Point Merge system will cause less pollution	2
	The Point Merge system will cause less CO2 emissions / reduce fuel burn	4
	Environment (EnV)	2
	The Point Merge system will have less of an impact on the environment compared to stacking	2
	Towns / Residential Areas (ReS)	4
	The Point Merge system will have less of an impact on populated areas / towns / residents compared to stacking	4
Rural / Countryside (RC)	1	
Point Merge will have less of an impact on AONBs compared to stacking	1	
Quality of life (QoL)	1	
Point Merge will reduce disturbance for people who live below compared with stacking	1	
Business (BuS)	1	
The Point Merge system will benefit the economy	1	
REASONS TO OPPOSE THE OBJECTIVE OF A SYSTEM BASED AROUND POINT MERGE	73	
Strongly oppose Point Merge system	1	
Holding patterns work / no need to change / it will be a waste of money	10	
Point Merge is a bad idea / opposition to Point Merge	12	

Point Merge (PM)	5
Vectoring problems associated with Point Merge system difficult for pilot to judge when they are due to land	1
Concerns of navigational kit failure if Point Merge system is implemented	1
Point Merge system does not account for adverse weather conditions	1
Point Merge system will mean aircraft will have to plan to carry more fuel for allow for vectoring / delays / adverse weather	1
No evidence that Point Merge will support an increase in airport capacity	1
No evidence that Point Merge is any better than the stacking system	1
London City Airport is not the best location for Point Merge system	1
Point merge will have a negative impact on Tunbridge Wells	1
Noise (NoI)	24
The Point Merge system will cause / create more noise for residents who live under it	13
Noise pollution is an equal concern to fuel burn / CO2 emissions	1
Do not know what the noise implications of adopting Point Merge are	1
Point Merge will have a negative impact on towns / villages / populated areas / new areas	4
Point Merge will cause more noise pollution to East Grinstead	2
Concerns of noise increases in Faygate	1
Concerns of increases in Noise over Forest Row	1
Oppose any additional noise/ increase in noise over Mayfield	1
Concerns of noise increase over Sevenoaks Weald	1
Rural Countryside (RC)	4
Proposals will ruin / blight the countryside / AONBs	2
Ashdown Forest is an AONB and should be protected	1
Lindfield is on the edge of a AONB and should not be overflow	1
Air Traffic	36
Safety concerns about the Point Merge system / possibility of mid air collisions	1
The Point Merge system will increase the amount of air traffic	3
The Point Merge system will increase the amount of air traffic at the merge point	2
Concerns of increases in air traffic over Forest Row	1
Concerns about increasing air traffic flying over High Weald AONB / Weald Village	2
Concerns about increase in air traffic over Sevenoaks Weald	1
Aircraft Height (AiH)	7
Low flying aircraft can have a permanent effect on the environment	1
Point Merge will not change anything in terms of flights below 4000ft	2
Concerns of increase in air traffic at low altitudes	3
Concerns of overflying in Tunbridge Wells at low altitudes	1
Flight Paths (FiP)	22
The Point Merge system will concentrate more flights on the same area causing more harm / pollution for people who live under it	12
Single track flight paths will be a burden to people who live under them	4
Point Merge will widen flight paths therefore affecting more people who were not initially affected	1
Concerns of over flying over AONB /environmentally sensitive areas in Dedham Vale	1
Shortest route for arrivals will affect East Grinstead if Point Merge / Stacking systems are not used	1
Over flying will have a negative impact on Felixstowe AONB	1
There should be no increase in air traffic over Horsham	1
Concerns that Point Merge system will not change anything with aircraft using the same final approach path	1
Night Flights (NiF)	2
Concerns about night flights	2
Air Pollution (AiP)	4
Point Merge will cause consistent/ constant pollution	1
Proposals will not reduce C02 burn/ emissions	2
Concerns of increases in air pollution over Forest Row	1
Quality of Life (QoL)	9
The Point Merge system will have a negative impact on people's quality of life / health	5
Concerns on people who moved to areas to avoid airport activity	1
I / We already suffer from health issues caused by pollution / noise impact	1
Concerns of health impact from noise pollution	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on quality of life in Faygate	1
Over flying will have a negative impact on residents quality of life in Felixstowe	1
Business (BuS)	9
The Point Merge system will have a negative impact on property values	2
The Point Merge system will have a negative impact on businesses	3
The Point Merge system will have a negative impact on tourism	2
Other mentions of financial loss	1
Proposals are profit related / money orientated	4
Wildlife (WiL)	1
Concerns about the effects of air traffic on wildlife	1
Visual (ViS)	1
Point Merge will create a visual impact from overflying	1
Population (PoP)	1
Edenbridge is densely populated and should not be flown over	1

SUGGESTIONS	49
Point Merge (PM)	6
Point Merge should benefit fuel usage / CO2 emissions	1
Point Merge should have safety benefits	1
Decisions implementing Point Merge system should be at the authority of the Airport Commission	1
Decisions implementing Point Merge system should be at the authority of Air Traffic Control (ATC)	1
The Point Merge system should be located away from Panshurst	1
Merge point should be over the Thames Estuary when approaching London City Airport	1
The Point Merge system should be located away from Tonbridge	1
The Point Merge system should be located away from Tunbridge Wells	1
Noise (NoI)	4
Noise disturbance should be spread across a wider area	2
AONB's should be protected from overhead air traffic / noise intrusion	1
More measures in place to mitigate noise pollution	1
Air Traffic (AiT)	36
Point Merge system should be located over the sea to reduce / minimise any impacts / negative effects	14
Move aircraft stacks from over land to over sea	3
As London is already noisy and polluted it could offer an alternative location for Point Merge	1
Point Merge should be conducted over a wider area to spread / share the impacts of it	5
Improve the stacking system to reduce noise / pollution / negative impacts	1
Utilize existing flights e.g full flights/ so to avoid the need of air traffic increase	1
Keep holding stacks over Southend	1
Aircraft Height (AiH)	2
Ensure Point Merge is undertaken at a higher altitude to minimise impact on land	1
Flight levels should not be altered	1
Flight Paths (FiP)	15
Point Merge should concentrate flights into a narrower track so that less properties will be affected	1
Ensure that flight paths are not widened to accommodate the Point Merge System	2
Use existing flight paths	3
Flight paths should not go over residential areas	1
Use more/ variable flight paths to evenly spread the impacts caused from over flying	3
Aircraft should take longer routes to avoid areas of tranquillity / minimise impact on the ground	1
Multiple respite routes to Gatwick Airport should be introduced to reduce impact on people below	1
PBN routes should be able to prevent overflying of residential areas	1
Respite routes should not be used	1
Ensure flight paths / routes into Gatwick Airport are strictly adhered to	1
Flights should only arrive / depart between 05.00 - 20.00	1
Flight path should be re routed to the south of Edenbridge to join the ILS as area is less populated	1
Re routing flight path over the North Sea will minimise negative impact over Shotley Peninsula	1
Airports (AiR)	6
Airports should buy houses they blight	1
Build more runways so there is less need to stack aircraft	1
A decision on the Thames Estuary Airport needs to be made first	1
Regional airports should be used more for air traffic to prevent Gatwick Airport from growing	1
A new airport should be considered to reduce the amount of air traffic coming into Gatwick	1
Improve infrastructure of existing airports	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	1
Fuel efficiency / emissions planning should / must be addressed	1
Rural Countryside (RC)	2
Impact on AONBs must be minimised	1
AONB's should be considered	1
Towns / Residential (ReS)	1
Point Merge should avoid populated areas to minimise impact on residents	1
Quality of Life (QoL)	1
People's health / well being should be the primary concern of the Point Merge System	1
Business / Economic (BuS)	1
Airlines/ airports/ airline passengers should pay the additional costs involved with air travel	1
Population (PoP)	1
Sparsely populated areas should be given equal treatment with regards to flight paths	1
General (GeN)	5
Alternative proposals should be considered / investigated	1
Improve ground transportation e.g Eurostar/ HS2 to reduce the need for air travel	1
Passenger safety must be the primary concern	2
Improving safety should not be at the expense of environmental impacts	1
OUT OF SCOPE	13
Air travel / Flying is highly destructive	1
Rural/Countryside (RC)	1
Ashdown Forest is already affected by low flying air traffic	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	3
Gatwick Airport is at full operating capacity / it cannot cope with an increase in aircraft arrivals / departures	2
Aviation already causes a lot of pollution in / over the UK	1

	Airports (AiR)	1
	Manston Airport should be considered as an alternative airport	1
	Noise (NoI)	7
	Crowborough already suffer with aircraft noise	1
	Lindfield already suffers from aircraft noise due to its position under the holding stack	1
	Penshurst ia already affected by aircraft noise	1
	Tunbridge Wells is already affected by aircraft noise	3
	Aircraft noise has been an issue since June 2012 and has continued since	1
	We / people in the area are already affected by aircraft noise	1
	Aircraft noise at night is disturbing	1
	People in the Gatwick Airport area already suffer from excess general traffic noise	1
	People in the Gatwick Airport area already suffer from noise and pollution	1
	GENERAL	63
	Flight Paths (FiP)	1
	I / we are only affected by departures from Gatwick Airport	1
	General	62
	No comment	3
	See previous / other response	14
	Further research required	2
	Further consultation required	3
	I do not understand this / I do not have sufficient knowledge to comment	11
	Consultation is complicated / confusing	5
	Not enough information to make a decision / More information needed	23
	Criticism of consultation / consultation document / consultation process	2
	Criticism of consultation maps / maps are inaccurate	3
	Failure of Government to make any decisions force everyone to suffer	1
	Not possible to comment until the merge points / routes are announced	2
	Objections to LAMP (London Airspace Management Program) video that " We all want to fly"	1
	Proposals do not affect me / us	3
	Response in relation to Chiddingston Parish Council / Support Chiddingston Parish Council comments	2
	There is already a stack near to Mayfield so any change would be an improvement	1
	Point merge / details are vague	1
	Base size:	70
Q17_A	Accommodating Non-Compliant Operators	
	Accommodated but with time restrictions	14
	Accommodated but with restricted route availability	22
	Accommodated but with potential delay	10
	Accommodated without restriction (and therefore reducing efficiency for all)	2
	Should not be accommodated at all	35
	Don't know	6
	Base size:	46
Q17_B	What, if any, comments do you have on accommodating non-certified aircraft?	
	COMMENTS ON ACCOMMODATING NON-CERTIFIED AIRCRAFT	24
	Non-compliant operators should be accommodated	7
	Non compliant aircraft should be accommodated	5
	The economic gains of operating non compliant aircraft need to be balanced against environmental impacts	2
	Non-compliant operators should NOT be accommodated	20
	Non compliant aircraft should not be accommodated	12
	Non compliant aircraft operators should be penalised if unable to perform a continuous descent approach	1
	Non compliant aircraft should only be in operation during set hours	1
	Operators should not be allowed competitive advantage by using non compliant aircraft	2
	Non compliant aircraft should only be accommodated in legitimate / emergency / military situations	4
	Restrictions / procedures / disadvantages should be in place making it harder for operators to run non compliant aircraft	4
	Aircraft should be compliant to reduce environmental impacts	1
	Air Traffic (AiT)	3
	Accommodating non compliant aircraft will increase air traffic	1
	Non compliant aircraft should be accommodated but should not take landing priority over compliant aircraft	1
	Non compliant aircraft must not be delayed / sequenced to the point where safety is affected	1
	Operators of louder aircraft should be charged more by the airports	1
	Flight path (FiP)	8
	Approach swathe should be as wide as possible from the south and east to evenly distribute approaching aircraft noise / disturbance	1
	New flight paths have been thought with compliant aircraft in mind / non compliant aircraft will require additional flight paths	1
	Non compliant aircraft should be kept as high as possible before approach / landing	2
	Non compliant aircraft should adhere to stricter / tighter flight paths	2
	Oppose any proposal that restricts aircraft making wider approach turns into Gatwick	1
	The financial gains of operating narrower flight paths is negligible / minimal fuel is saved	1
	Flight paths should not be over densely populated areas	1

	Noise - (NoI)	9
	Support for accommodating non compliant aircraft if it means flight paths are spread and reducing noise	1
	Non compliant aircraft affect / disturb residents living under / around flight paths	1
	Compliant aircraft will be on tighter / narrower flight paths subjecting people below to more noise	1
	Non compliant aircraft are louder / noisier	4
	Aircraft noise should be spread	2
	Aircraft (AIC)	12
	There should be a push to ensure that all aircraft are compliant / operators should work to a timetable to make aircraft compliant	10
	It will take time for all aircraft to be compliant	1
	Safety concerns about non compliant aircraft	1
	Air Pollution (AiP)	2
	Non compliant aircraft create more pollution	2
	Airport (AiR)	1
	Accommodating non compliant aircraft will ensure airports are being utilised fully / running at optimum capacity	1
	GENERAL	6
	Concerns that changes have already happened	1
	Criticism of the consultation / process	1
	Concerns raised that are outside of this consultation	1
	Lack of understanding / need more information	2
	Support comments made by Chiddingstone Parish council	1
	Opposition to the change of airspace usage in / around London	1
	OUT OF SCOPE	8
	Concerns about the effects of noise on health	1
	Concerns about noise levels in East Grinstead	1
	There should be no increase in the number of flights	1
	There should be a ban on night flights	1
	Mentions of Manston flights	1
	Mentions of Southend airport	1
	Noise levels have risen	1
	Other	1
	Base size:	69
Q18_A	Point Merge Fuelling Policy	
	Part of the contingency fuel uplift	9
	Part of the flight plannable route fuel uplift	25
	Don't know	35
	Base size:	35
Q18_B	Please state the reasons why you believe fuel for the Point Merge arcs should be considered part of the contingency fuel uplift or part of the flight plannable route fuel uplift?	
	POINT MERGE FUELLING POLICY	14
	Disagree with Point Merge system	1
	Sufficient fuel for Point Merge should be considered as part of the contingency fuel uplift	3
	Sufficient fuel for Point Merge should be considered as part of the flight plannable route fuel uplift	10
	REASONS WHY FUEL FOR POINT MERGE ARCS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED PART OF THE	5
	The extent of deployment and duration in Point Merge arcs cannot be predicted before departure	1
	The inference is that Point Merge will be more fuel efficient / cause less delays therefore should need less fuel than a traditional route	1
	If additional fuel is loaded to cover the plannable route this will need to be dumped before landing which is detrimental to the area	1
	For planning purposes aircraft have to assume they would fly the entire Point Merge arc when they will only need to do that if they need to be delayed	1
	Having contingency fuel would leave enough fuel for flying the arc despite fuel being used already for contingencies	1
	REASONS WHY FUEL FOR POINT MERGE ARCS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED PART OF THE FLIGHT	4
	Any other way makes fuel consumption look less than it is which would be wrong / misleading	1
	Aircraft operators would know that the Point Merge system was in operation so would plan accordingly	1
	Airlines should plan for merging / stacking / diversions / delays	1
	Airlines should plan for the possibility that the whole arc will need to be flown	1
	GENERAL	20
	No Comment	1
	Comments not relevant to the question	2
	Not relevant to planning flight paths	1
	Questions are misleading / contrived	2
	Don't understand / too complicated / confusing information / insufficient knowledge	8
	Agree with / Support for Chiddingstone Parish Councils response	1
	Other	6

	Base size:	69
Q19_A	Fuel Burn Efficiency for Specific Routes	
	Strongly support	4
	Tend to support	21
	Neither support nor oppose	17
	Tend to oppose	2
	Strongly oppose	10
	Don't know	15
	Support	25
Oppose	12	
	Base size:	39
Q19_B	Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the proposal seeking to reduce overall fuel burn across the fleet by as much as possible, even if it means some individual routes may be less fuel efficient as a consequence.	
	COMMENTS SUPPORTING / IN FAVOUR OF FUEL BURN	14
	Fair way to deal with issue (of fuel burn)	1
	Agree with / support reduction of fuel consumption	7
	Agree with / support providing noise levels remain the same	1
	Less fuel would be used / fuel is saved / prevents wastage	3
	Reduces CO2 / emissions	2
	Reduces pollution	2
	Will reduce operating costs	1
	Will reduce noise / as engines will run at reduced thrust	1
	Will lead to development of engines that are more fuel efficient	1
	COMMENTS OPPOSING / AGAINST FUEL BURN	19
	Fuel burn restricts aircraft to make a wider radius/on approach to Gatwick	1
	Fuel burn should not be an excuse to vector traffic over specific areas	3
	Fuel burn should take place out at sea / over unpopulated areas not over built up areas	1
	Fuel burn causes pollution / extra pollution / for residents under flight path	1
	Fuel burn causes noise / extra noise / for residents under flight path	5
	Fuel burn causes environmental issues / no consideration to environment	2
	Fuel burn has an economic impact on business / under short flight path	1
	Fuel burn has an impact on house prices / under short flight path	1
	Fuel burn not an issue / important issue when deciding flight paths / more important factors considered	3
	Fuel efficiency should not be used if affecting quality of life	2
	Fuel efficiency causes visual impact / frequency of flights	2
	Below 7000ft flying longer routes around sensitive areas should take precedence over short routes flying overhead	1
	Shorter routes minimise fuel burn	1
	Concentration of routes should be avoided / more fuel burn or not	1
	For incoming long haul flight planes, fuel burn is insignificant / irrelevant	1
	Airlines want to save fuel to increase profits	1
	In favour of steeper, quieter descent (oppose fuel burn)	1
	Safety is more important than fuel burn / than cost of fuel burn	2
	PRNAV has become more accurate	1
	Airlines should reduce amount of cheap flights / charge more / for other flights	1
	No answer	9
	Base size:	71
Q20_A	Controlled Airspace Boundaries	
	A large impact	23
	A medium impact	7
	A small impact	6
	No impact at all	3
	Don't know	32
	Large/medium impact	30
Small/no impact	9	
	Base size:	38
Q20_B	If you believe it has an impact, please describe the operation(s) that would potentially be affected.	
	GENERAL	38
	The SFC-1500 airspace near Leith Hill should be moved southward to allow increased terrain separation for GA aircraft	1
	CTA base height should be raised 500ft to reduce noise impact below	1
	CTA base height should be raised 500ft to improve safety	1
	Steeper ascent / descent should be utilised to minimise noise footprint	1
	The effects of noise need to be treated as equal to the effects of fuel burn / CO2	1
	Concerns that proposals leading to an increase in flight numbers will have a detrimental effect on the Kent environment	1
	Airspace changes may interfere with / have an effect on general aviation (GA) aircraft activities	9

	Concerns that proposals will confine general aviation (GA) / non CAT aircraft into tighter airspace increasing	3
	Higher air traffic density will reduce pilots ability to practice "see and avoid" procedure	1
	Proposals will mean general / light aircraft will be more prone to "icing" during winter months	1
	Changes to the controlled airspace boundaries will impact on non CAT aircraft operations affecting safety	1
	Changes to controlled airspace boundaries are needed / current situation is unsatisfactory	1
	Concerns that changes to controlled airspace boundaries may negate any planned fuel saving	2
	Lowering the controlled airspace boundary will increase air pollution levels for those under the flight paths	1
	Lowering the controlled airspace boundary will increase aircraft noise levels for those under the flight paths	5
	Concerns about the increased impacts of having lower controlled airspace boundaries	1
	Concerns that the controlled airspace is being lowered over Thanet	1
	Concerns that the controlled airspace is being lowered over Canterbury	1
	Changing controlled airspace boundaries may impact on Manston airport's flight paths	2
	Changing controlled airspace boundaries may impact on Redhill aerodrome	1
	Changing controlled airspace boundaries may impact on Farnborough	1
	Changing controlled airspace boundaries may impact on Biggin Hill	2
	Overall flight numbers should be reduced	1
	Too complicated / not enough knowledge / information to make a comment / decision	8
	Agree with / Support for Chiddingstone Parish Councils response	1
	The proposal is not needed / unnecessary / should not happen	3
	Doesn't affect me / my town	2
	Proposals are financially motivated	3
	Questions regarding increases / decreases in flight numbers as a result of the proposals	1
	Consideration should be given to widening the use of non-Class A airspace to accommodate broader groupings of air traffic (e.g. GA aircraft).	1
	Other	4
	Comments not relevant to the question	1
	OUT OF SCOPE	1
	33. Aircraft currently fly overhead although we are not under the flight path	1
	Base size:	352
Q21	Please provide any other information that you feel is relevant to the on-going development of the airspace covered by this consultation.	
	COMMENTS ON THE ONGOING DEVELOPMENT OF AIRSPACE COVERED BY THIS CONSULTATION	165
	General support for the proposals	3
	Opposition to proposal/s	6
	I strongly oppose these / any changes	1
	Agree with respite routes	1
	Disagree with respite routes	1
	Oppose the proposal to realign all Runway 26 departure routes below 4000ft	1
	Support for increasing the height of overflight	1
	Opposition to widening of / changes to flight paths	3
	Opposition to Point Merge System	2
	Priority should be to minimise the impact of any changes	1
	Noise (NoI)	59
	Proposals will lead to an increase in noise levels affecting peace / tranquility of villages / countryside / a wider area	21
	People chose to live away from aircraft disturbance/they will be affected by proposals	14
	Aircraft noise is more noticeable in rural areas / areas with little or no background noise	6
	Aircraft held in stacks create too much noise for residents	1
	Businesses could be damaged by increased noise from Gatwick operations	1
	Concerns about increasing noise/disturbance from aircraft	11
	Schools /pupils will be adversely affected by any increase in aircraft noise / no planes should fly under 4000ft over schools	1
	Aircraft noise in the South East is unavoidable	1
	Any proposal which results in an increase in noise levels will be opposed	1
	The proposal should give more consideration to the impacts of noise on people rather than the profits of the airline industry	2
	There is already too much aircraft noise to the east of Gatwick - ie arrivals	1
	The proposals will have a positive effect on noise pollution / welcome anything that reduces noise over my area	2
	ANCON / Leq57dBA model in assessing noise disturbance by overflying aircraft is flawed / Flaws in assessing aircraft noise impact	3
	Air Pollution (AiP)	15
	Improving / reducing CO2 emissions is important	3
	Proposals may / will lead to unwanted increases in environmental damage / air pollution	12
	Any increase in flights from Gatwick and consequent increase in road traffic will add to pollution	1
	Air Traffic (AiT)	70
	Concerns that proposals will allow an increase in night flights	2
	Increases in air traffic will be visually intrusive	3
	Proposals appear to be a way of increasing air traffic / will lead to an increase in air traffic	11
	Stacks/holds are insufficient/anti-social/environmentally unsound	2
	There will be more complaints if flight paths are moved	2

It is deceitful to conduct a consultation on flight paths that are unknown	1
The skies are already congested in the South East / there is no room for additional flights	3
Anything that reduces the number of planes over my area is welcome	1
Non certified aircraft should not be allowed / accommodated	1
The current proposal is strongly opposed due to the increased controlled airspace especially to the north of the current CTA boundary.	1
The corridor formed between the southern boundary of the Heathrow CTR (Class A) and the northern boundary of the Gatwick CTA (Class D) is an extremely busy VFR route and the planned extension does not seem to take into account the ground features used by VFR pilots to navigate, e.g. the M25	1
boundary moves to the north of the M25 removes the clearly defines boundary and increases the risk of incursions into controlled airspace	1
Object to any increase in air traffic over Plaistow	1
There should be no increase in air traffic over Alfold	1
Ashdown Forest needs respite for low flying aircraft/all negative aspects of aircraft	1
There should be no increase in air traffic over Beare Green	1
Concerns about the increase in air traffic over Capel	1
Object to any increase in air traffic over Chiddingfold	1
Oppose any additional flights over Chiddingstone / flights over Chiddingstone should be avoided	3
The visual impact of aircraft over Chiddingstone requires special consideration	1
Crowborough needs to have respite from permanent low altitude overflying	1
Object to any increase in air traffic over Dunsfold	1
Route flights away from / stop flights over East Grinstead / it is unacceptable	3
Route flights away from / stop flights over Felbridge / it is unacceptable	1
Concerns about the increase in air traffic over Felixstowe	1
Hever area needs respite	1
Oppose any increase on current air traffic over Mayfield	1
Oppose any additional flights over Penshurst / Penshurst Place or surrounding areas	2
Concerns about the Redhill Aerodrome airspace with larger aircraft operation from Gatwick under 4,000ft / at low levels / concerns about potential effects on GAL if planning permission for longer runway at RA goes ahead	3
There should me no increases in air traffic over Rudgwick	1
No low flying aircraft over Weald village	1
Shotley peninsular / AONB requires protection from further air traffic movements in order to preserve the sensitive / tranquil area / reduce the number of aircraft flying over Shotley	2
Oppose any increase in day / night flights over Speldhurst	1
Toys Hill is the highest point of Kent AONB / would be badly affected / oppose any increases in air traffic under 4000ft over Toys Hill / Kent Down AONB	2
Aircraft Height (AiH)	9
Topography needs to be considered where visual impact is greater	1
Concerns about low altitude flights / 4000 ft seems low	6
Concerns about the reduction in height over environmentally sensitive areas	2
Flight Paths (FIP)	20
Airlines do not follow flight paths due to associated fuel savings / Airlines should be made to follow their flight paths	1
Airspace changes are not required / needed	1
Oppose any changes to the westerly flight path	1
Current departures on utilizing runway 08 do not require respite as they are routed over farmland	1
Better management of airspace will reduce the need for aircraft to go-around / will lead to more direct	1
Concerns that spreading flight paths / swathes will lead to an increase in flights without consultation	3
Opposition to new departure routes / deviation from Centreline	3
New routes will disturb new areas/blight residents underneath	2
Support the proposal to increase steepness of take off trajectory	1
Welcome the reduction of aircraft flying on easterly operation approaches to Gatwick	1
Concerns about aircraft following one / two flight paths towards airport / introduction of narrow flight paths	1
Routes should be revised from time to time to avoid long term blight for residents beneath	1
Support concept of multiple respite paths / on the existing vectored broad swathe approach to touchdown to minimise noise to all controlled areas	3
A substantial part of the proposed increased overfly areas are at higher altitudes with closer proximity to noise and pollution	1
Flight path / route is destroying / will destroy green belt land / conservation areas	1
Small changes to flight paths / arrival / departure points could have a positive affect on many people / communities	1
Respite routes could make air traffic controllers jobs harder	1
Point Merge (PM)	12
Point merge will / may result in areas of concentrated air traffic / noise	4
The small fuel savings of Point Merge are insignificant compared to alternate costs / impacts	1
I am opposed to the Point Merge system / it should be rejected	2
Point Merge / New flight paths will negatively affect quality of life	5
Point Merge / New flight paths will negatively affect rural businesses	2
Point Merge will create continuous disturbance / noise / visual impacts for some people	1
Point Merge respite needs to be carefully worked out	1
Point Merge should not be at the expense of disturbing the peace of the countryside / AONB	1

people who live beneath it / a single flight path will impose an intolerable burden on those living below it/ impact of Point Merge should be spread evenly	1
Only support proposal for point merge if this reduces air traffic and associated noise over Tunbridge Wells	1
Airports (AiR)	8
The proposals appear to be based on preparing the flight paths for a second runway at Gatwick	1
Proposals will not affect Gatwick's Operations	1
In favour of Kent International Airport and amenities as an overflow airport for Gatwick	1
Reigate has been increasingly blighted by overhead nuisance	1
The use / expansion of Manston / Kent International Airport should have been considered as part of this consultation	4
Rural / Countryside (RC)	8
Some businesses rely on the peace of the countryside / visitors to AONBs / may affect these businesses / is important to the rural economy	6
Rural way of life is threatened by airport expansion	1
Most of the surrounding areas are designated green belt so as to stop development / should not be able to destroy the airspace above this	1
Wildlife / bird populations of the Kent Downs would be affected by the proposed flight path	1
Should take into account the proposal to make the village of Sevenoaks Weald a conservation area	1
Towns / Residential (ReS)	18
Proposals will blight / negatively affect more areas / areas of high population	3
Proposals will affect property values/make properties harder to sell	8
Urban areas should be avoided with over flying aircraft / greater use should be made of flying over open fields	3
It would appear that the residents of East Grinstead are going to suffer more because of the changes recommended in this report	1
Need less disruption to towns / villages in Kent	4
Need less disruption to towns / villages in Sussex	1
Local Infrastructure (LI)	9
Airports / local infrastructure cannot handle additional flights / passenger demands	8
The Gatwick area is prone to flooding / airport could not cope with extra passengers	1
There will be an additional burden of cost on local government for providing support services eg health services	3
Business (BuS)	3
Increases in air traffic / noise / pollution will affect / harm local tourism trade	2
Gatwick airport is an important part of the local economy	1
Quality of Life (QoL)	35
Proposals/concentration of air traffic will have negative effect on health/well being/quality of life of people below	19
Low flying aircraft cause stress / affect health / well being / quality of life	6
The aviation industry should not be allowed to destroy peoples quality of life	1
WHO reports / reports consider that sleep disturbance leads to decreased quality of life (health / work / concentration issues etc)	5
EU Noise Directive commits EU to developing long-term strategy to reduce number of people affected by noise	4
Any environmental justifications for change will need to consider people and their health and noise levels, not just a reduction of CO2 emissions / the environmental justification is disingenuous	6
Population (PoP)	6
Concerns that younger people / families may leave an area blighted by overflying aircraft	1
Aircraft flying over Crowborough will affect more people as the area is densely populated	1
All people / stakeholders in East Grinstead should be consulted	2
Felbridge is densely populated and should not be flown over	1
Should show consideration to residents of Horley	1
SUGGESTIONS	164
Noise (NoI)	86
Topography needs to be considered when allowing for noise levels	2
Departures on runway 08 should climb straight ahead / gain height quickly to reduce noise impact / before turning	2
There should be noise limits on arriving as well as departing aircraft / noise levels should be monitored	2
Flight paths should be altered regularly as to minimise noise impact for as many residents as possible	4
Aircraft noise should be directed over areas of low population density	3
Aircraft noise should not be introduced to new areas	3
Aircraft noise levels should be reduced over residential areas	4
Efforts need to be made to reduce noise / over densely populated areas at night	2
Aircraft noise should not be increased for anyone / kept to a minimum	10
Aircraft noise can be reduced by slower descent	1
All possible steps should be taken to reduce the impact of aircraft noise on quality of life / noise blight should be addressed above the costs of fuel / airport capacity etc	6
Aircraft should descend more steeply to keep the noise footprint much closer to the airport / stay as high as possible for as long as possible	3
Use narrower Noise Preferential Routes (NPR's) where possible	1
Noise over AONBs should be reduced / AONBs should be protected from noise	5

Should share the impact of aircraft disturbance over a wider area / noise nuisance from take off and landings should be spread across as wide an area as possible	8
Put planes over towns where the noise will have less impact due to traffic / background noise etc	4
Aircraft should not accelerate at full power until above 4000 ft	1
Reduce noise pollution by having aircraft come in over the sea	1
A set of noise ceilings should be set for each airport as well of for areas under the flight path / noise levels should be monitored for compliance	1
Noise levels should be measured effectively	1
Aircraft landing gear should be lowered as late as possible to reduce noise levels	1
Older, noisier aircraft should be routed over less populated areas / restricted in hours of operation	2
The growing population of Billingshurst would benefit from reduced noise impact if flight paths were adjusted to avoid direct flights over Billingshurst	2
Noise levels over Charcott, particularly in summer, are becoming intolerable	1
Chiddingstone is already affected by noise from overflying aircraft / it is unbearable	3
Low flying aircraft over Chiddingstone have become more noise intrusive including at night over recent months	1
There has been a reduction in noise since stacking from Stansted airport was moved out of Dedham Vale	1
Concerned about the impact on noise levels in the Dorking area	1
We chose to live in Dorking for some peace and quiet	1
Durford Wood is subject to more noise intrusion in the night due to Easyjet aircraft flying at low altitudes	1
Opposition to aircraft over flying Durfold Wood	1
Noise levels are very intrusive for the area around East Grinstead when runway 08 is in operation	3
There has been an increase in noise over Felbridge recently as aircraft speed up before making the southerly	1
Reduce the aircraft noise suffered in Edenbridge	1
There has been an increase in noise over Felbridge recently as aircraft speed up before making the southerly turn	1
Concerns about noise from night flights over Felixstowe	1
Noise impact over the High Weald AONB is very intrusive because of the low ambient noise level	1
Hever is already affected by noise from overflying aircraft / it is unbearable	1
Hurst Green has become increasingly affected by aircraft noise over the years	1
Leigh is already affected by noise from overflying aircraft/has got worse in last year/is unbearable	1
Noise from aircraft continuously flying has increased over the years / suffer from constant noise	1
Oppose any additional noise caused by aircraft over Mayfield	1
Concerns about increase in noise pollution over Penshurst arising from proposals	1
Concerns about the noise impact on my area of expansion plans at Redhill Aerodrome	1
Redhill already contends with noise from M23 / M25 / Redhill aerodrome / mainline railway	1
Reigate already contends with noise from M23 / M25 / Redhill aerodrome	1
Proposals will lead to an increase in noise over Sevenoaks	2
Concerns about the increase in aircraft noise over Sevenoaks Weald	1
Concerns that proposals will increase noise in Standen	1
Noise from aircraft reverberates and bounces off the various hills with the Surrey Downs / is more disturbing	1
Surrey Hills is a beautiful area threatened by aircraft noise	1
Any increase in aircraft noise over Tonbridge will affect house prices	1
An increase in aircraft noise over Tonbridge will be detrimental to the area	2
The rural community of Toys Hill would be particularly affected by the noise impact / due to its height	2
Concerns about increase in noise pollution over Tunbridge Wells arising from proposals	4
Residents of Tunbridge Wells already suffer considerably (quality of life, health) from the impact of aircraft noise from westerly arrivals	2
We chose to live in Upminster for some peace and quiet	1
Constant noise pollution in Upminster since 2012/needs to go back to previous level of noise	2
Air Pollution (AiP)	19
Pollution levels should be continually monitored	3
Anything that can affect health must be carefully considered when making proposals/ changes	2
Flight paths should be altered regularly as to minimise air pollution impact for as many residents as possible	2
Careful consideration needs to be given to all forms of pollution - Light / noise / air	1
Introduce CO2 / fuel taxes to reduce the number of flights / use market forces to make flights more expensive	2
Concerns about the impact of emissions on the water quality at Bough Beech reservoir	1
Dedham Vale AONB is narrow and as such can be avoided with little impact on flight length and CO2	1
Concerns about the pollution levels in the Speldhurst area	1
An increase in air pollution will be detrimental to residents of Tonbridge	2
The rural community of Toys Hill would be particularly affected by CO2 emissions / due to its height	2
Concerns about increasing air pollution arising from proposals	1
Since 2012 we have been subjected to constant air pollution in Upminster	1
Air Traffic (AiT)	89
Holding areas / stacks should be over the Channel / sea to avoid any impact / disruption to residential areas	2
Flight paths should be shared fairly above both high and low population areas	2
There should be limits on aircraft movements / no increases	2
Any increase in air traffic should be kept to a minimum / less than 5%	1
There should be no increase in over head air traffic	3
Flights / respite routes should be spread more evenly / fairly over a wider area	4
Keep low flying aircraft / flight paths away from towns / populated areas	6

All possible steps should be taken to reduce the impact of aircraft volume on quality of life	1
More effort should be devoted to an alternative to stacking / holding	1
Stacks / Holds should only be used in an emergency	1
Air traffic should be reduced for reasons of noise impact	1
Air traffic should be reduced for reasons of environmental impact	3
Require more fuel efficient aircraft	1
Minimum height constraints during the approach should be imposed	1
Flight Paths (FiP)	53
Aircraft should climb more steeply to keep the noise footprint much closer to the airport	3
Air traffic control should be allowed flexibility to manipulate flight paths when required	1
Flight paths should avoid urban / residential areas / areas of high population	15
Air traffic should try to avoid flight paths over areas of natural beauty/wildlife habitats	4
Better monitoring of flight paths is required / flight path deviation detection / enforce published flight paths	10
Allowing approaches to Gatwick from northerly directions will increase routing options	1
Flight paths should not be over / should avoid small villages	1
Flight paths should not be moved	1
Flight paths should not be lowered	1
Should locate flight paths over towns as they have noise already instead of rural areas / Avoid flight paths over rural areas	3
Should have maps showing proposed routes so we can make a decision / before we make a decision	2
Should consider shortening final approach and having a steeper descent	7
Flight paths should be over water / the Estuary where possible	3
LCY departures should be re-routed south to fly over open fields	1
In order to allow flights from Runway 08 to gain height quickly it may be necessary to move the main in-bound	1
There should be a fairer allocation of flights over other areas / organised to ensure that no one area or group	4
Modify the flight paths to improve our experience of the effects from the airport	1
Respite routes should be utilised once discussions have taken place with residents which stand to be affected	1
Seaford flight path should be realigned over non residential areas	2
The design of new flight paths should avoid areas that have not previously been over flown / not already affected by low flying aircraft	1
In periods of minimum wind landings should be made in an easterly direction to give respite to the westerly approach	2
Multiple routes / as many as possible within the controlled area	1
Greater use should be made of the runway and routes to the west of Gatwick	1
There should be fines for aircraft that deviate from their allocated flight path	1
Aircraft Height (AiH)	8
Keep aircraft as high as possible above towns / more than 7000ft above	4
Aircraft routing should be at the maximum height possible for safety reasons	2
There should be no increase in low altitude flying over areas already affected	1
Aircraft approaches should be planned to have aircraft at the highest position for as long as possible	1
Aircraft joining glidescope at 4000 ft will reduce ground noise	1
Gatwick needs more control over aircraft height whilst aligning with the approach from the east	1
Night Flights (NiF)	13
More consideration should be given to reducing night flights / should continue to be restricted	4
Night flight paths should follow main artery routes / motorways to minimise noise impact / reduce spread of	1
There should be no night flights	3
Should consider a similar plan to Heathrow at Gatwick - No flights from late night to early morning	4
Current night time flying over Tonbridge is very intrusive	1
Airports (AiR)	13
Capacity at Gatwick should not be allowed to be increased	2
It is not sensible to increase the size of Gatwick airport / Gatwick airport should not be allowed to expand	1
It is better to make more use of airports away from major cities/other airports in SE e.g. Manston or Lydd	2
Building an airport in the Thames Estuary / a new airport would be more beneficial / environmentally sound by routing flights over water	4
Gatwick should amend charges for greener carriers / become an airport with green credentials	1
Should build a third runway at Heathrow instead	1
Proposals should be reviewed with all other London airports / not in isolation	1
Should consider the effects of an additional runway when considering noise impacts	1
Should consider building a new airport to relieve pressure from existing airports	1
Rural / Countryside (RC)	17
Low flying aircraft / routes should avoid AONBs / other historic areas / AONB designated / have statutory protection	8
Should consider other less environmentally sensitive areas for overflying / respite routes	3
There is an expectation of peace and quiet in rural areas / AONBs	5
Some rural / sensitive areas should be avoided at weekends when the areas are visited by the public	1
AONBs should not be totally excluded from flight path especially in winter when there are fewer visitors	1
OUT OF SCOPE	151
Noise (NoI)	62
Runway 08 / SFD departures have increased noise pollution in recent years	3
We are already affected by noise from low flying aircraft	1
We / people are already affected by aircraft noise / it is unacceptable	29
There is already too much noise over rural areas near Gatwick	3

Reducing flight numbers is not the answer to reductions in noise	1
Residents on existing flight paths bought their property with the knowledge of the potential noise and disruption from aircraft	3
Noise from aircraft disturbs our peace / home life	5
Noise from aircraft affects us, particularly during the summer	3
Noisier older aircraft should be replaced with newer quieter models / should not be permitted to use the airport	4
Noise pollution is affecting peoples health / wellbeing / quality of life	7
Changes with Easyjet routes have affected us with increased noise	2
There has been an increase in noise recently / over the last year / past few years	6
Noisy aircraft should be curtailed at all times	1
Some aircraft are particularly noisy (A320 / Airbus series) / have high-pitched 'whine' / need modifying to reduce noise / modification should be mandatory	9
Noise from aircraft turning South from Gatwick	1
Noisy aircraft should not be allowed to fly	1
Air Pollution (AiP)	7
The south east of the UK is already affected by high level of air pollution	1
There should be incentives to airlines for fleet improvements / greener aircraft	2
Air pollution from aircraft is affecting the planet / future of our planet / climate change	1
People are already affected by air pollution	1
Departures from Runway 08 has increased air pollution	1
Expanding regional airports would have a huge impact on reducing CO2 emissions	1
Air Traffic (AiT)	78
I / we have noticed an increase in the number of flights overhead in the last year / recently	2
Concerns about the safety effects of increasing air traffic out of Gatwick on other local airports	2
The UK needs an increase in flight numbers	1
Surrey has a high level of air traffic / is one of the most overflow areas in the UK	3
Air traffic at Gatwick should not be increased	4
Number of flights should be decreased	2
Overflying began in 2012 without consultation and has continued	1
We are already affected with constant overflying	2
People would like to see a reduction of the environmental impacts caused by air travel / any increase in flights	4
Holding helicopters at low level over residential areas is NOT acceptable and is in breach of the operating	4
Opposed to increase in flights/there are already too many	3
Flight Paths (FiP)	22
Already experienced a route change of flights departing easterly on the Seaford route from Gatwick	1
The deviation from the Centreline created stress / disturbed the quality of life	1
Pilots do not adhere to the Continuous Descent Approach	1
On westerly arrivals prefer aircraft to join the glide path west of Bough Beech reservoir	1
Runway 26 arrivals have increased over Charcott in recent years / proposals will increase flights even further	1
Further consideration should be given to the proposed flight paths over Dedham Vale as this would destroy the peaceful nature of the area	2
Durford Wood is disturbed by low flying aircraft / excessive speedbrake use / use of same horizontal arrival route due to poor descent profile planning	1
There is enough unpopulated land around Gatwick to be able to avoid low level flying over towns like East Grinstead	1
Hever is an AONB / flights overhead should be avoided	1
Flights stray over Horsham - concerns about safety in a built up area / concerns about aircraft flying at under 4000ft over Horsham	1
Arrival flight paths should be routed further west of Sandwich and Dover to minimise disturbances	1
Opposition to / concerns about the proposed new / north east flight path that would cut across the Kent Downs / North Kent AONB	1
Special consideration should be given to Leigh to remove the village from the new flight paths / not line up over the village	1
Flight paths should be away from the North Downs	2
Flight paths should be routed away from Redhill / Redhill Aerodrome	1
Planned changes show a wider turning circle flying north over Redhill	1
Concerns about low flying aircraft / new flight paths over Sevenoaks	1
Concerns about the increase in flights at low altitudes over the Speldhurst area	1
Changes to the flight path would have a detrimental effect upon the residents of Toys Hill	1
Changes to the flight path will seriously affect an AONB / historic areas / wildlife / SSSI around Toys Hill	1
Concerns about low flying aircraft / new flight paths over Tunbridge Wells	2
Concerns about increased frequency of flights over Tunbridge Wells at night in Summer	1
Night Flights (NiF)	21
Concerns about extending flying hours	3
Gatwick's flight schedule does not allow enough time for local residents to sleep	1
Stop night flights / early morning flights as they disturb residents sleep / are harmful to those suffering the noise	7
No increase in night flights / no night flights at Gatwick	7
Noisy aircraft should be banned at night / early morning to minimise the impact of noise	3
Night flights should be kept to a minimum	2
Night flights are not essential to the UK economy	4

Aircraft Height (AiH)	11
There has been an increase in visual impact recently / over the last year / past few years	1
Low flying aircraft over Chiddingstone are often lower than 4000ft	3
Crowborough is in an elevated position which results in overflying aircraft being lower to the area	1
Opposition to flights below 4000ft in the TN8 area	1
Consideration should be given to increasing the altitude of arriving flights / implementing steeper angles of descent over Kent	1
Aircraft fly over Leigh at a very low level / should stay at a higher altitude	2
Oppose any increase on low flying aircraft over Mayfield	1
Consideration should be given to increasing the altitude of arriving flights / implementing steeper angles of descent over Sussex	1
There should be no increase in the number of low flying flights passing over Tonbridge	1
Airports (AiR)	50
Should build a new airport in an area where the benefits outweigh any negative impacts	1
Continual expansion of Heathrow / Gatwick / existing airports is counter productive / not sensible / need a longer term strategy	6
New runways should be built at Gatwick / Heathrow	3
Disagree with any plans for a new airport in the Thames Estuary	2
Disagree with any plans for a new airport in Kent	1
Disagree with second runway / expansion at Gatwick will have a detrimental impact on surrounding areas	16
Disagree with expansion at Heathrow	1
Build a new airport in the Thames Estuary / will help Gatwick's airspace from becoming overpopulated	13
Build another airport in a less populated area	2
Heathrow should be allowed to expand / is preferable for expansion over Gatwick	2
London airports future capacity issues need to be addressed first / Airport Commission's review of airports should take place before any proposals put forward	3
There should be more regional airports outside the South East/more local/smaller airports in others part of the country	9
Gatwick was never designed to be an international hub	1
The airport should be allowed to grow	1
Stansted should be better utilised / the new runway should be at Stansted / Stansted is less populated	1
A longer term solution to airport capacity is needed	4
A second runway at Gatwick may force local government to reallocate spending designated for vital services to projects associated with airport expansion	1
Rural / Countryside (RC)	7
AONB / sensitive areas will be negatively affected by an increase in air traffic at Gatwick	3
Low flying aircraft cause lasting damage to the environment	2
Low flying aircraft disturb our tranquility / cause disturbance	2
Compensation (CoM)	15
711. CoM - People who are detrimentally affected should be compensated	14
712. CoM - Anyone affected by an increase in noise should be compensated	1
GENERAL	158
There should be more meeting with the general public/more consultation with public/make them more aware of consultation	11
Difficulty reading / understanding maps provided / not representative of impact on ground	7
Proposals need to be re-thought / a different approach could be better / a more strategic approach is needed	5
Proposals could have safety concerns	4
Changes should only be made when agreed with the local population to be affected	2
Views of people both in populated and more rural areas should be treated equally	1
Comments on issues outside of / not covered by this consultation	5
Criticism of the consultation	51
Consultation document needs to be summarised / clear short statement	2
More information required about respite routes	2
Support for Leigh Parish Councils response	1
Support for / agree with Chiddingstone Parish Councils response	5
See previous / other response	13
Comments are pointless / it's a done deal	5
More research is required / to understand the impacts on residential properties / populated areas affected	7
Alternative solutions could be adopted (nsf)	2
Changes are unjustified / unnecessary / predicated on flawed reasoning	3
There has been no previous consultation	1
There should be a second consultation once the routes / point merge have been identified / giving detailed information of the flight paths	19
Further consultation is needed to ensure that people are better informed on the impact of any changes / a consultation designed for the general public to understand	2
Some change / expansion / improvement is desirable / necessary	2
Airport operators / aviation industry /commercial world want to make changes because of financial gain regardless of the local population / issues affecting local residents / only acts in its own interest	19
Positive comments on the consultation / consultation document	2
We need to be listened to	3
There is no case regarding economic growth / are vague/misleading / economic arguments do not take account of environmental and social costs	4

Many people enjoy the benefits of air travel / should be prepared to share the disadvantages	2
Need to take into account the DfT's guidance to CAA on the environmental objectives to the exercise of its air navigation functions	1
Mentions of Easyjet	2
Criticisms of Government	3
Oppose any further visual impact caused by aircraft over Mayfield	1
Toys Hill and surrounding area would not benefit economically	2
Other	24
Other negative comments	10
Other positive comments	7
Operators who use Gatwick Airport should receive training on CDA	1
CDA page in the UKAIP (website) has disappeared	1
Concerns about noise from aircraft using speedbrakes	1
Track distance from ATC is often poor/non-existent	1
Better planning and information from ATC would allow smoother descent to glide scope intercept	1

London Airspace
Consultation

NATS

YOUR LONDON AIRPORT
Gatwick

Appendix D2 London Airspace Consultation
Responses from members of the public: postal and email
1st April 2014

This document shows final topline results for responses made by members of the public to the London Airspace Consultation, carried out on behalf of National Air Traffic Services

All responses shown in this document were made by post or email, not through the online response form, during the consultation period of 15 October 2013 - 21 January 2014.

Findings reflect the view of all members of the public who submitted a response to each question
Responses are shown in the form of numbers not percentages

		Total
	Base size:	8
Q11	PartB Please state the reasons why you support or oppose this objective to realign all Gatwick Airport Runway 26 departure routes below 4,000ft to help make best use of the existing runway.	
	General comments	2
	Without detailed information, we assume the changes would be generally helpful	1
	Can't comment as lack of detail	1
	Suggestions	4
	Comments about not increasing the number of flights	1
	Primary concern should be to minimise noise	1
	If the proposals cause more anxiety to those overflown, they should be abandoned	2
	If the proposals cause more nuisance to those overflown, they should be abandoned	2
	Reconsider change in flight path	1
	Outbound aircraft must continue to cross West Kent	1
	Approaching flights should be flown higher, and dropped lower later	1
	Base size:	16
Q12	PartB Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the objective of providing respite routes below 4,000ft and/or between 4,000ft and 7,000ft.	
	Reasons to oppose respite routes / negative comments	10
	Because it would harm the Kent Downs AONB	1
	Lack of information	1
	Current system is safe and fairer	1
	NATS/GAL do not have a true understanding of noise from arriving aircraft	1
	Concerns about noise pollution	2
	Proposals unclear	1
	Leq 57 dB contours are not fit for purpose / negative comments on noise contours	2
	Currently we have respite on some days which we are grateful for	1
	Seems logical but will cause issues in different areas	1
	Subscribe to the idea of respite but proposed solution is an issue in West Kent / needs to be thought about again and redesigned	1
	Subscribe to the idea of respite but disagree with flight path concentration / unfair on those overflown	1
	Support of the principle of respite, but cannot support proposals due to lack of information about where the flight paths would be	1
	RESPITE ROUTES - SUGGESTIONS	11
	Better to have a wide approach swathe with additional routes and respite routes	1
	Consideration should be given to people who are overflown	1
	Request that meaningful respite routes are implemented	2
	Focus should be on approach height, not sea level due to elevated area we live in (Penhurst)	1
	Favour wider flight paths to spread the inconvenience	1
	Respite routes should allow relief to communities in Oakwood Hill currently blighted by noise	1
	Paths would need separation of ten miles throughout a 15 mile flight path to the point of PM	1
	NALS/GAL should be working for the common good and not just for their vested interests	1

	Flight paths should be steeper / as steep as possible	2
	Proposal to route aircraft over Tunbridge Wells at 4k feet is wrong as planes will join the instrument landing system near Edenbridge at 3k feet	1
	Multiple respite routes are needed	4
	Altitude should be as high as possible	1
	In summer, high concentrations of aircraft flying over narrow areas will affect more people	1
	Consideration should be given for more easterly landings, giving respite to westerly approaches	1
	More arrivals should be routed via Crowborough and south of Tunbridge Wells to fly over Tonbridge. Tonbridge area is a valley, making effective height of aircraft higher, and is outside of High Weald AONB	1
	Tonbridge should not become the principle / default vector point from which all approach paths are aligned	1
	Maximum noise allowance over urban areas should be set	2
	Minimum altitudes should be observed / penalties for deviation from this	1
	Support respite routes for London City, but this option not available	1
	Respite will only work if all air traffic is removed from an area for a specific period of time	1
	Would prefer a variety of direct flights / multiple routes to a single route albeit more people affected by multiple routes/flight paths	1
	Base size:	75
Q13	Please provide any additional information you feel is relevant in the space below	
	PLACES OR AREAS THAT MAY NEED SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	72
	Upminster	1
	Billingshurst	1
	Tourist attractions (historic houses / National Trust properties)	3
	Outwood	2
	Kent Downs AONB	10
	Surrey Hills AONB	6
	Ide Hill	24
	Toy's Hill	27
	Crockham Hill	28
	Greensand Ridge	1
	Hever / Hever Castle	1
	Ide Hill Primary School	1
	Unspecified AONB	4
	Westerham	4
	Chartwell	2
	North Downs	3
	Loxwood	1
	South Downs	2
	Sussex Coastal areas	1
	Cranleigh	1
	Redhill	3
	Reigate	3
	North Kent AONB	2
	Areas of Great Landscape Value	1
	Okewood Hill (RH5)	1
	Rural areas / rural communities	4
	Durford Wood (RH14)	4
	Unspecified parks / national parks	1
	Hadlow Down	1
	High Weald AONB	2
	Schools / hospitals / care homes / community facilities	3
	National Trust properties	1
	Shotley Peninsula	7
	West Kent	1
	Populated areas	1
	Tunbridge Wells	1

Southborough	1
Bidborough	1
Tonbridge	1
Hildenborough	1
Sevenoaks	2
Penshurst / Penhurst Place	2
Populated rural areas	1
Areas of high ground	1
Dedham Vale AONB	1
Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AONB	1
Leith Hill	3
Smallfield	1
Horley	1
Isle of Sheppey	1
Horsham	1
Unspecified AONBs	1
Reasons why area may need special consideration	68
Concerns about noise pollution	38
Concerns about impact on health	4
Comments about being affected by incoming flights when the wind is in the north / east direction	1
Many people could be affected given new housing developments	1
Reason not specified	1
Villages full of character / old historic buildings	1
Concerns about damage to buildings from noise/vibrations from aircraft	1
Comments about protected area/ Concerns about overflight of protected areas	34
Areas are hilly and so noise magnified / impacts magnified	30
Concerns about visual intrusion	8
Kent Downs has a number of national trust properties which would be affected by the proposals	5
Impact on tourists / visitors / tourist industry	22
Part of the Kent Downs has a high number of birds / Sevenoaks Wild Life Reserve in postcode TN14	6
Flight path would disturb national trails (Greensand Way and Vanguard Way)	15
Concerns about air pollution	28
Impact of national trust property / heritage	22
Open-air theatre would be impacted	1
Impact on wildlife / animals	14
Surrounding area is a greenbelt	8
,Detrimental impact/impact of low-flying aircraft on local people	2
Any attempt to noise-pollute Churchill's old home would be given full publicity in the press	1
Comments about suffered enough / taken fair share of the burden already over the years	1
Recreational areas	13
Another flight path over the Kent Downs would be detrimental	1
To preserve tranquil environment / concerns about tranquil environment being disrupted	26
Low flying aircraft would destroy rural area / and way of life	2
Concerns about increased flights	1
Why can't more densely populated areas north or south of Durfold Wood (RH14) not be targeted?	1
Noise is more pronounced in rural areas / mentions of 10db lower than in urban areas	5
Mention of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 2000	1
Mention of laws/statutes (EU Law) / duty to protect and improve environment	6
Impact on natural beauty of local area	2
Unfair to expect rural communities to bear the brunt of aircraft noise	1
Government guidelines for AONBs	2
Area rich in birdlife	12
AONBs	1
Endangered / important ecosystem	2

	Educational value	2
	Concerns about impact on the village	1
	Horley already suffers from aviation impact	1
	Suggestions	40
	There appears to be no adherence to CDA	1
	Proposed new flight paths will affect land in an AONB	1
	The fact some flight paths already fly over some parts of other AONBs this does not justify additional encroachment onto a further AONB	1
	Oppose extending flight paths further northeast of existing flight paths	1
	Oppose extra flights over protected areas	1
	Reroute flights over the sea/Thames estuary and not over AONBs	1
	All P-RNAV departures from Gatwick Airport fly to the north and are overflying the Surrey Hills AONB	1
	Assuming there are no plans to increase flight path over Toys Hill	1
	Tourist attractions should be avoided in summer, but not at the expense of flying continuously over nearby villages	1
	Oppose flight paths over Crockham Hill / Toys Hill / Ide Hill	10
	Human health is more important than fuel consumption	1
	Putting flight paths in tourist areas is ridiculous - object to proposals	1
	Putting flight paths in protected areas is ridiculous - object to proposals	2
	Aircraft across Cranleigh would contravene Article of the European Convention on Human Rights	1
	extra fuel or CO2 in proportion to that generated from the long distances aircraft have already covered	1
	Do not fly over protected areas but look elsewhere	3
	Sensitive/vulnerable areas should be given precedence over a shorter route to Gatwick Airport	1
	Maps need to not only depict AONBs but also Areas of Great Landscape Value / proposals need to be reconsidered in light of this	1
	Areas designated Areas of Great Landscape Value should be afforded greater consideration of the impact on tranquility of the proposals	1
	Wish for alternatives to be given greater consideration	1
	The burden of overflights should be spread	2
	NATS/Air Authorities would be failing in their duties to conserve and enhance AONBs if it makes avoidable encroachment onto an area of natural beauty	1
	Comments about reducing number of flights over AONBs/direct them away from AONBs/overflights should not be allowed	2
	Would make better sense to direct traffic over the North Sea than over Shotley Peninsula	3
	Leith Hill should be preserved for future generations - should not be impacted/destroyed by aircraft overhead	1
	Further air traffic over the Shotley Peninsula should be avoided	1
	Another flight path over the Kent Downs would bring major disturbance	1
	Birds can cause air crashes	1
	Do not allow aircraft to spoil/overfly Toys Hill	2
	Do not move the NPR to the north	1
	Encourage aircraft to gain height more quickly or noise abatement procedures	1
	Oppose proposals if means more flights over Horley	1
	Put flights over rural areas to lessen noise impact	1
	Objections to planes flying over these areas when it isn't the agreed flight path / more enforcement needed	1
	Base size:	9
Q14	Please state what you think the criteria should be in the space below	
	General Comments	6
	Where possible it makes sense to avoid AONBs/National Parks below 4k feet unless this adds to environmental burden of flying over more densely populated areas	1
	Heavily overflown areas must be considered for respite	1
	The proposal NE extension North of Edenbridge - opposed due to impact on sensitive areas	1

	Support further respite paths and not a single approach route from a point merge	1
	the population	1
	Towns/countryside should share equal burden of overflying aircraft	1
	Areas mentioned	6
	Hilly areas	1
	Schools	1
	Hospitals	1
	Surrey Hills AONB	2
	North Downs AONB	1
	High Weald AONB	1
	ANONBs during the summer months	1
	School time	1
	Night flights over rural/country areas	1
	Unspecified AONBs	1
	Leith Hill	2
	Coldharbour	1
	Abinger	1
	Areas over-flown below 5k feet	1
	Villages	1
	Reasons given for time sensitive areas	5
	AONBs are meant to be protected	1
	A common sense approach is needed	1
	Noise more notable in the countryside	1
	Impact on tourists / Sundays appear to have more flights at peak visitor time	1
	Complaints escalate in the summer	1
	Base size:	9
Q15	What, if any, factors should be taken into account when determining the appropriate balance of flying around environmentally sensitive areas versus overhead	
	Reasons why flying longer routes should have greater precedence	6
	Noise is more noticeable in the countryside	1
	Protection of environmentally sensitive areas	2
	This should always be the case unless involved flying over populated areas that could be affected by noise nuisance	1
	To avoid high Weald AONB	1
	Sensitive areas should be avoided	2
	Reasons why flying shorter routes should have precedence	1
	Fuel burn is a bigger issue than noise in under-populated areas. Direct route should be taken, especially if alternative is to fly longer, shallower routes over centres of population	1
	Balancing local impact against increased CO2 - Suggestions	3
	Towns/countryside should share equal burden of overflying aircraft	1
	Aircraft should be as high as possible in interests to those on the ground	1
	Shorter routes must not be allowed to override the concerns for quality of life for those who live under flight paths	1
	Balancing local impact against increased CO2 - General Comments	1
	The current proposals for Point Merge will cause more fuel burn/emissions	1
	Base size:	14
Q16	Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the objective of a system based around Point Merge.	
	Positive Comments about Point Merge	4
	Reduces delays / improves efficiency / improved performance	1
	0724 Reduces CO2 emissions / reduces environmental impact	2
	It will result in less noise	2
	Removes necessity for stacks	1
	Supportive of new structures over the sea	2
	Improved safety	1
	No objections provided air traffic does not increase NE of Gatwick	1
	Comments about aircraft having to stack over the sea due to regulations	1

	Would welcome if PM for arrivals could facilitate continuous climb for departures	1
	Negative Comments about Point Merge	11
	Proposals are too vague	2
	If aircraft cannot be vectored in and kept to a decent CDA, then it is madness to try a PM system	1
	,Against merging of paths at one point/having a narrow track/will make life unbearable for those underneath it	4
	PM will cause noise pollution	1
	Statements about COsavings are false	1
	PM does not distribute flights fairly	1
	The current system is fairer	1
	A PM solution is impractical above High Weald	1
	Concerns about a long flight-path above Tunbridge Wells / Southborough / Bidborough / Tonbridge	1
	GAL/NATS have chosen long flight-path regardless of impact on populated area of West Kent	1
	Many people will be affected by noise if a PM solution is initiated over West Kent	1
	Object to PM solution over West Kent	1
	A rethink/new solution needs to be implemented	1
	Stacking over the sea welcomed / but directing flights to a single path is opposed	1
	Major drawback is only having one or two respite routes	1
	It has advantages to airline industry it inflicts misery on those below	1
	0768 Inadequate explanation of amounts of CO2 that would be saved	1
	No clear case for PM has been made	1
	PM may not provide as many benefits as anticipated	1
	Arcs should be placed out at sea / support this	1
	Primary concern should be for health and safety of local people	1
	Have a wider swathe to spread noise nuisance as far/wide as possible	1
	A sense of proportion needs to be established	1
	Selfish/unfair to concentrate arrivals from a PM over a single flight path	1
	Impact of PM should be spread fairly as the current system provides	1
	A larger PM system arc over the south coast with tracks to a merge point on finals line should be considered	1
	Object unless modern technologies and efficiencies can be realised whilst avoiding concentrated intrusive impacts caused by so few flight paths	1
	Claimed benefits of PM should not solely/mostly be used to benefit airport/operators	1
	CDA should be enforced	1
	Different airlines arrive at different heights (e.g. BA above 4k feet / Emirates well below 3k feet). The different in height is a major factor in noise levels. Until such time that there is proper policing and research, no consideration should be given to point merge	1
	Do not have a problem in making things easier for controllers, but not at the expense of increased concentration of flights over local people/countryside/AONBs	1
	Doubt that PM and merge points are essential	1
	Base size:	2
Q17	What, if any, comments do you have on accommodating non-certified aircraft?	
	Suggestions	2
	A short timeline should be given for exclusion of all non-compliant aircraft	1
	Would seem reasonable to set a deadline for non-compliant operators to become compliant	1

	Base size:	3
Q18	Please state the reasons why you believe fuel for the Point Merge arcs should be considered part of the contingency fuel uplift or part of the flight planned route fuel uplift?	
	Reasons for Part of the flight planned route fuel uplift	2
	For safety reasons (e.g. the other option could lead to low fuel)	2
	General comments	1
	compromise on safety	1
	Base size:	5
Q19	Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the proposal seeking to reduce overall fuel burn across the fleet by as much as possible, even if it means some individual routes may be less fuel efficient as a consequence.	
	Reasons to Oppose	2
	Do not support anything that will lead to more suffering/misery for those who are overflown	1
	All routes should be made more fuel efficient	1
	General comments/suggestions - Fuel Burn Efficiency for Specific Routes	3
	Aviation industry needs to consider people on the ground	1
	Flying longer routes should take precedence	2
	Base size:	6
Q20	If you believe it has an impact, please describe the operation(s) that would potentially be affected.	
	Suggestions - CAB	2
	Urge NATS to consider how release of controlled air space can be achieved at lower levels in Phase	1
	Comments about the use of Class C airspace	1
	10002 In a Class G survey, 10%-20% of traffic flies higher than 5k feet. Would expect such pilots to be able to fly at such altitude	1
	Hope more effective use of Area Control Centres can be made	1
	More Class A airspace can be made available as other airports are under-utilised at times (and London City is closed at the weekends)	1
	New and existing London airspace should not regulate out VFR flights	1
	Comments about exploring alternative airspace classifications	1
	10008 Gatwick should not require airspace under 4k feet and 20+ miles from the airport	1
	Some space should be available for those operating under visual flight rules	1
	GENERAL - Negative comments about Controlled Airspace Boundaries	6
	Disappointed there has been no release of controlled airspace at lower levels	1
	Class A airspace significantly impacts VFR flights	1
	Airspace in London TMA, Worthing CTA, Daventry CTA, Clacton CTA and surrounding ATS routes are classified as Class A from 2.5k feet up to FL 195 - meaning VFR flights cannot be accommodated	1
	Proposals prohibit access to airspace if they do not hold an instrument rating	1
	Reduced airspace capacity to VFR traffic	1
	Comments about implications as VFR flights have to fly lower or around airspace (increased noise / higher fuel consumption)	1
	Issues about safety for VFR traffic	1
	Concerns that aircraft will be arriving at Gatwick at lower altitudes than at present	1
	Lack of information / proposal is too vague	1
	GA has all but disappeared due to budget tourism	1
	Do not wish to see airspace lowered	1
	Disagree with lowering controlled airspace due to noise/increased noise impact	1
	Should return airspace classified as A to C	1

		Base size:	89
Q21	Please provide any other information that you feel is relevant to the on-going development of the airspace covered by this consultation.		
	GENERAL- Other comments about the proposals		38
	General concerns about the changes		1
	Concerns about increased air traffic		4
	General concerns about noise		9
	Those previously unaffected/not overflown should remain unaffected / they should not be overflown in future		1
	1255 Reference to responses to Draft Aviation Policy Framework Consultation about 57 dB Laeq, 16h contour being the wrong means of measurement		2
	Reference to responses to Draft Aviation Policy Framework Consultation about protecting quiet areas and AONBs		1
	Night flights should be abolished / restricted		5
	If new PBN procedures help solve problem of overflying this is great, if not, respondent will be unhappy		1
	,Concerns about impact of noise/air pollution on health		4
	Oppose the proposals due to increase impact (e.g. noise)		6
	West Sussex will be destroyed by noise and pollution		1
	Concerns about house price devaluation		3
	Oppose changes in general /do not want planes in local area/ oppose proposal		6
	Concerns of narrow flight paths in already heavily overflown areas		2
	Appreciation that flights have to be somewhere, but no one should bear the brunt of them all		1
	Comments about Gatwick Airport profiteering at expense of local residents		2
	Local people do not benefit from Gatwick's existence / comments about negative contribution to local economy		3
	Oppose low flights		1
	Proposals are about increasing capacity		2
	Comments about proposals driven by commercial interests		1
	Dispute claim that GAL/NATS are complying with Government guidelines		1
	Concerns about long approach paths		1
	Comments that noise tables presented are not representative of actual noise		1
	Setting noise zone heights from sea level is meaningless		1
	A meaningful measure of actual noise is needed. Comments about an acceptable noise parameter		1
	Question about when new flight paths come into affect		1
	Oppose any more flights		2
	Comments about how existing transport infrastructure will cope with increased flights		2
	Maps inaccurate		1
	Supportive of the work of LAMP / the proposals		1
	Scepticism about rerouting/changing flight paths		1
	Would be preferable to raise controlled airspace by 1k feet		1
	Planes don't stick to agreed flight paths/routes - this should be enforced		1
	Do not narrow flight paths / flight corridor		1
	Object to proposals if flights re-routed over Sevenoaks		1
	GENERAL - SUGGESTIONS		20
	Aircraft should fly to the south of Lingfield village and not directly over the village		2
	Would like continuous respite		1
	Night flights should be abolished		1
Oppose changes to extend flight paths further to NE of existing Gatwick flight area		7	
Suggest flight path changes should await the AC's review of airports in the SE		1	
More research is needed on impact of noise and implications of respite		2	
Would wish for number of places to be scaled back		1	
If increased flights are inevitable, consideration should be given to fewer flights during the evenings and weekends		1	
Comments about should be working to reduce noise		1	

Noise levels further away from Gatwick should be monitored	1
Profit should not be placed over the cost of noise suffered by people under flightpaths	1
Attention should be paid to reducing noise impact	1
If older, noisier aircraft have to make later and more fuel inefficient descents, this may spur them to invest in newer, quieter, more fuel efficient aircraft	1
Penalties should be imposed for breach of noise thresholds with fines going to local communities affected	1
Proposed changes are better, but some of the principles are wrong - there should be no flights over populated areas because of financial reasons when another other (merging in the estuary) exists	1
Nobody should be impacted by aircraft when an alternative exists that does not impact on people	1
Comments about flight paths being important to local residents (in terms of implications and consequences)	1
NATS and other public sector bodies should pursue emissions reduction as a priority	1
Suggestion that NATS should show leadership in terms of how to reduce emissions	1
Mention of obligations to reduce emissions / concerns about emissions	1
Comments about safety issues in general	1
Keep flights as high as possible for as long as possible	1
COMMENTS ABOUT THE CONSULTATION / CONSULTATION PROCESS	47
comment without more detail	9
Further consultation should be carried out once information on the location of flight paths/ routes becomes available	8
Wishes to be included in future consultations/discussions	3
Would like more information / to be kept informed as proposals develop	2
Hard copies of consultation should be made available	1
Need to wait for recommendations from the AC about runway capacity in the SE	9
Impossible to consult without considering effects of Heathrow Airport	1
Criticism of not consulting about flights under k feet at London City Airport	1
Consultation is inaccessible / incomprehensible / difficult to understand	8
Very important that people who live under flight paths are consulted and engaged / considered	1
Comments about the Davies Airports Commission - and implications for current consultation	1
,Consultation period is too short / consultation rushed	2
Concerns that not all residents, who the consultation was relevant for, were consulted	2
Request for all residents, that this concerns, to be consulted / wants views to be considered before changes are made	1
Comments about lack of awareness of the consultation	1
Requires a response to respondent's letter/response/question	10
Criticism of the consultation	9
Comments about lack of publicity / adverts	5
Sceptical about the consultation / taking interest in local people's responses	3
Questions about demographics are not relevant	1
Maps/documents misleading	1
Tax payers deserve to have a say	1
issues of impartiality	3
The consultation is about economic growth / profits / commercial interests at heart	2
Some questions not addressed in the consultation (e.g. levels of pollution existing flights cause / evidence from studies about effects of pollution / which aircraft pollute more than others / how weather affects pollution etc)	1
Complaints about publicity materials / not easily readable	1
Comments about repetition in the consultation materials	1
Comments about other consultations/previous consultations being extended	1
Comments about mistake not to consult again	1

Comments about consultation not taking account of people who live under London City / Heathrow flightpaths	1
Flight paths around Gatwick look fine, although 4k feet is a little low	1
Only when regulations are observed may a comprehensive review be undertaken	1
ENDORSEMENTS	10
Support the response from Leigh Parish Council	2
Support the response from GACC	7
Reference to Westerham Council's submission	1
REFERENCES / DIAGRAMS	4
Reference to maps / pictures / photographs	2
Reference to other papers / correspondence	2
OUT OF SCOPE	1
Mentions of night time flights	1
COMPENSATION	5
Mentions of compensation	5
REFERENCE TO OTHER AIRPORTS	11
Heathrow Airport	4
Luton Airport	1
Stansted Airport	2
Thames Estuary / Boris Island	1
Manston Airport	1
Manston Airport	1
Nutfield Airport	2
Isle of Grain Airport	1
AIRPORT EXPANSION	8
,Oppose Gatwicks extension/the location of Gatwick does not lend itself to further expansion	2
References to London City Airport expansion planning application / plans for expansion	1
Subtext of this consultation is to permit a large increase in air traffic / increases in air traffic / expansion	1
Object to further airport expansion	2
Comments about potential expansion of airports	2
Comments about Gatwick unable to cope with recent flooding	1
MISCELLANEOUS	47
Tunbridge Wells/associated towns/villages are affected by Westerly Operations	1
Flights do not always use designated flight paths	1
References to a second runway at Gatwick	9
Comments about current aircraft noise	20
Comments about impact of current aircraft	5
Comments about noisy airbus jets / A319/A320 series / whine noise	5
Comments about existing pollution / or pollution not from aircraft	11
Comments about how aircraft currently affect respondent/people	1
Comments of motorway / traffic congestion	3
Comments about Gatwick Airport unable to cope in recent floods/bad weather	1
Comments about departures from Runway 08	1
Comments about how ATC control aircraft	1
Comments about LB Newham failing to police London City Airport	1
Comments about different noise assessment measures at Gatwick and London City Airport	1
Comments about climate change	1
Reference to current night flights	1
Comments about opposing relaxation of control of aircraft from Gatwick Airport	1
Reference to 1974 agreement and overflying	1

Appendix D3 London Airspace Consultation Responses from organisations: online response form 1st April 2014

This document shows final topline results for responses made by organisations to the London Airspace Consultation, carried out on behalf of National Air Traffic Services

All responses shown in this document were made through the online response form during the consultation period of 15 October 2013 - 21 January 2014.

Findings reflect the view of all organisations which submitted a response to each question

Responses are shown in the form of numbers not percentages

Total

	Base size:	47
Q11_A	Making best use of Gatwick Airport Runway 26	
	Strongly support	4
	Tend to support	10
	Neither support nor oppose	13
	Tend to oppose	2
	Strongly oppose	13
	Don't know	5
	Support	14
Oppose	15	
	Base size:	33
Q11_B	Reasons to Support / positive comments	12
	Proposed changes make sense	2
	Better efficiency	1
	Support provided there is a balance between impact of realignment and noise in sensitive areas	2
	Support to minimise noise impact	1
	Support the objective for reasons stated in the Consultation	2
	Supported, as fit well with Noise Policy statement for England of reducing noise	1
	High departure routes with uninterrupted climbs means less people will be affected	1
	Support two routes in a particular direction as it is good noise management	1
	Tend to support this objective as it is likely to result in a reduced requirement for controlled airspace.	1
	Support provided does not impact on Heathrow operations	1
	We tend to support making the best use of Gatwick Runway 26 but always on the basis that it does not interfere or prejudice the operational needs of Dunsfold Airport whose flight needs and frequencies will increase in the near future	1
	Reasons to Oppose / negative comments	14
	Concerns about impact on local area due to increases in air traffic	3
	Concerns about noise pollution	1
	Not enough information has been provided on specific flight paths	1
	Economic benefit outweighed by effect on population/environment below flight path	1
	Concerns on effect of increased flight concentration on noise	1
	Oppose if routes are positioned over highly populated areas, such as Horsham	1
	Proposals would affect people in the new developments in Kilnwood Vale/Horsham	1
	Could negatively affect business	1
	Could affect visitors enjoyment to outdoor attractions	1
	Change in flight path could affect opportunities for residents	1
	Increased overflight below 4000ft will have a detrimental effect on Sevenoaks community	1
	Noise will affect tranquility/beautiful countryside	1
	As leads to disturbance for new areas	1
	Noise could influence students learning	1
	We do not support the realignment of Runway 26 and strongly oppose any additional flight paths to accommodate increased traffic.	1
	Questioning in whose interest are the proposals based upon	1
	Reasons for Neither/ Nor	3
	Not likely to have a large impact on the area	2
	Depends on where the routes are	1
	General comments	2
Guidance required on how RNAV and non-RNAV aircraft will be managed	1	
Greater use of TIG/ WIZ departure route would increase noise exposure	1	
Suggestions	8	
Needs to fit with existing/future improvements	1	
The impact of changes on the local area should be taken into account when decision the outcome/next steps	2	
Primary concern should be to minimise noise	1	
Realignment should consider impacts of people/dwellings below flight path	1	
Optimal design is encouraged	1	
Gatwick aircraft should fly between 3000ft-4000ft over Nutfield parish to avoid Redhill airspace	1	
Reducing NPRs would result in more concentrated noise pollution over designated areas	1	
Decision needs to be made on airport capacity before this approach is considered	1	
Reconsider change in flight path	1	

Q12_Aa	To make a tighter right hand turn or earlier turn) to restrict aircraft/noise over the most populated areas of Imberhorne and East Grinstead	1
	Not increasing power/turning too steeply to minimise noise	1
	Base size:	47
	Respite Routes for Gatwick Airport below 4,000ft	
	Strongly support	4
	Tend to support	14
	Neither support nor oppose	8
	Tend to oppose	4
	Strongly oppose	14
	Don't know	3
Support	18	
Oppose	18	
Q12_Ab	Base size:	29
	Respite Routes for Gatwick Airport between 4,000ft and 7,000ft	
	Strongly support	0
	Tend to support	11
	Neither support nor oppose	7
	Tend to oppose	3
	Strongly oppose	7
	Don't know	1
	Support	11
	Oppose	10
Q12_B	Base size:	35
	Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the objective of providing respite routes below 4,000ft and/or between 4,000ft and 7,000ft.	
	Reasons to support respite routes / positive comments	12
	Modern aircraft navigational capabilities allow for accurate tracking/routing away from populated area	1
	It will manage noise more effectively/reduce noise impact	4
	A good idea in principle as spreads the burden	4
	Support respite so long as doesn't involve significant areas of population being affected/has proven benefit for people	2
	We tend to support making the best use of Gatwick Runway 26 but always on the basis that it does not interfere or prejudice the operational needs of Dunsfold Airport	1
	Support as long as no increase in track miles or negative impact on descent profile	1
	As long as, no new areas are overflowed and those that have previously been aren't overflowed	1
	Reasons to oppose respite routes / negative comments	14
	Concerns about lack of scientific research into effect of noise disturbance / comments about a trial / pilot	1
	Comments about areas that will be newly overflowed and therefore impacted	1
	Noise is spread over a wider area/more people affected	6
	Added complexity of departure and arrival routes, increases risk of mistakes made by controllers and pilots degrading safety	1
	Only one route would optimise fuel burn and CO2 emissions	1
	Fewer people that are exposed to noise, fewer that need to mitigate against impacts	1
	Concerns that it will impact on more people	1
	Not a valid proposal just a stop gap for the main issue	1
	Tend to oppose respite routes on the assumption that additional controlled airspace below 7000ft would be required.	1
	Will not lessen negative impact for those underneath flight paths	1
	House price devaluation	1
	The departure route that currently affects our area is that of the Seaford 08 Departure and it is any change to that in line with 3.22. described as "Respite Routes" that we object to	1
Respite is a proposal that speaks of desperation	1	
General comments about respite routes	7	
Ensure respite leads to no extra miles flown/fuel burnt/low altitude flights/concern this may happen	1	
Routes needed to be assessed for economic/environmental impact	1	
Welcome proposal that PBN could be used to create respite routes that could be applied to populated areas and noise sensitive areas	1	
No indication of where respite routes will be/support depends on knowing where they will be	1	
Noise impact has already been reduced by technological advancements	1	
Properties that are under existing flight paths will benefit most from respite	1	
Respite does not address concerns of increased overflight over Sevonoaks Weald	1	

RESPIRE ROUTES - SUGGESTIONS		11
Keeping closer to the West of the Seaford departing SID rather than the East side which is over the most populated areas, is the definitely preferred route. With the alternative respite route being the centre line of this SID departure route.		1
Should minimise locations where residents are exposed to noise		2
Position of routes needs to minimise noise/impact on people/populated areas		1
Dispersal of flight paths or use of alternate paths so people have predicable respite would be beneficial		1
More research/ a trial is needed to assess benefits/potential/implications/need to involve specialist researchers		2
Flight paths need to avoid areas not previously overflown / minimal existing air traffic		1
Respite routes must be determined by safety/planned around the safety case		1
Provision of additional routes to Runway 26 would facilitate respite		1
Flight paths should be clear to people when they move to an area		1
Modern navigation capabilities allow very accurate tracking, which could be used to route aircraft away from population concentrations in the first instance		1
Dispersal and airborne predictable respite are valid noise management options to be considered, where large concentrated areas of population cannot be avoided.		1
Where provision of respite is considered, operational resilience must also be taken into account		1
It should be possible to route aircraft away from population centres around Gatwick Airport		1
Complexity needs to be minimised to avoid additional workload/ambiguity of the flight deck/take up memory FMS database		1
Multiple routes with similar names increase the risk of mis-selection		1
Whilst it might seem fair to "split" the departures over the two "edge" routes, the westerly route affecting us, suffers far more (3 reasons given - see response)		1
No answer		2
Base size:		45
Q13_A	Please indicate which, if any, place(s) or area(s) within the consultation swathes you think require special consideration in the on-going design process. Please describe the characteristics of these locations, stating whether they should be considered due to concerns about noise impact, visual impact and/or any other impact?	
	EAST SUSSEX	2
	Ashdown Forest	1
	Chailey	1
	ESSEX	5
	Southend	1
	Walton on Naze Backwaters	1
	North Essex, Bradfield	1
	North Essex, Manningtree	2
	North Essex Wrabness,	1
	North Essex, Harwich	1
	Stock	1
	Ramsden Heath	1
	South and West Hanningfield	1
	Runwell	1
	Rettendon	1
	Battlesbridge	1
	South Woodham Ferrers	1
	HIGH WEALD	5
	High Weald AONB	5
	KENT DOWNS	2
	Kent Downs ANOB	2
	KENT	18
	Chiddingstone / Chiddingstone High Street / Chiddingstone Castle / Chiddingstone Causeway	2
	Crockham Hill	1
	Hever Castle	4
	Penshurst / Penhurst Place/ Penshurst Place & Gardens	3
	Sevenoaks / Sevenoaks Weald	4
	Tonbridge	1
	Westerham	1
	Isle of Sheppey	1
	North Kent	1
	Ashurst Wood	1
	Riverhill Himalayan Gardens	1
	Chartwell National Trust Property	1
	St. Julian's Country Club	1
	Swale Estuary	1
	Teynham	1
	North Kent Corridor	1
	Thanet	1

Weald School	1
Weald Village	1
Weald Primary School / Pre-School	1
LONDON AREA	1
Downham	1
SOUTH DOWNS	1
South Downs National Park	1
SUFFOLK	10
Shotley Peninsula	3
South Suffolk AONB / coasts / heaths	2
Dedham Vale	7
Stour Valley	2
Suffolk Coasts / Heaths	3
River Orwell	2
River Stour / Stour Estuary	2
West of Dedham Vale lying between Sudbury and Halstead	1
SURREY	8
Surrey Downs /Surrey Hills AONB	3
Lingfield	1
Dormansland	1
Godstone	1
Surrey	1
Holmwood Common	1
South Nutfield	1
Nutfield	1
Northern boundary in vicinity of Caterham	1
Dunsfold Aerodrome	1
Felbridge	1
WEST SUSSEX	6
Horsham	1
Broadbridge Heath	1
Area around Horsham	1
East Grinstead	2
Crawley Down	2
Turners Hill/ Balcombe	1
West Hoathly/Sharpthorne	1
Domewood	1
Furnace Wood	1
St Leonards Forest	1
Imberhorne	2
OTHER	10
National Trust properties / National Trails / Historic houses	1
Populated areas	1
Community facilities / schools / hospitals / nursing homes	2
Wildlife / biodiversity	1
Unspecified heritage assets / listed buildings / conservation areas / battlefields / monuments / parks	1
Hoo Peninsula	1
Woodland Trust(s) sites	1
Copthorne	2
Minister -on-Sea	1
AONBs	2
National Parks	1
Airspace west of Gatwick Airport	1
REFERENCE TO CONSULTATION DOCUMENT	1
Figure B8 Page B24	1
General Comments	3
Organisation cannot comment as does not have local knowledge	1
The proposed low level airspace boundary takes no account of the A226 and A264, prime landmarks used in visual navigation by VFR light aircraft using this area of airspace. A small adjustment of the airspace boundary to inside these features will not affect the routings for controlled traffic into Gatwick and will allow safer VFR navigation and reduce the risk of controlled airspace infringement.	1
Airspace design cannot compromise safety for benefit of environmentally sensitive area	1
easyJet supports a design that does not impose route restrictions that may give rise to inefficient flight profiles. Full consideration should be given to the advantages offered by the use of PBN, and the capability of modern aircraft to fly precise flight paths as well as the ability to climb rapidly.	1
Reasons why area may need special consideration	35
Area is protected / conservation area / nationally recognised landscape/ramsar site	9
Concerns about noise impacts	11
Area is an AONB/ avoid AONBs	6

	Areas have not been previously overflown	1
	Visitors of areas are looking for peace and tranquility / impact on tourism	3
	Businesses serving needs of visitors / economic implications	4
	Concerns about visual impact	4
	For reasons for cultural heritage	4
	Wildlife in the area	1
	General concerns about effect of increased flights on the area	3
	Concerns about emissions/environmental impact	2
	Site/s are of special scientific interest	1
	Interested to find out about effects of proposed changes on atmospheric nitrogen levels	1
	Area is a Ramsar site	2
	Hever Castle is a particularly sensitive area and should be avoided given importance as a heritage site	1
	Concerns about pollution	4
	Areas around Horsham should avoided due to large scale residential developments and proposed future developments/ impact of noise due to overflight would be significant	1
	Air Quality	1
	Will affect general amenity	1
	As places of rest and relaxation	2
	As previously overflown within SFD NPR	1
	As atmospheric pollution may affect pupil's health	1
	Aviation reasons / Class G airspace critical to organisation	1
	Children unable to concentrate	1
	Negative impact on breeding stock / livestock . Mill production	1
	The following schools require special consideration in the on-going design process, particularly in relation to noise impact:- Itchenfield Primary School/ - Slinfold Primary School/ - Rudgwick Primary School/ - Loxwood Primary School/ - Plaistow and Kirdford Primary School/ - Fairway Infant school/ - Copthorne CE Junior School/ - Crawley Down Village School/ - Balcombe CE Primary School/ - Handcross Primary School/ - Warninglid Primary School/ - Holy Trinity CE Primary School/ - St Marks CE Primary School/ - Colgate Primary School/ - St Andrews Primary School/ and - Rusper Primary School.	1
	Area already overflown from flights to Luton and Stansted Airports	1
	The SFD 08 departure is currently over farmland. Any additional routes would impact households to both the west and the east of the route,	1
	It is vitally important that Dunsfold, which is expected to renew its ATZ to 2,500ft is not prejudiced in any way	1
	Airspace use over Suffolk should be at a minimum because of the area of outstanding beauty and the detrimental effect from pollutants	1
	Would impact housing developments	1
	Suggestions	9
	Support for much more activity over water/the sea than land (Thames Estuary / North Sea / English Channel)	1
	Nationally/internationally recognised sites within the consultation swathes shown in Figures B8 and B9 should be considered due to noise impacts. Sites include Special Protection Areas (SPAs) for birds, Ramsar and sites of SSI	1
	Recommend that protected landscapes are classified as noise sensitive sites	1
	Stay above 5000ft over Sevenoaks	1
	Airport overflying above 7000ft could take place over the Thames Estuary due to local aircraft movements from Manston	1
	Burn more fuel to avoid flying over ancient villages/countryside	1
	Operational efficiency of the airspace must always be considered	1
	Little importance should be placed on visual impact of aircraft	1
	The area to the north of Brentwood, Billericay and Wickford should be excluded from the corridor	1
	Boundaries should not be rigid when planning airspace	1
	Extra flights would compound wide affects on AONBs	1
	Seems to be no limit on flight number using proposed approach	1
	No further flights over the AONBs should even be contemplated into London City until the present impacts have been addressed	1
	Uncertain about assessments made	1
	Approach and departure routes should remain south of Dunsfold Aerodrome	1
	Base size:	38
Q13_B	Please provide any additional information you feel is relevant in the space below	
	General Comments	3
	Organisation cannot comment as does not have local knowledge	1
	The proposed low level airspace boundary takes no account of the A226 and A264, prime landmarks used in visual navigation by VFR light aircraft using this area of airspace. A small adjustment of the airspace boundary to inside these features will not affect the routings for controlled traffic into Gatwick and will allow safer VFR navigation and reduce the risk of controlled airspace infringement.	1

Airspace design cannot compromise safety for benefit of environmentally sensitive area	1
easyJet supports a design that does not impose route restrictions that may give rise to inefficient flight profiles. Full consideration should be given to the advantages offered by the use of PBN, and the capability of modern aircraft to fly precise flight paths as well as the ability to climb rapidly.	1
Reasons why area may need special consideration	35
Area is protected / conservation area / nationally recognised landscape/ramsar site	9
Concerns about noise impacts	11
Area is an AONB/ avoid AONBs	6
Areas have not been previously overflowed	1
Visitors of areas are looking for peace and tranquility / impact on tourism	3
Businesses serving needs of visitors / economic implications	4
Concerns about visual impact	4
For reasons for cultural heritage	4
Wildlife in the area	1
General concerns about effect of increased flights on the area	3
Concerns about emissions/environmental impact	2
Site/s are of special scientific interest	1
Interested to find out about effects of proposed changes on atmospheric nitrogen levels	1
Area is a Ramsar site	2
Hever Castle is a particularly sensitive area and should be avoided given importance as a heritage site	1
Concerns about pollution	4
Areas around Horsham should avoided due to large scale residential developments and proposed future developments/ impact of noise due to overflight would be significant	1
Air Quality	1
Will affect general amenity	1
As places of rest and relaxation	2
As previously overflowed within SFD NPR	1
As atmospheric pollution may affect pupil's health	1
Aviation reasons / Class G airspace critical to organisaion	1
Children unable to concentrate	1
Negative impact on breeding stock / livestock/mill production	1
The following schools require special consideration in the on-going design process, particularly in relation to noise impact:- Itchinfild Primary School/ - Slinfold Primary School/ - Rudgwick Primary School/ - Loxwood Primary School/ - Plaistow and Kirdford Primary School/ - Fairway Infant school/ - Copthorne CE Junior School/ - Crawley Down Village School/ - Balcombe CE Primary School/ - Handcross Primary School/ - Warninglid Primary School/ - Holy Trinity CE Primary School/ - St Marks CE Primary School/ - Colgate Primary School/ - St Andrews Primary School/ and - Rusper Primary School.	1
Area already overflowed from flights to Luton and Stansted Airports	1
The SFD 08 departure is currently over farmland. Any additional routes would impact households to both the west and the east of the route,	1
It is vitally important that Dunsfold, which is expected to renew its ATZ to 2,500ft is not prejudiced in any way	1
Airspace use over Suffolk should be at a minimum because of the area of outstanding beauty and the detrimental effect from pollutants	1
Would impact housing developments	1
Suggestions	9
Support for much more activity over water/the sea than land (Thames Estuary / North Sea / English Channel)	1
Nationally/internationally recognised sites within the consultation swathes shown in Figures B8 and B9 should be considered due to noise impacts. Sites include Special Protection Areas (SPAs) for birds, Ramsar and sites of SSI	1
Recommend that protected landscapes are classified as noise sensitive sites	1
Stay above 5000ft over Sevenoaks	1
Airport overflying above 7000ft could take place over the Thames Estuary due to local aircraft movements from Manston	1
Burn more fuel to avoid flying over ancient villages/countryside	1
Operational efficiency of the airspace must always be considered	1
Little importance should be placed on visual impact of aircraft	1
The area to the north of Brentwood, Billericay and Wickford should be excluded from the corridor	1
Boundaries should not be rigid when planning airspace"	1
Extra flights would compound wide affects on AONBs	1
Seems to be no limit on flight number using proposed approach	1
No further flights over the AONBs should even be contemplated into London City until the present impacts have been addressed	1
Uncertain about assessments made	1
Approach and departure routes should remain south of Dunsfold Aerodrome	1

	Schools	1
	Area between Gatwick and Tonbridge	1
	East Grinstead	2
	Crawley Down	1
	Cophthorne	1
	Penshurt Place & Gardens	1
	Hartfield	1
	Swale Area	1
	North Kent	1
	Populous Areas	2
	AONBs	1
	Newick	1
	Chailey	1
	Wivelsfield	1
	South Downs National Park	1
	Dedham Vale	1
	Suffolk Coasts / Heaths	2
	Airspace west of Gatwick Airport	1
	Weald Village	1
	Ightham Mote Nat Trust	1
	Knole Park Nat Trust	1
	Riverhill House	1
	Long Barn House	1
	Nizels Golf Course	1
	Imberhorne Lane	1
	SFD 08 departure	1
	Dunsfold Aerodrome	1
	Reasons given for time sensitive areas	16
	Area is sensitive at all times of day and night as it is a centre of population	1
	Tourist attractions should be avoided where possible	2
	Castle has an open-air theatre	1
	Specific times in day when area should not be subject to overflight	1
	If flight path is affecting a large number of people	1
	Overflying could negatively affect economy of area	1
	Shouldn't be over historic homes/ gardens which rely on tranquility	1
	Areas heavily overflown below 4k	1
	Would affect outdoor events in summer (e.g. weddings)	1
	Concerns over possible increase in the amount of controlled airspace required by potential Respite Routes	1
	It should be noted that most recreation in the AONB occurs at the weekends and summer evenings and flight paths should seek to avoid these periods	1
	We consider that the whole of this area of West Kent should have special consideration. There are a large number of AONBs, SSSIs and Conservation Areas as well as a great number of well-known tourist attractions	1
	Early morning	1
	There is no reason to change the SFD 08 departure for respite reasons. Any change would be to the detriment of the surrounding population	1
	We would not be time sensitive before 07:00 or after 19:30 in winter or 20:30 during the summer months	1
	Whilst areas of outstanding natural beauty should be preserved, the preservation of quality of life at home should be sacrosanct. Areas of population should be avoided at all costs	1
	Base size:	37
Q15_A	Balancing local impact against increased CO2	
	Flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas should always have greater precedence than flying overhead on shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/ CO 2	8
	Flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas should generally have greater precedence than flying overhead on shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/ CO 2	10
	Flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas should be given equal weighting to flying overhead on shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/ CO 2	5
	Flying shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/CO 2 should generally have precedence over flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas	2
	Flying shorter routes which minimise fuel burn/CO 2 should always have precedence over flying longer routes around environmentally sensitive areas	3
	Don't know	9
	Base size:	29
Q15_B	Reasons why flying longer routes should have greater precedence	10
	The extra fuel burn/CO2 emission is likely to be minimal relative to the whole flight	1
	Effect on environment of greater fuel burn would be offset by benefit to environment of reduced noise/visual intrusions	1

	Priority has to be given to reduced and minimal noise disturbance	2
	Fuel burn/emissions reduced	1
	If environmental sensitivity means areas of high population then they should always be avoided	1
	If environmental sensitivity means AONBs or National parks, then they should generally be avoided taking into account CO2 emissions/ fuel burn	1
	Below 7000ft diversion justified by small CO2 bill	1
	Avoiding sensitive/protected/environmentally significant areas should be a priority	4
	Should be large periods of the day when overflying environmentally sensitive areas is prohibited	1
	Should take into account altitude and flight times	1
	Reasons why flying shorter routes should have precedence	3
	Less fuel used	1
	Consider using continuous descent path	1
	Use CDO on arrival, so consider CD path to avoid environmentally sensitive areas	1
	Concerns over possible increase in the amount of controlled airspace required by the proposed changes	1
	Emissions savings should always be priority	1
	Balancing local impact against increased CO2 - Suggestions	17
	While overfly routes are above 7,000ft, therefore having lower noise disturbance, other environmental objectives should be factored in such as need for fuel efficiency and minimising CO2 emissions - there has to be a balance	1
	Depends on altitude. Above 7k ft it should be the shortest route. Below 4k ft it should be to avoid noise impact. Between 4k ft and 7k ft, routes should be optimised for both noise and fuel burn	2
	For operations below 4k ft, noise and emissions should both be considered in the planning of airspace	1
	Overflight of environmentally sensitive areas should be flown as high as possible without adversely impacting continuous climb or descent profiles	1
	Low altitude route should be avoided	1
	Effect of noise should take precedence over fuel savings / emissions	1
	Flights over AONBS and European habitat designations should be avoided	2
	Shorter routes should be used to reduce CO2	1
	Take into account sensitivity of rural areas to noise	1
	Flight paths should be routed along busy areas to save disturbance of rural areas, may be no increase in fuel use	1
	AONBs & other environmentally sensitive flights should only be overflown at 7k, as disturbance will be minimal	1
	Safety should be the first priority	1
	Request that integration of Farnborough routes is taken into account when LAMP is designing new routes, in terms of environment, fuel burn and airspace limitations	1
	This Council supports a scheme to minimise CO2 emissions/, this is an area that needs to be balanced with the requirements of environmentally sensitive areas, particularly AONB's and SSI's and the potential for effect on tranquil areas. Whilst the areas within this District will be overflown above 7000ft, there is potential for visual and noise impact on these tranquil areas in particular atmospheric conditions	1
	We think that this question is spurious in that current routes would have been selected as the most efficient routing for air movements when originally designed. If the previous questions relating to the provision of respite and making the best use of the runway are true then they will always take precedence given the minimal additional fuel use that would be required in any further changes	1
	Suggest that the flight paths are set to the south of the Dedham Vale AONB. This may give shorter flightpaths and also therefore lower CO2 emissions	1
	Need to consider loss of amenity against environmental impact	1
	Altitude and timing would be factors which should be taken into account	1
	if continuous climb departure/continuous descent profiles can be achieved, then longer routes are likely to be an improvement on the current stepped routings we often see today	1
	Balancing local impact against increased CO2 - General Comments	3
	Each case needs to be treated on its own merits	2
	Not enough information/cant give a definite answer	1
	Support bandings used by DfT in defining noise/emissions trade-off	1
	Base size:	26
Q16_Aa	Arrivals based on Point Merge at Gatwick	
	Strongly support	4
	Tend to support	11
	Neither support nor oppose	5
	Tend to oppose	2
	Strongly oppose	2
	Don't know	2
	Support	15
	Oppose	4

Q16_Ab	Base size:	30
	Arrivals based on Point Merge for London City and London Biggin Hill	
	Strongly support	3
	Tend to support	16
	Neither support nor oppose	6
	Tend to oppose	1
	Strongly oppose	0
	Don't know	4
	Support	19
	Oppose	1
Q16_B	Base size:	28
	Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the objective of a system based around Point Merge.	
	Point Merge in General Positive Comments about Point Merge	10
	Point merge is beneficial / a positive change	3
	Point Merge is more efficient/will reduce delays/improve performance	5
	Reduces fuel burn	2
	Reduces CO2 emissions / reduces environmental impact	4
	Areas affected by aircraft noise are reduced	1
	Point Merge will keep aircraft higher for longer	1
	Supported provided does not impact communities/people/residents/protected areas	2
	Departing aircraft can achieve a higher altitude more quickly	1
	Stacking and vectoring is inefficient/Point Merge removes need for it	2
	NATS should place importance on pursuing this due to benefits outlined	1
	Support if can demonstrate that fuel burn/CO2 emissions are minimised	1
	Negative Comments about Point Merge	4
	Concerns that more precise/ condensed tracks concentrate noise	1
	Concerns about Point Merge fuel requirements/fuel burn	1
	Concentrating flights into one Merge Point will be intolerable for the areas affected	1
	The possibility of increased flights and shorter gaps between flights on a concentrated flight path is concerning, particularly at low altitudes	1
	Stacking during busy times seems counterproductive as there will be two systems in operation	1
	Point Merge Suggestions	13
	Arcs/ point merge should be placed out at sea / support this	4
	More investigations/Modelling required for viable alternatives	1
	Stacking should take place over the sea (not over ANOBs/national parks)	1
	Keep aircraft as high as possible for as long as possible within safety limits	1
	CAA/NATS should look at alternatives to Point Merge	1
	Put Point Merge arcs over the English Channel/Thames Estuary/over water	2
	To avoid holding, emphasis should be placed on departure, en-route speed and arrival management techniques	1
	More understanding of the operational impacts of Point Merge is required before proposals can be endorsed without reservation	2
	Alternatives to PM should encompass clear benefits and be validated by stakeholders	1
	Fuel planning issues need to be addressed	1
	The PM should not be located over land and should avoid environmentally sensitive areas	1
It affects the operations of Dunsfold Aerodrome to a lesser extent	1	
It is expected that, as a norm, there will be minimal routine use of the full arc procedure	1	
	Base size:	22
Q17_A	Accommodating Non-Compliant Operators	
	Accommodated but with time restrictions	3
	Accommodated but with restricted route availability	4
	Accommodated but with potential delay	5
	Accommodated without restriction (and therefore reducing efficiency for all)	3
	Should not be accommodated at all	8
	Don't know	4
Q17_B	Base size:	15
	What, if any, comments do you have on accommodating non-certified aircraft?	
	Negative	1
	0630 Concerns that accommodating non-compliant operators could lead to a need for increased controlled airspace	1
	Neutral/General	5
	0848 NATS must continue to accommodate non-compliant aircraft / non-compliant aircraft should be accommodated as much as possible	2
	0849 Not accommodated as to maximise benefits of changes (in reasons not to accommodate net)	1
0850 Non-RNAV certified aircraft should not be accommodated at all after 31 Dec 18	2	

	Suggestions	8
	Non-certified aircraft should only be accommodated, but with restrictions	2
	Non-RNAV aircraft should not be accommodated after a deadline for it to be achieved has been reached	1
	short timeline should be given for exclusion of all non-compliant aircraft	1
	Airports/NATS should work with non-compliant operators to encourage them to become compliant within a clearly defined timescale	1
	Accommodation should depend on the proportion of users that are compliant	1
	The system should be able to use the benefits of modern technology	1
	Comments about incentivising non-compliant aircraft to become compliant	1
	Our main concern is continuing access to airspace at all levels to/from overhead Chilbolton used to coordinate with the Met observatory, though any other airspace within the Consultation Area could be under investigation on a very sporadic basis	1
	This organisation also operates maritime patrol aircraft which may also be uncertified at the time of implementation	1
	Arrangements will have to be made for specialised operations such as police and air ambulance helicopters	1
	Base size:	21
Q18_A	Point Merge Fuelling Policy	
	Part of the contingency fuel uplift	4
	Part of the flight plannable route fuel uplift	5
	Don't know	12
	Base size:	12
Q18_B	Please state the reasons why you believe fuel for the Point Merge arcs should be considered part of the contingency fuel uplift or part of the flight plannable route fuel uplift?	
	Reasons for Part of the contingency fuel uplift	2
	Inefficiencies associated with planning fuel uplift for whole length of Arc	1
	PM fuel should be treated in same way as currently	1
	Reasons for Part of the flight plannable route fuel uplift	3
	No delay expected - fuel to be included in the flight plannable route fuel uplift	1
	Fuel implications should not be treated as a contingency	1
	Not in favour of reduced contingency fuel	1
	Suggestions	5
	Point Merge arc (say 50% of arc length) should be used for planning purposes	2
	Point Merge structures should be promulgated as 'Linear Holds' and not as STARS	1
	Need a fuel policy to cope with point merge	3
	PM Fuel policy should be prioritised as is the biggest cost to aircraft operators	1
	General comments	3
	Decision lies with individual carriers	2
	Should be based on safety and operational procedures / safety should not be compromised	1
	British Airways uses a flight planning system that has the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) approved concept of statistical contingency fuel	1
	PM Arcs will increase trip fuel required/increased financial/env cost	1
	Base size:	25
Q19_A	Fuel Burn Efficiency for Specific Routes	
	Strongly support	7
	Tend to support	5
	Neither support nor oppose	7
	Tend to oppose	2
	Strongly oppose	1
	Don't know	3
	Support	12
	Oppose	3
	Base size:	16
Q19_B	Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the proposal seeking to reduce overall fuel burn across the fleet by as much as possible, even if it means some individual routes may be less fuel efficient as a consequence.	
	Reasons to Support	9
	Generally supportive of robustness of evidence and intended outcome of an overall reduction in fuel consumption and CO2 emissions	1
	Provides overall optimum result	1
	Broadly desirable but needs to factor in other environmental considerations	1
	Supports the objective in principle but overall savings must be demonstrated	1
	Must be fuel burn reduction available to all operators and from all London Airports	1
	Agree with overall objective to reduce fuel consumption	1
	If fuel/emissions are reduced - support proposal	4
	Reasons to Oppose	2
	Lack of information	1
	Avoid environmentally sensitive areas even if more fuel burn	1

	General comments/suggestions - Fuel Burn Efficiency for Specific Routes	5
	Reducing fuel burn is a society objective and so should be assessed across the fleet	1
	Need for balance of environmentally sensitive areas	1
	Further work is needed in order for an informed view to be taken	1
	People are more important than other factors	1
	Need holistic view/transparency/independence	2
	Compensation could be paid by those benefitting to those losing	1
	Base size:	21
Q20_A	Controlled Airspace Boundaries	
	A large impact	6
	A medium impact	2
	A small impact	3
	No impact at all	2
	Don't know	8
	Large/medium impact	8
	Small/no impact	5
	Base size:	13
Q20_B	If you believe it has an impact, please describe the operation(s) that would potentially be affected.	
	Reason for answer	6
	Should not be to the disadvantage of IFR commercial traffic	1
	Object to any reclassification of airspace and if it has to be re-classified then it should be to D or Class C	1
	LAMP and Farnborough need to co-ordinate fully and efficiently on their airspace proposals so as not to adversely impact GA and air sports stakeholders	1
	Any increased traffic will obviously have a considerable impact which will be made worse if the flights come in on a lower path. Any impact must be subject to further consultation	1
	Lowering controlled airspace boundaries means, effectively, adding another layer to an already crammed cake. Why double the misery?	1
	Those flights operating outside controlled airspace and routing within controlled airspace to and from precise points out of scientific necessity. Maritime patrol and Atmospheric research could be affected	1
	Suggestions - CAB	2
	The question needs to be placed in context of improvements to arrival flows being a highly beneficial undertaking to pursue	1
	We are concerned to ensure that lowering some areas of controlled airspace do not impact on the potential for other airports to grow, specifically Manston airport, Kent. We would not want controlled airspace to restrict the ability for Manston to develop	1
	GENERAL - Negative comments about the Proposals - Controlled Airspace Boundaries	2
	Concerns about noise measurement / 57 DB Laeq 16h contour is wrong measurement / underestimates noise disturbance	1
	Concerns over based of LTMA not being raised despite proposals for more continuous climb and descent routes	1
	Base size:	39
Q21	Please provide any other information that you feel is relevant to the on-going development of the airspace covered by this consultation.	
	GENERAL	24
	OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS	16
	Opposes increase in flights over green belt settlement area (Nuffield and South Nuffield)	1
	Area lies outside of the consultation area/ wouldn't affect their area	1
	Some people/areas will be affected more and others less by the proposals / some people will be newly affected	1
	Supportive of the work of LAMP / the proposals	2
	Priority should be to reduce noise/visual impacts/emissions/these are more important than profit or efficiency	1
	Concern over safety issues with planes below 4000ft with planes from Redhill Aerodrome	1
	Proposals will affect residents health & well-being (negative)	1
	Airspace changes have a significant affect on large population centres	1
	More aircraft using TIG/ WIZ and less using LAMB/ BIG/ CLN/ DVR conflicts with legacy proposal	1
	Concerns over the airspace being available for smaller airfields (stow Maries aerodrome)	1
	During previous role I saw proposals which looked good but didn't deliver	1
	Take a keen interest in any aviation developments	1
	Proposals will improve safety	1
	We support increased efficiency of air traffic flow, but wish to retain the ability to conduct research which requires non standard access to portions of this airspace on an infrequent basis	1
	Potential for Peace & tranquility to be affected by Air traffic	1
	Sensitive conservation areas affected	1
	Need to carry out further research on flight paths/ respite routes/ health effects	1
	Airspace change/modernisation is long overdue	1

No objection to the proposals	1
Support overall objective of increase fuel efficiency, minimising CO2 emissions whole managing noise impacts	1
Supports airspace development as London airspace is congested (move to general section)	2
Aviation brings economic/social benefits that can't be ignored	1
Intention to improve safety is welcomed	1
Welcomes work to improve airspace design	1
Supportive of the proposals to streamline air traffic management	1
SUGGESTIONS	13
Need for more research/more understanding of impact on noise/pollution/environment	1
Full integration of routes within the London area, which would achieve the greatest overall benefit (in terms of airport flow, CO2 emissions and fuel burn)	1
Flights organised so no one suffers greatly	1
NATS and Gatwick will face considerable opposition to changes	1
Reducing health impact of noise from overflying aircraft should be a priority in redesign of airspace management	1
Limiting Gatwick aircraft to fly below 4000ft, may impact on the safety of smaller planes flying from Redhill Aerodrome	1
Encourage use of regional airports such as Manston	1
Controlled airspace shouldn't constrict development of Manston	1
Encourage use of regional airports such as Manston	1
Mention of a need for compliance with environmental regulations	1
Favour respite routes for London City Airport	2
Change route to avoid Chiddingington Castle/village	1
Keep aircraft as high as possible for as long as possible	1
Fit vortex generators on aircraft to minimise noise	1
Important to have some indication of cumulative impact of the various phases of the Airspace programme	2
The emphasis must remain focussed on taking advantage of PBN together with concerted action to introduce CCO and CDO	1
COMMENTS ABOUT THE CONSULTATION / CONSULTATION PROCESS	18
Not enough information/unable to comment because incomplete/need to know more	2
Need for further consultation/would like to consulted again/duty to have 2nd consultation	2
Organisation wishes to be included in future consultations	5
Welcome the consultation / opportunity to comment / interested party	1
Concern about technology used for consultation/should make hard copies available	1
Willing to share experiences / provide advice	2
The consultation is too early/premature - needs to wait for recommendations from the AC about runway capacity in the SE	1
Vital to consult all residents affected/concerns that not all those affected have been properly consulted	1
Consultation should be completed without delay as there is considerable environmental benefit to be achieved	1
Good to show that future decisions will be based on overall and not individual benefits/ shows all stakeholders treated in the same manner	1
Aspects of the consultation were confusion and technical terms weren't used correctly	1
No comment throughout submission	1
Welcomed that consultation is published in context of environmental objectives of Government	1
Consultation is not understandable to those outside the aviation industry and could affect their ability to comment on it	1
Considerable distrust of the consultation	1
Unhappy that there will not be a consultation on the routes	1
Lack of proper considerations in this consultation programme could have a serious impact and affect on the future viability of aviation business at Dunsfold Aerodrome	1
REFERENCES / DIAGRAMS	1
Reference to other papers / correspondence	1
COMPENSATION	4
Residents/businesses affected should get compensation	3
Those affected should be compensated (e.g. financial compensation / noise amelioration such as double or triple glazing)	1
REFERENCE TO OTHER AIRPORTS	1
Manston Airport	1
AIRPORT EXPANSION	3
Comments about a second runway at Gatwick	2
Object to further expansion at Gatwick	1
MISCELLANEOUS	8
Airbus A319/320 is particularly noisy	1
Comments about abolition/reduction in night flights into Gatwick	1
Comments about Runway 08	2

	Night flights should be restricted at Gatwick	1
	Not Responding to LAMP Consultation	1
	Height of Gatwick planes through Redhill airspace is dangerous for smaller aircraft which rely on visual navigation	1
	Concerns about impact of current flights	1
	Aircraft noise less of an issue over towns	1

London Airspace
Consultation

NATS

YOUR LONDON AIRPORT
Gatwick

Appendix D4 London Airspace Consultation Responses from organisations: postal and email 1st April 2014

This document shows final topline results for responses made by organisations to the London Airspace Consultation, carried out on behalf of National Air Traffic Services

All responses shown in this document were made by post or email, not through the online response form, during the consultation period of 15 October 2013 - 21 January 2014.

Findings reflect the view of all organisations which submitted a response to each question

Responses are shown in the form of numbers not percentages

		Total
	Base size:	33
Q11	PartB Please state the reasons why you support or oppose this objective to realign all Gatwick Airport Runway 26 departure routes below 4,000ft to help make best use of the existing runway.	
	Reasons to Support / positive comments	16
	Support provided noise levels do not increase	3
	Aircraft departure routes below 4k ft are those using latest technology thus minimising noise effects	1
	Maximising utilisation of R26 means a 2nd runway not required	1
	Investing in PBN technologies / operations become more efficient / improved performance from the airport	2
	Support providing expected increase in departures can be realised	3
	Better efficiency	4
	As delays reduced so too will environmental impacts	1
	Welcome PBN as the basis for the design as this will make Gatwick Airport more efficient	2
	Support provided there is a balance between impact of realignment and noise in sensitive areas	1
	Aligns with organisation's submissions to AC that support making better use of existing runway capacity	1
	Support to minimise noise impact	1
	Without detailed information, we assume the changes would be generally helpful	2
	Reasons to Oppose / negative comments	11
	Concerns about impact on local area due to increases in air traffic	2
	Concerns about noise pollution	2
	Alternative departure routes are not needed all of the time / only required at peak times	1
	Oppose departure route for aircraft in the A320/B737 class that would overfly local villages at lower altitudes than present	1
	Not enough information has been provided on specific flight paths	2
	No mention of compensation	2
	Due to blight from flight paths	3
	Astonished by proposal given claim is not about expansion	1
	While increased heights reduce noise on the ground, this is negated by narrower low level routes where noise will increase	1
	Reduction in emissions from better routes is negated by ability to fly more aircraft	1
	Increased number of people overflowed	1
	Object top process that it is opaque and provides no opportunity for discussion post hoc by those who will be affected by the changes	1
	Do not recognise current mapping for R26 departures	1
	Concerns about safety	1
	As leads to disturbance for new areas	1
	No evidence that legacy routes will be maintained	1
	Reasons for Neither/ Nor	1
	No preference as primarily focuses on London Gatwick routes below 4k ft	1
General comments	8	
Future recommendations must clarify the requirements on NATS to provide air traffic control services versus the provision of airspace for aircraft along with the management of noise and carbon emissions	1	
Welcome and support moves to raise altitudes of aircraft by raising the transition altitude	1	

Arrival routes are currently more of a concern than departure routes for R26 due to noise	1
Difficult to comment on current flight paths and whether they should be directed away from population centres such as Edenbridge and Crockham as no information available of aircraft heights and noise generated by aircraft	1
Support requirement for aircraft to climb faster	1
Swathe for Runway 26 has potential to impact site/area/development (e.g. increasing noise)	3
Changes could have an impact on efficiency of existing/future improvements in/out of other London airports. Needs to be carefully managed	1
Welcome opportunity to comment on proposed changes to departure routings up to 4k ft	1
When will LCA be in a position to proceed with low level change proposals?	1
Guidance required on how RNAV and non-RNAV aircraft will be managed	1
Logical to assume that routes could be based on the new precision area navigation (P-RNAV) routes previously consulted on by GAL	1
Objectives from earlier airspace change are aligned with proposed current changes	1
P-RNAV Route 4 turns to the north and then east after take-off and then heads east towards Edenbridge and Sevenoaks and overflies the Kent Downs ANOB. We therefore point to legal duties to have regard to National Parks and ANOB to preserve tranquility of the countryside	1
R26 departure routes will be more concentrated along a single line. This will result in increased disturbance for people overflown.	1
Welcome comment in A3.23 that NATS/GAL are seeking the optimal set of outcomes	1
A4.13 might suggest that greater nos of people will be affected if the climb above 4k ft takes a longer period of time	1
Concerned about departure slots being one minute apart in peak period as would make life unbearable for those people under the 4k flight path	1
Suggestions	15
The impact of changes on the local area should be taken into account when decision the outcome/next steps	1
Primary concern should be to minimise noise	2
If the proposals cause more anxiety/nuisance to those overflown, they should be abandoned	1
Realignment should consider impacts of people/dwellings below flight path	2
Consideration should be given to a minimum banking threshold and minimum assent rate with penalties for infringement	1
Consideration should be given to utilising the ability of aircraft to land or take-off with tail winds to equalise use of both Gatwick runways	1
Control noise by elevating the angle of descent as much as possible	1
Use CDA under low power drag conditions	1
Unnecessary use of air brakes/landing gear to reduce speeds for spacing should be restricted to reduce noise	1
Primary objective should be to reduce impacts on businesses/people affected	1
Efforts should be made to protect noise sensitive developments	3
Design changes for Gatwick must be fully integrated within NATS overall airspace concept for the UK	1
Changes must not impose design constraints on Heathrow	2
Any realignment of departure routes must be kept inside existing NPR to avoid overflying residents not previously overflown	1
Changing NPRs needs further consultation	1
Oppose any routes than unfairly burden residents in rural West Kent	1
There needs to be agreed criteria and thresholds upon which to judge detrimental impacts of precision routes on communities living under the new flight paths	1
There is a need for noise monitoring/measurement of new departure routes	1
Optimal design is encouraged	1
London airports are too close together to be dealt with separately	1
A slight increase in route miles would be accepted if it means that on time departure can be achieved	1

Q12	Suggest removing the word "significantly" from A3.18 as this is subjective	1	
	NATS/GAL have a moral duty to seek quicker ascent/descent trajectories to minimise noise impact on the ground	1	
	Drop current plans for Runway 26 and come up with a model which can increase take-off capacity without affecting local people	1	
	Base size:		50
	PartB Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the objective of providing respite routes below 4,000ft and/or between 4,000ft and 7,000ft.		
	Reasons to support respite routes / positive comments		23
	Modern aircraft navigational capabilities allow for accurate tracking/routing away from populated area	4	
	It will manage noise more effectively/reduce noise impact	13	
	A good idea in principle as spreads the burden	4	
	Tighter flight paths would increase noise and therefore necessary to have respite	1	
	Support respite so long as doesn't involve significant areas of population being affected/has proven benefit for people	2	
	Reduces emissions	2	
	Would support in theory but oppose as no indication as to where respite routes would be	1	
	Support provided minimum effect of flight efficiency / provided aircraft operation inefficiency is not increased	3	
	Fleet will be fully RNP compliant meaning aircraft can follow ground tracks with increased predictability	1	
	Support in principle but concerned about significant extra miles flown at low altitude	2	
	Welcome principle of RRs but they must be kept within existing swathes	1	
	Better predictability as to when area overflown	1	
	Support with caveat that it potentially impacts more people regularly exposed to noise in order to offer respite	1	
	Provides respite for those overflown / desirable	2	
	More need for respite given introduction of RNAV1 and accurate deployment of PBN	1	
	Reasons to oppose respite routes / negative comments		6
	Lack of information about the proposal / no detail of where proposed routes would be	2	
	Comments about areas that will be newly overflown and therefore impacted	3	
	Current system of broad swathes gives people some protection / better / fairer	1	
	0154 GAL/NATS don't have a true understanding of noise disturbance from aircraft arriving from 25 miles away / to inflict this over a predetermined flight path with single respite route would make life untenable for those underneath flight path	2	
	Noise is spread over a wider area/more people affected	1	
	General comments about respite routes		21
	Pleased this is being done through the consultation	1	
	Ensure respite leads to no extra miles flown/fuel burnt/low altitude flights/concern this may happen	2	
	If flights go along a very narrow path, it is good for some people, but is unacceptable for those living under the flight path	3	
Each flight path must be considered on a case-by-case basis	1		
Support respite routes for London City Airport but understand this option is not available	4		
No preference as proposals focuses on low level routings at Gatwick Airport	1		
Welcome opportunity to comment on proposed changes that made be made by LCA and NATS to departure routings up to 4k ft	1		
Routes needed to be assessed for economic/environmental impact	3		
Respite is of concern as there is no definition nor any information about the distance between respite routes	1		
Understand need to mitigate noise below 4k ft	1		

Extra routes can have implications (for flight management, navigation systems capacity, flight crews in terms of operations and ATC in terms of increased complexities)	1
Variable nature of people's responses to noise exposure makes it hard to judge if respite routes will offer an improvement to people living around the airport or not	1
Welcome proposal that PBN could be used to create respite routes that could be applied to populated areas and noise sensitive areas	1
No indication of where respite routes will be/support depends on knowing where they will be	1
Proposals made for two adjoining areas are not thought to be valid	1
Modern aircraft navigational capabilities allow for accurate tracking / will facilitate respite	1
Route positioning is limited by aircraft performance (route turns limited by aircraft speed)	1
Welcome that options to improvement noise management, but would not support if noise is introduced to areas/ communities not previously overflown	1
Dispute validity of ruling out respite below 3k-4k ft.	1
No benefits on flightpath for communities within 15 miles of touchdown	1
Query as to why aircraft fly at different heights over the same points	1
Health impacts get no mention as a guiding principle	1
Respite for one may not mean for respite for all	1
From PM likely need for respite before reaching ILS approach	1
RESPITE ROUTES - SUGGESTIONS	42
Position of routes needs to minimise noise/impact on people/populated areas	1
Aim of flight paths should be to minimise effect of noise	1
Dispersal of flight paths or use of alternate paths so people have predicible respite would be beneficial	1
Comments about a need for multiple respite routes on rota basis	6
Routes need to be varied so nobody is disturbed daily / nobody should be overflown for more than two days a week	1
More research/ a trial is needed to assess benefits/potential/implications/need to involve specialist researchers	8
The introduction of 'respite routes' could lead to significant extra miles flown at low altitude and therefore additional fuel burn, which must be avoided.	1
Support the principle but oppose single flight path from a new point merge / further respite paths need to be on existing broad swathes to alleviate noise nuisance/disruption	1
Flight paths need to avoid areas not previously overflown / minimal existing air traffic	6
Further discussion is needed	1
A respite in middle of the night would be opposed if it meant more flights at beginning/end of night	1
If respite periods are implemented, they need to be trialled first for effectiveness	1
The area overflown will increase and as such, compensation needs to be looked at	1
Comments about restricting night-time flights	2
Need more than one route to spread impact/need multi-route approach	9
Do not understand any safety concerns about more than one respite route as the switch between routes can take place at less busy times	1
Point merge at sea this would allow more options	1
Significant challenge is how respite will change noise for residents/people	2
Benefits from introducing respite below 4k ft to reduce noise should have priority over fuel/CO2 emissions	1
There should be no flights over new areas/stay within existing swathes	3
Support further investigation into respite routes for London City Airport	5
Respite would only work if all air traffic removed from a specific area for specific time - want this to be given more consideration	4
Further benefits could be achieved if the point merge arcs were moved further to the south than indicated	1
Mention of a more complex system needed	3
Respite routes must be determined by safety/planned around the safety case	6

	PBN and aircraft technical capabilities will facilitate respite where required	2
	Comments about ensuring there is a business case to assess economic/environmental impact	2
	Integration into entire London network will be key	3
	Propose that height levels of aircraft should be maintained at maximum level throughout the controlled area	1
	Operators should be encouraged to use modern aircraft with quieter engines	1
	Routes must be designed to take full a/c of aircraft performance capabilities	2
	Routes should be of equal distance and altitude	1
	A balanced approach needed between trade-off of optimal fuel usage and noise mitigation	2
	This consultation is not enough/incomplete/another consultation is needed	2
	It is more important to have higher and straighter routes with continuous descent or ascent with turns as high as possible	1
	Research with regard to respite should be undertaken to see if this is a solution or not / concerns about lack of scientific research	2
	There are only two forms of meaningful respite (1) wind direction changes resulting in easterly direction lands (2) cessation of nighttime operations	1
	Have suggested to NATS that whenever runway direction is marginal, they should opt for easterly operations as that would disturb fewer people	1
	Unacceptable that there is no respite for those affected below 4k ft	1
	People who are overflowed should have opportunity for respite	1
	Those who will be overflowed (up to 7k ft) should be consulted	2
	If NATS/GAL decides that suggested notification and consultation on the use of routes is not pursued, GATCOM believe that the consultation exercise does not satisfactorily fulfil all the requirements of CAP 725 or CAP 778	1
	New terminal airspace designs must employ further improved use of PBN to facilitate continuous climb and continuous descent operations	1
	A pattern of high level disturbance would not be supported as effect on health/social effects are unknown	1
	Use angle of descent and ascent/steeper angles to reduce noise	2
	Avoiding majority of people affected should take precedence / overfly rural/countryside areas instead where possible	1
	Those not previously overflowed must not experience serious deterioration of their quality of life	1
	More attention needed on respite routes closer to Gatwick/below 3k-4k feet	1
	The noise from night flights is the biggest irritant	1
	Comments about having respite by reducing number of departures	1
	Propose that respite is trialled and understood by a specialist aviation group	1
	Increased controller intervention means PM is not necessarily less complex than stacking	1
	Flight time restrictions should be imposed at weekends/early mornings/evenings	1
	No answer	2
	Base size:	
Q13	Please indicate which, if any, place(s) or area(s) within the consultation swathes you think require special consideration in the on-going design process. Please describe the characteristics of these locations, stating whether they should be considered due to concerns about noise impact, visual impact and/or any other impact?	
	EAST SUSSEX	6
	Ashdown Forest	4
	Crowborough	3
	Ashdown Park	1
	Newick Park	1
	Uckfield	2
	Heathfield	1
	Parts of East Sussex (not specified)	1
	ESSEX	1
	Redbridge	1
	GUILDFORD	1
	Cranleigh Village	1

HIGH WEALD	10
High Weald AONB	10
KENT DOWNS	6
Kent Downs ANOB	6
KENT	14
Chiddingstone / Chiddingstone High Street / Chiddingstone Castle / Chiddingstone Causeway	7
Crockham Hill	1
Hever	5
Hever Castle	7
Ide Hill	1
Leigh	2
Penshurst / Penshurst Place/ Penshurst Place & Gardens	6
Sevenoaks / Sevenoaks Weald	1
Tonbridge	3
Toys Hill	1
Tunbridge Wells	1
Area to the west of Tonbridge and Tunbridge Wells / Tunbridge Wells	3
Hildenborough	2
Chartwell	3
Knole Park / Knole / Knole House	3
Igtham Mote	1
Rural areas of Kent	1
Villages to the west of Tunbridge Wells (Langton Green / Speldhurst / Groombridge / Ashurst)	1
Medway Estuary	1
Edenbridge	1
Speldhurst	2
Bidborough	2
Rusthall	1
Langton Green	2
Cowden	2
Pembury	1
Southborough	1
Crockhurst Street	1
Groombridge	1
Markbeech	1
Isle of Grain	1
Isle of Sheppey	1
Parts of Medway Towns (Chatham, Gillingham and Rainham)	1
Towns and villages in North Kent	1
Thanet towns of Ramsgate/Broadstairs/Margate/Westgate-on-sea and Birchington an coastal towns of Herne Bay, Whitstable and surrounding villages within 7k ft, but typically 8k ft for arrivals to London City Airport	1
North Kent	1
Ashurst wood	1
NORTH DOWNS	1
North Downs AONB	1
SOUTH DOWNS	7
South Downs National Park	7
SUFFOLK	5
South Suffolk AONB / coasts / heaths	3
Dedham Vale	5
Stour Valley	1
Suffolk Coasts / Heaths	1
River Orwell	1
River Stour / Stour Estuary	1
SURREY	14
Surrey Downs /Surrey Hills AONB	6
Ewhurst Village	1
Bletchingley Village	3
Southern half of Tandridge district / rural areas of the district	1

Burstow	1
Felbridge	1
Horne	1
Lingfield	2
Dormansland	1
Elmbridge Village	1
Leith Hill (Surrey)	2
Coldharbour (Surrey)	1
Quebec House (Surrey)	1
Emmetts Garden, Idel Hill (Surrey)	1
Godstone	1
Surrey	1
Holmwood Common	1
South Nutfield	1
Nutfield	1
Glovers Road (Charlwood)	1
WEST SUSSEX	4
Ockenden Manor	1
Gravetye Manor	1
Ifield Village Conservation Area	2
Horsham	1
Broadbridge Heath	1
Area around Horsham	1
East Grinstead	1
Crawley Down	1
Turners Hill/ Balcombe	1
West Hoathly/Sharpthorne	1
Wakehurst Place	2
Ardingly South of England Show Ground	2
OTHER	33
Marsh Green	3
National Trust properties / National Trails / Historic houses	5
Large conurbations / urban areas	2
Rowly Village	1
Rural areas (unspecified)	7
Populated areas	7
Community facilities / schools / hospitals / nursing homes	8
Residential properties that are overflowed	1
Wildlife / biodiversity	5
Unspecified heritage assets / listed buildings / conservation areas / battlefields / monuments / parks	1
Development sites	3
Relevant local communities	3
Hoo Peninsula	2
Unspecified protected areas / protected areas in general	1
LCA departures: overfly significant areas of countryside from Bearsted following M2 and A299 is within 7k ft, but typically 12k+ ft. While noise impact minima, there is visual intrusion of overflight in areas of tranquility such as the Kent Downs ANOB)	1
Thames Estuary Marshes	1
Woodland Trust(s) sites	1
Copthorne	1
Minister -on-Sea	1
AONBs	12
SSIs	1
Areas of Tourism	1
Areas overflowed by departure routes that are not currently in NPRs	1
forecast density	1
General Comments	15
Organisation cannot comment as does not have local knowledge	1
It will be difficult to avoid crossing the North Downs ANOB if entering/leaving the SE or south of Kent	1

Mention that other local organisations may have responded with reference to sensitive areas/locations	2
Recognition that as preference is for no flights over Crowborough, this may mean more flights over Ashdown Forest	1
Recognition that it is challenging to avoid sensitive locations given their size	1
Organisation does not have it's own view but supports the ICAO balanced approach to aircraft noise around airports	1
Showing swathes does not identify relevant local communities	1
The Countryside and Wildlife Act means public bodies have a duty to have regard to the purposes of conserving and enhancing natural beauty of AONBs	2
Reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) / Government / DfT guidance related to ANOBs/National Parks	5
Decision-makers are urged that public benefits of protecting the Surrey Hills from aircraft noise is not to be under-estimated	1
This question is best answered by the communities affected	1
The Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000 stipulations	1
Proximity of Surrey Hills to Gatwick results in environmental impacts (traffic congestion / noise / pollution)	1
Reference to the Surrey Hills Management Plan (development will respect special landscapes)	1
Noise is a more important factor than visual intrusion or air pollution	1
Current guidance seems to allow unchecked increases in aviation activity over ANOBs/National Parks	1
Reference to CAA guidance about avoidance of ANOBs / National Parks below 7k ft	1
Reference to Noise Policy Statement for England	1
Reference to Defra literature review about human noise on UK protected species	1
Reference to English Nature review about impact of low flights on nesting birds in summer and waterfowl in winter	1
Reference to 2006 Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) meaning public bodies have a duty to regard biodiversity in decision-making process	1
Reference to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981	1
Reference to Habitats Regulations 2010	1
Runway 08 arrivals do not affect Kent below 4k ft	1
Runway 26 departures do not affect Kent between 4k and 7k ft	1
Runway 26 arrivals affect a number of sensitive areas	1
Supportive of ICAO balanced approach to aircraft noise management around airports	1
Reasons why area may need special consideration	48
Area is protected / conservation area / nationally recognised landscape/ramsar site	8
Concerns about noise impacts	39
Area is an AONB/ avoid AONBs	14
Hilly areas may need special consideration (due to them being closer to overflying planes)	3
Visitors of areas are looking for peace and tranquility / impact on tourism	13
Businesses serving needs of visitors / economic implications	8
Concerns about visual impact	10
Noise thresholds should be lower in rural areas as noise is more intrusive in tranquil country environment / reference to ISO recommendations that there should be a 10db difference in noise assessment in rural areas / need to weight impact on rural and urban areas	10
Bletchingley Village should not be subject to further noise pollution	1
Bletchingley Village should not be subject to further air pollution	1
For reasons for cultural heritage	3
Wildlife in the area	1
Government policy on airspace requires due consideration for national parks	1
The South Downs National Park is one of the most busy/pressurised regions of the UK	1
The swathes between 4k and 7k ft will impact the area/park	1
Concerns about cumulative impact of multiple flights	1
Due consideration should be given to presence of hospitals/schools and community facilities	1

General concerns about effect of increased flights on the area	1
Rural areas of the district should not be a carde blanche for the area to be overflown at high levels of intensity	1
Would not wish for these towns/area to be affected by increased noise, particularly at night	2
Do not want flights over Tunbridge Wells	1
Concerns about emissions/environmental impact	2
Concerns about impact of noise on people's health	2
While Uckfield is further away, and would be less impacted by aircraft noise, we have the same concerns as we do about Crowborough (ie health issues associated with noise, particularly at night) - do not want flights over Uckfield	1
Protection of air traffic noise should take precedence over the protection of green belt / ANOBs / parks	3
Site/s are of special scientific interest	1
Interested to find out about effects of proposed changes on atmospheric nitrogen levels	1
Respite is welcome but intensity of noise disturbance during non-respite days is unknown	1
Area is a Ramsar site	2
Hever Castle is a particularly sensitive area and should be avoided given importance as a heritage site	1
Comments about ambient noise being lower in countryside/sensitive areas/sites	3
Concerns that increased flights will increase noise and pollution in the area	1
Suggestions	36
Areas that have not been previously overflown	1
Air traffic should overfly urban areas / have a fairer spread between rural and urban areas / urban areas should not be exempt	2
Should avoid overflying urban areas / give more weight to overflying less heavily populated areas	2
Flight paths South of Suffolk AONB preferable	2
Flights over Dedham Vale & Stour Valley should be avoided	2
Flights should be over rural areas (achieved if fly slightly away from current NPRs)	1
Routes near current NPRs should be used if less property overflown	1
Urban and rural areas should share an equal burden of overflying aircraft	1
Mention of the 1995 Environment Act	1
Mention of the Civil Aviation Act 1982	1
Mention of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	1
Avoid flying under 7k ft as area/location/park is a sensitive area	1
Minimise/reduce overflying if area cannot be avoided	1
A minimum altitude of 3000 ft is suggested before aircraft turn on to new course to avoid noise issues in the area	1
Routes should be designed to improve/preserve noise climate for areas of ANOBs / tranquil areas	1
Design process needs to account for fact that larger aircraft take longer to gain height / turn	1
Areas subject to existing noise impacts can suffer from frequency of overflying	1
Large areas of the Thames Estuary are Ramsar/SPA so intensification of air traffic will need to be assessed	1
The district has a number of designated areas of importance - without an assessment of the impact on these areas, we are unable to comment on the merits of routing	1
Protection of ANOBs should not be at the expense of residents	1
If it is not possible to prevent overflying of schools/hospitals/nursing homes the airports should provide mitigation measures (insulation / maintenance of these facilities)	1
Any residential property overflown will need respite	1
Routing of flights needs to be prioritised to avoid flights over towns	1
Important that flight paths are not moved outside swathe to the east to avoid larger population concentrations in Tonbridge	1

Preferred flight paths should join the final approach path as far to the west as possible to reduce noise impact	1
Parts of Tonbridge and Hildenborough appear to be within the swathe where aircraft could be at 3k ft at point of joining final approach path. Paths at this point should not be selected due to impact on the population	1
Supportive of reducing number of people affected by aviation noise, but noise impact should be reduced as much as possible / in ANOBs	1
Arrivals to Gatwick Airport should be as steep as possible to allow more flexibility	1
Independent noise monitoring required / penalties for exceeding noise thresholds	1
Heritage assets/heritage should be considered carefully in the proposals	1
Visual impact of planes should be taken into a/c as factor that impacts heritage assets	1
Move proposed corridor south and away from designated areas	2
New designs must employ further improved use of PBN to facilitate use of CCA and CDA	1
Support for much more activity over water/the sea than land (Thames Estuary / North Sea / English Channel)	2
Justification for using routes over water as historical navigation by visual/radio beacons no longer applies as aircraft have electronic guidance	1
will have to be designed to ensure lower levels of noise as recommended by ISO are not exceeded.	1
Appreciate benefit of higher altitude over Kent Downs AONB. However, Eastern arrivals over Folkstone-Dover area could go east at Margate, over the sea	1
London City Airport departures should be at 7k ft and above - urge consideration given to shifting some of these departure routes over the Thames and north sea to avoid east Kent	1
Priority should be given to avoiding built-up areas given impact at night on sleep disturbance	1
National parks and ANOBs should take 2nd preference to avoidance of built-up areas	1
Any proposals to allow Gatwick departures to fly a little further north or to increase number of flights would seriously impact the public's enjoyment of Surrey Hills ANOB	1
Improved technology should allow aircraft to keep more accurately to flight paths to avoid sensitive areas	1
Views of the local community should be taken into a/c	1
Important that a creative solution is sought so that any new flightn paths are designed and their likely impact thoroughly researched before they are introduced and approved.	1
Those responsible for making decisions should visit Hever and other beauty spots such as Leith Hill which are most affected by air traffic disturbance from Gatwick Airport	1
Ascents/descents need to be as steep as possible to reduce impact of noise	1
Nationally/internationally recognised sites within the consultation swathes shown in Figures B8 and B9 should be considered due to noise impacts. Sites include Special Protection Areas (SPAs) for birds, Ramsar and sites of SSI	1
Recommend that protected landscapes are classified as noise sensitive sites	1
Application of respite routes to relieve overflying of protected landscapes should be explored further to assess if beneficial impact on visitors and residents in these areas in terms of noise	1
Without some level of constraint, the noise environment in ANOBs/National Parks might degrade them as traffic increases	1
Impact of noise on protected landscapes should be assessed and alternatives found if there would be an adverse impact on these landscapes	1
Balanced approach should be taken to protect densely populated areas and quiet areas/protected landscapes	1
If adverse impact on protected landscapes cannot be avoided, NATS should consider mitigation measures (limits on flights, limits on noise, use of predictable flight times)	1
For Gatwick, bird sites up to 11km have been identified as sensitive to overflight	1

Q13_B	Important aircraft join the ILS final approach path at 3k ft/as near as possible to airport to minimise people affected	2
	If not possible to join ILS further west, then aircraft need to be kept as high as possible to reduce noise impact	1
	Overflying of noise-sensitive receptors should be avoided	1
	Aircraft using the NPR should either be directed down alternative lines within the NPR in order to provide underlying communities with known periods of respite or much greater use should be made of NPR Wizard in order to route aircraft away from the ANOB	2
	Heathrow NPRs must be redesigned in order to allow aircraft departing Gatwick to climb more steeply to affect as few people as possible	2
	Those affected should be consulted	1
	Avoid flights of AONBs if at all possible	2
	Base size:	52
	Please provide any additional information you feel is relevant in the space below	
	General Comments	11
	It will be difficult to avoid crossing the North Downs ANOB if entering/leaving the SE or south of Kent	1
	Mention that other local organisations may have responded with reference to sensitive areas/locations	2
	Recognition that as preference is for no flights over Crowborough, this may mean more flights over Ashdown Forest	1
	Recognition that it is challenging to avoid sensitive locations given their size	1
	Showing swathes does not identify relevant local communities	1
	The Countryside and Wildlife Act means public bodies have a duty to have regard to the purposes of conserving and enhancing natural beauty of ANOBs	2
	Reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) / Government / DfT guidance related to ANOBs/National Parks	5
	Decision-makers are urged that public benefits of protecting the Surrey Hills from aircraft noise is not to be under-estimated	1
	The Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000 stipulations	1
	Proximity of Surrey Hills to Gatwick results in environmental impacts (traffic congestion / noise / pollution)	1
	Reference to the Surrey Hills Management Plan (development will respect special landscapes)	1
	Noise is a more important factor than visual intrusion or air pollution	1
	Current guidance seems to allow unchecked increases in aviation activity over ANOBs/National Parks	1
	Reference to CAA guidance about avoidance of ANOBs / National Parks below 7k ft	1
	Reference to Noise Policy Statement for England	1
	Reference to Defra literature review about human noise on UK protected species	1
Reference to English Nature review about impact of low flights on nesting birds in summer and waterfowl in winter	1	
Reference to 2006 Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) meaning public bodies have a duty to regard biodiversity in decision-making process	1	
Reference to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981	1	
Reference to Habitats Regulations 2010	1	
Runway 08 arrivals do not affect Kent below 4k ft	1	
Runway 26 departures do not affect Kent between 4k and 7k ft	1	
Supportive of ICAO balanced approach to aircraft noise management around airports	1	
Reasons why area may need special consideration	47	
Area is protected / conservation area / nationally recognised landscape/ramsar site	8	

Concerns about noise impacts	39
Area is an AONB/ avoid AONBs	14
Hilly areas may need special consideration (due to them being closer to overflying planes)	3
Visitors of areas are looking for peace and tranquility / impact on tourism	13
Businesses serving needs of visitors / economic implications	8
Concerns about visual impact	10
Noise thresholds should be lower in rural areas as noise is more intrusive in tranquil country environment / reference to ISO recommendations that there should be a 10db difference in noise assessment in rural areas / need to weight impact on rural and urban areas	10
Bletchingley Village should not be subject to further noise pollution	1
Bletchingley Village should not be subject to further air pollution	1
For reasons for cultural heritage	3
Wildlife in the area	1
Government policy on airspace requires due consideration for national parks	1
The South Downs National Park is one of the most busy/pressurised regions of the UK	1
The swathes between 4k and 7k ft will impact the area/park	1
Concerns about cumulative impact of multiple flights	1
Due consideration should be given to presence of hospitals/schools and community facilities	1
General concerns about effect of increased flights on the area	1
Rural areas of the district should not be a carde blanche for the area to be overflown at high levels of intensity	1
Would not wish for these towns/area to be affected by increased noise, particularly at night	2
Do not want flights over Tunbridge Wells	1
Concerns about emissions/environmental impact	2
Concerns about impact of noise on people's health	2
While Uckfield is further away, and would be less impacted by aircraft noise, we have the same concerns as we do about Crowborough (ie health issues associated with noise, particularly at night) - do not want flights over Uckfield	1
Protection of air traffic noise should take precedence over the protection of green belt / ANOBs / parks	3
Site/s are of special scientific interest	1
Interested to find out about effects of proposed changes on atmospheric nitrogen levels	1
Respite is welcome but intensity of noise disturbance during non-respite days is unknown	1
Area is a Ramsar site	2
Hever Castle is a particularly sensitive area and should be avoided given importance as a heritage site	1
Comments about ambient noise being lower in countryside/sensitive areas/sites	3
Concerns that increased flights will increase noise and pollution in the area	1
Suggestions	29
Air traffic should overfly urban areas / have a fairer spread between rural and urban areas / urban areas should not be exempt	2
Should avoid overflying urban areas / give more weight to overflying less heavily populated areas	2
Flight paths South of Suffolk AONB preferable	2
Flights over Dedham Vale & Stour Valley should be avoided	2
Flights should be over rural areas (achieved if fly slightly away from current NPRs)	1
Routes near current NPRs should be used if less property overflown	1
Urban and rural areas should share an equal burden of overflying aircraft	1
Mention of the 1995 Environment Act	1
Mention of the Civil Aviation Act 1982	1
Mention of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	1
Avoid flying under 7k ft as area/location/park is a sensitive area	1
Minimise/reduce overflying if area cannot be avoided	1

A minimum altitude of 3000 ft is suggested before aircraft turn on to new course to avoid noise issues in the area	1
Routes should be designed to improve/preserve noise climate for areas of ANOBs / tranquil areas	1
Design process needs to account for fact that larger aircraft take longer to gain height / turn	1
Areas subject to existing noise impacts can suffer from frequency of overflying	1
Large areas of the Thames Estuary are Ramsar/SPA so intensification of air traffic will need to be assessed	1
The district has a number of designated areas of importance - without an assessment of the impact on these areas, we are unable to comment on the merits of routing	1
Protection of ANOBs should not be at the expense of residents	1
If it is not possible to prevent overflying of schools/hospitals/nursing homes the airports should provide mitigation measures (insulation / maintenance of these facilities)	1
Any residential property overflown will need respite	1
Routing of flights needs to be prioritised to avoid flights over towns	1
Important that flight paths are not moved outside swathe to the east to avoid larger population concentrations in Tonbridge	1
Preferred flight paths should join the final approach path as far to the west as possible to reduce noise impact	1
Parts of Tonbridge and Hildenborough appear to be within the swathe where aircraft could be at 3k ft at point of joining final approach path. Paths at this point should not be selected due to impact on the population	1
Supportive of reducing number of people affected by aviation noise, but noise impact should be reduced as much as possible / in ANOBs	1
Arrivals to Gatwick Airport should be as steep as possible to allow more flexibility	1
Independent noise monitoring required / penalties for exceeding noise thresholds	1
Heritage assets/heritage should be considered carefully in the proposals	1
Visual impact of planes should be taken into a/c as factor that impacts heritage assets	1
Move proposed corridor south and away from designated areas	2
New designs must employ further improved use of PBN to facilitate use of CCA and CDA	1
Support for much more activity over water/the sea than land (Thames Estuary / North Sea / English Channel)	2
Justification for using routes over water as historical navigation by visual/radio beacons no longer applies as aircraft have electronic guidance	1
Differences in noise thresholds between rural and urban areas mean that air traffic will have to be designed to ensure lower levels of noise as recommended by ISO are not exceeded.	1
Appreciate benefit of higher altitude over Kent Downs AONB. However, Eastern arrivals over Folkstone-Dover area could go east at Margate, over the sea	1
London City Airport departures should be at 7k ft and above - urge consideration given to shifting some of these departure routes over the Thames and north sea to avoid east Kent	1
Priority should be given to avoiding built-up areas given impact at night on sleep disturbance	1
National parks and ANOBs should take 2nd preference to avoidance of built-up areas	1
Any proposals to allow Gatwick departures to fly a little further north or to increase number of flights would seriously impact the public's enjoyment of Surrey Hills ANOB	1
Improved technology should allow aircraft to keep more accurately to flight paths to avoid sensitive areas	1
Important that a creative solution is sought so that any new flight paths are designed and their likely impact thoroughly researched before they are introduced and approved.	1

	Those responsible for making decisions should visit Hever and other beauty spots such as Leith Hill which are most affected by air traffic disturbance from Gatwick Airport	1
	Ascents/descents need to be as steep as possible to reduce impact of noise	1
	Nationally/internationally recognised sites within the consultation swathes shown in Figures B8 and B9 should be considered due to noise impacts. Sites include Special Protection Areas (SPAs) for birds, Ramsar and sites of SSI	1
	Recommend that protected landscapes are classified as noise sensitive sites	1
	Application of respite routes to relieve overflying of protected landscapes should be explored further to assess if beneficial impact on visitors and residents in these areas in terms of noise	1
	Without some level of constraint, the noise environment in ANOBs/National Parks might degrade them as traffic increases	1
	Impact of noise on protected landscapes should be assessed and alternatives found if there would be an adverse impact on these landscapes	1
	Balanced approach should be taken to protect densely populated areas and quiet areas/protected landscapes	1
	If adverse impact on protected landscapes cannot be avoided, NATS should consider mitigation measures (limits on flights, limits on noise, use of predictable flight times)	1
	For Gatwick, bird sites up to 11km have been identified as sensitive to overflight	1
	Important aircraft join the ILS final approach path at 3k ft/as near as possible to airport to minimise people affected	2
	If not possible to join ILS further west, then aircraft need to be kept as high as possible to reduce noise impact	1
	Overflying of noise-sensitive receptors should be avoided	1
	Aircraft using the NPR should either be directed down alternative lines within the NPR in order to provide underlying communities with known periods of respite or much greater use should be made of NPR Wizard in order to route aircraft away from the ANOB	2
	Heathrow NPRs must be redesigned in order to allow aircraft departing Gatwick to climb more steeply to affect as few people as possible	2
	Those affected should be consulted	1
	Avoid flights of ANOBs if at all possible	1
	Base size:	28
Q14	Please state what you think the criteria should be in the space below	
	General Comments	18
	Objective must be to minimise impact (noise/visual) on the maximum number of people	1
	Supportive of multiple respite paths on existing vectored broad swathe approach to touchdown to minimise noise in controlled area	2
	Routes should be designed on basis on minimisation of noise to maximum number of people affected	1
	Regarding flight efficiency, all aspects of environmental impact should be taken into account	1
	Wish to minimise environmental impact within constraints of operating safely	1
	LCY already has strict regulations regarding arrivals/departures - further enhancement may prove penalising	2
	Wish to work with all stakeholders to achieve improvements where required to facilitate respite	1
	PBN/technical capabilities will aid process of respite where required/ form the basis of initial route options	4
	Comments about altering routes only when there is an acceptable safety case	4
	Altering routes should only be introduced following safety and business assessment deemed acceptable to airspace users	1
	Moving flights several miles north of Hever (to avoid the castle) would then affect Sevenoaks Weald village and Ide Hill which would be undesirable	1
	Respite should be considered in all locations above 7k ft, but not at the expense of those not previously overflown	1
	This question is best answered by the communities affected	1
	When reviewing routes for respite purposes, it is also important to take into account implications for fuel burn	2

Locate routes over the least populated areas and not offer respite where this approach is taken	1
Proposal would not appear to offer a respite if a densely populated area in Basildon is chosen	1
justification for removing consultation options for respite routes on departures from London City Airport. When economy improves, demand for flights will increase	1
Altering routes for purpose of noise management should be considered where and when feasible and appropriate to do so	2
There are no specific locations	2
Any location targeted for overflight concentration should qualify for respite	1
Reference to WHO/those arguing that official decibel levels underestimate numbers of people affected and health consequences	1
Options for respite route should be shown alongside existing legacy route and that they meet criteria on page A11	1
Request a night time ban on noisier aircraft	2
Night time quotas are not long enough at present	1
Night time flights should avoid densely populated areas	1
Greater efficiency during day should mean reduced night time flights	2
Areas mentioned	11
Chiddingstone Castle / village	1
Cranleigh Village	1
Hever/Hever Castle	1
Leigh	1
Surrey Downs /Surrey Hills	1
Tonbridge	1
Tunbridge Wells	1
Areas that are overflowed below 5000ft	1
Rowley Village	1
Ewhurst Village	1
Local ANOBs (not specified)	3
Schools	2
Villages (not specified)	1
Tourist attractions / historic houses (such as Penshurst Place)	3
Urban areas below 4k ft (reasons unspecified)	3
National parks (unspecified)	1
Areas of high landscape value	2
Valleys	1
Area between Gatwick and Tonbridge	1
Crawley Down	1
Copthorne	1
Penshurst Place & Gardens	1
Hartfield	1
Swale Area	1
North Kent	1
Populous Areas	1
AONBs	1
Reasons given for time sensitive areas	9
Area is sensitive at all times of day and night as it is a centre of population	1
Surrey Hill ANOB is less sensitive after dark and during the working week as used by less visitors at these times	1
During the summer months it would be preferable not to send aircraft over ANOBs below 7k ft as per Government guidelines	1
Small children would be sensitive to aircraft noise	1
Common sense not to fly continuously over villages at night where ambient noise levels are lower than in towns	1
Tourist attractions should be avoided where possible	4
Ambient noise is greater in the countryside than in urban areas	2
Criteria should be high density population areas with higher quiescent noise levels	1
Avoid flying over areas with low background noise	1
Castle has an open-air theatre	2
Concerns about noise pollution	1

Q15	Specific times in day when area should not be subject to overflight	1	
	Routes should be within the current NPRs	1	
		Base size:	46
	What, if any, factors should be taken into account when determining the appropriate balance of flying around environmentally sensitive areas versus overhead		
	Reasons why flying longer routes should have greater precedence		13
	Extra costs are trivial when compared with total flight costs		2
	The extra fuel burn/CO2 emission is likely to be minimal relative to the whole flight		4
	Little justification of flying over environmental areas unless can't be avoided		1
	Effect on environment of greater fuel burn would be offset by benefit to environment of reduced noise/visual intrusions		3
	Longer routes usually mean larger-radius turns, thereby reducing noise impact as well as fuel/emissions		1
	Priority has to be given to reduced and minimal noise disturbance		3
	Reference to DfT Guidance to the CAA on Environmental Objectives Relating to the Exercise of its Air navigation Functions (January 2014)		1
	Fuel burn/emissions reduced		1
	Should take into account altitude and flight times		1
	Reasons why flying shorter routes should have precedence		3
	Less fuel used		2
	Longer flight paths results in higher CO2/emissions		1
	mitigated against benefits overall		2
	Balancing local impact against increased CO2 - Suggestions		20
	Extra costs should be borne by travellers / airlines		2
	Flying around environmentally sensitive areas is what should be unless this involves flying over populated areas/ villages that could be affected by noise nuisance		1
	While overfly routes are above 7,000ft, therefore having lower noise disturbance, other environmental objectives should be factored in such as need for fuel efficiency and minimising CO2 emissions - there has to be a balance		1
	If the area is an AONB or similar then there should be a minimum altitude / restricted numbers of flights		1
	There should be no night flights over environmentally sensitive areas if there is residential accommodation in the vicinity		1
	Depends on altitude. Above 7k ft it should be the shortest route. Below 4k ft it should be to avoid noise impact. Between 4k ft and 7k ft, routes should be optimised for both noise and fuel burn		1
	Recommend factors to take into account including number of people affected, how disturbance might change at different times of day/week/year and the cost of implementing an alternative route		1
	Once decision made, recommend regular monitoring/review to ensure impacts are not worse than expected		1
Avoiding urban/residential areas should be priority/take precedence over environmentally sensitive areas		4	
Would welcome an idea of extra fuel required and would support GAL offsetting this extra fuel burn with a compensating measure		1	
For operations below 4k ft, noise and emissions should both be considered in the planning of airspace		1	
Cost benefit analysis needed between flying around sensitive areas and amount of fuel/emissions of longer route		1	
Altitude, frequency and timing of flights alongside anticipated CO2 savings should be borne in mind		1	
Designing routes to avoid environmentally sensitive areas can only be justified at lower altitudes and balanced with human population		1	
Recognition of conflict between reducing noise and CO2 emissions		1	

	At lower altitudes emphasis should be on reducing noise. Above 7k ft emphasis should be on reducing emissions. But consideration will need to be given to mitigating noise impacts on noise sensitive sites and protected landscapes	1
	When leaving the hold planes like the shortest track miles to landing with a reasonable turn to finals having joined the localiser. The challenges therefore for any new ATC procedure is to ensure the system is more effective than existing arrangements and significant benefit has to be proved	1
	All flight routes up to 7k ft should give greater precedence to flying longer routes	1
	A longer route to avoid a particular area should only be considered when outweighs cost in terms of fuel and CO2	1
	The human affect must not be ignored as overflight of towns is not fully understood as to pollution issues, noise an disturbance on productivity, mental alertness of children etc	1
	Theoretical fuel saving by flying shorter route would be lost due to higher power setting required for a climbing turn	1
	Future engine development will soon match/exceed fuel/CO2 savings suggested	1
	Determined on a case by case basis, linked to blight and variance of legacy routes	1
	Balancing local impact against increased CO2 - General Comments	21
	Each case needs to be treated on its own merits	2
	Not enough information/cant give a definite answer	3
	Organisation can accept longer route if on-time arrival can be achieved	1
	Definition of environmentally sensitive areas should be clarified/clearly stated	4
	Should be a compromise between greater fuel burn and flying round environmentally sensitive areas	1
	Comments about climate change	3
	Government agencies/NATS/PPPs should make decisions and recommendations on environmental impact and pursue emissions reduction as a priority	3
	There has to be a balance between the need to fly longer routes and fuel burn/CO2 emissions	4
	Comments about departures use more fuel than arrivals / extending departure routes would not be preferable	3
	The higher the location about sea level, the greater the effect of aircraft noise for a given aircraft altitude	1
	Increasing length of departure routes may not provide the defined environmental benefits that can be achieved in a PBN operating environment	1
	In A 4.26 reference is made to potential for reducing fuel burn, but it is not made clear that this is per flight, and therefore misleading as changes enable far more flights	1
	Disagree that noise and emissions should be considered alongside one another	1
	Agree with A3.18 that value of maintaining legacy arrangements and we are not in favour of creating new routes as that leads to noise increase for new areas overflown	1
	Recognition of need to minimise noise impacts on local communities along with need to reduce fuel burn and emissions	1
	Not possible to comment in detail until approach charts for proposed new procedures are made available	1
	Good quality information and option selection is needed to ensure right decisions are made	1
	Reference to ICAO framework	2
	Reference to Aviation Policy Framework	2
	Absence of economic metrics means not possible to make assessment of savings/penalties each set of options implies	1
	No answer	1
	Base size:	54
Q16	Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the objective of a system based around Point Merge.	
	Positive Comments about Point Merge	26
	Point merge is beneficial / a positive change	3
	Point Merge is more efficient/will reduce delays/improve performance	4
	Reduces fuel burn	3

Reduces CO2 emissions / reduces environmental impact	8
Areas affected by aircraft noise are reduced	4
Support as it will result in less noise	6
Point Merge will keep aircraft higher for longer	5
Supported provided does not impact communities/people/residents/protected areas	1
Departing aircraft can achieve a higher altitude more quickly	1
NFP reduces the no. of aircraft vectored off	1
Stacking and vectoring is inefficient/Point Merge removes need for it	8
PM offers greater control over relative position of aircraft and therefore area affected by noise	1
PM offers greater predictability	3
Supported if fuel savings can be verified in London airspace	1
Support recommendation that atcs required to ensure timely arrival of consecutive aircraft in a manner that they merge only on final approach and not before	1
Support provided the PM arc is located over the English Channel	1
PM could enable continuous climbs and better environmental performance within a TMA	1
Negative Comments about Point Merge	28
Concerns that point merge will lead to higher flight concentration	10
Concerns that more precise/ condensed tracks concentrate noise	3
Concerns about Point Merge fuel requirements/fuel burn	2
Point Merge will lead to more fuel being burned	1
Concerns that Slinford is close to the PM , meaning increased nuisance from airplanes	1
Concentrating flights into one Merge Point will be intolerable for the areas affected	2
Concerns are related to the flying the flat segment of the arcs at the low altitudes and the amount of airspace required to be reserved for the arcs	3
Proposals are designed to increase capacity which will cause more fuel burn/CO2 emissions	1
Proposals are too vague	1
Concerns about noise pollution	2
No mention of compensation	1
Concerns about safety	2
Inadequate noise measuring systems	1
It will detract from the special qualities of the area	1
The possibility of increased flights and shorter gaps between flights on a concentrated flight path is concerning, particularly at low altitudes	1
Recognise that the arcs, if placed at sea will have negative environmental impact	1
Inadequate explanation about how PM could save CO2 emissions	4
PM as proposed will impose intolerable burden if a single path is chosen	2
Recognise benefits of PM but concerned about the long segments (at Oslo/Dublin) flown at low altitudes requiring additional fuel burn	3
Concerns about the use of speed techniques rather than path stretching	2
In E4.15 it is unclear if that impact is likely to change due to proposed changes or due to increased traffic increased traffic is of concern	1
Negative impact on Southend Airport	1
Some concerns about fuel load requirements	1
Benefits of PM are unclear	1
Means changing departure routes at runway 08 - no evidence this is the best option for Gatwick	1
Point Merge Suggestions	34
Expect further clarity in PM proposals for gatwick/LAMP airfields as this will drive procedures elsewhere	1
ATCs should be equipped with computer facilities to enable efficient use of point merge	1
Arcs/ point merge should be placed out at sea / support this	9
Stacking should take place over the sea (not over ANOBs/national parks)	1
Increasing the angle of decent would reduce burden on residents	1
Difficult to fully comment without the details	1

Important to make those aware if going to be affected by the change / provide information once PM routes decided upon	1
Significant compensation should be paid to those who will be overflowed	3
Consideration should be given to practical operation of PM	1
Consider an alternative solution to allow aircraft to commence CDA from top of descent point	1
Acknowledge advantages of PM but can alternatives be developed?	1
CDA should be enforced	3
Keep aircraft as high as possible for as long as possible within safety limits	1
If PM used it should be used for quieter aircraft that can approach at a greater angle and therefore reduce detrimental effect/impact	1
Need to resolved seeking a solution to whether fuel burn for PM is based on route or contingency fuel	1
CAA/NATS should look at alternatives to Point Merge	3
between relevant stakeholders is essential. This discussion can only take place once airspace users have clear guidelines on fuelling policy from PM operations	1
PM could be an enabler for continuous climbs and better environmental performance within the TMA	2
Careful management of PM with daily route changes could provide additional noise benefits	1
Final routes need to be properly assessed in terms of impact on biodiversity and compliance with European Birds Directive 2009/147/EC	1
Put Point Merge arcs over the English Channel/Thames Estuary/over water	4
Greater consideration for moving the southern boundary of the PM for London City (E3.18) towards the north to avoid southern section over land	1
Welcome opportunity provided by PM to reposition most low altitude air traffic approaching London City into a single flow, approaching from the east over the Thames Estuary	1
Welcome aircraft departing London City Airport will be higher before reaching the Kent coast, but suggest continuing with Thames Estuary would be better - this should be investigated before the next consultation	1
In Para F3.44 it mentions that routes for gatwick will come from the region of Margate and then hastings. We strongly suggest that all operations should go over the sea at Margate and then along the channel	1
Worth considering alternatives in addition to PM to find most efficient solution	2
While there is a constraint by the Shoeburyness Danger Area, it is hoped that detailed route planning will allow approach close to centre line of the Thames Estuary	1
As PM holds will be 7k+ ft, impact will be visual rather than noise related. Recommend a system that most effectively avoids/minimises visual impacts on protected landacapes is adopted	1
Inadequate information has been provided - it is essential that detailed approach procedures for LGW 26L are produced so that PM proposals can be properly understood and evaluated	1
It would be helpful to have a Jeppesen approach plate, for example, for non-radar approach as this might provide insight into what NATS have in mind	1
Precision route should avoid settles/noise sensitive areas	1
Effect will be largely neutral on LSA as PM traffic will often prevent Southend departures from climbing until the tracks have crossed sufficiently	2
To facilitate climb for Southend southbound departures, PM traffic must be kept at not below 5k ft until at least GRAIN	2
There must be clear dialogue between proposals and the LSA Airspace management changes to ensure that the benefits are distributed fairly and beneficially	2
Comments about concepts being validated as part of the Single European Sky ATM Research project (SESAR)	1
Would like CAA/NATS to look into availability of any alternatives for PM that may require more efforts and capability for metering rather than patch stretching to deliver aircraft to a point prior to top of descent from which a CDO can be accomplished	1
Alternatives about metering requires collaboration of ANSPs due to distance required	1

	Utilisation of required time of arrival capability could be an alternative to PM	1
	Alternatives, including PM, to actual arrival system should encompass an outline of clear benefits for airlines in terms of airspace and runway capacity, fuel planning and fuel usage	1
	Oppose unless a fairer/more balanced approach is adopted	1
	Benefits of PM need to be balanced with movement of departure routes to the east	1
	Query last sentence of E 2.15 because air traffic movements have reduced since 2001 given larger aircraft are used. "as" should be replaced by "if"	1
	if only two respite routes, these must be revised from time-to-time	1
	No answer	1
	Base size:	27
Q17	What, if any, comments do you have on accommodating non-certified aircraft?	
	Positive	2
	Maximum benefit of the new procedures, and the airspace redesign, will only be reached when the entire fleet wishing to use this airspace has been certified	1
	Accommodation will ensure Gatwick remains competitive with other airports	1
	Neutral/General	15
	This is a technical question relevant to aviation specialists	4
	Not sure what is meant by "accommodated"	1
	Proportion of non-RNAV1 compliant aircraft is low / that will operate in the future will be minimal	5
	Route spacing requirements for RNAV1 route design will always be greater than minimum radar separation	1
	Number of locations within TMA route structure where actual route spacing approaches the minimum permitted would be relatively few	1
	Slightly inferior navigation performance of the subject aircraft is unlikely to compromise radar separation minima on a regular basis	1
	Benefits noted but equipment expensive	1
	Committed to working with NATS/CAA to try to minimize requirement and impact of potential mixed mode operations	2
	NATS must continue to accommodate non-compliant aircraft / non-compliant aircraft should be accommodated as much as possible	2
	Suggestions	21
	Non-certified aircraft should only be accommodated, but with restrictions	3
	Non-RNAV aircraft should not be accommodated after a deadline for it to be achieved has been reached	1
	Assume private aircraft accommodated in lull of operations	1
	A short timeline should be given for exclusion of all non-compliant aircraft	2
	The option taken should be the best one for residents	1
	Reducing noise for residents should be a reason to get rid of older, noisy planes	1
	Older aircraft should be charged for hold-ups / should not be allowed to bypass the system	1
	Airports/NATS should work with non-compliant operators to encourage them to become compliant within a clearly defined timescale	1
	After encouragement to become compliant, if non-compliant operators fail to show progress, then restrictions should be applied	1
	Anything that hinders efficiency should be avoided	1
	In the absence of a mandate for LAMP Phase 1, all non-certificated aircraft must be accommodated	1
	Accommodate flights that are not RNAV1 compliant but are flyable through the MEL	3
	Business case for investment in new equipment may be difficult if not matched by a suitable return	1
	Favour unrestricted (but conditional access) as an option for consideration given fleet size small	1

	Technical intervention by controller would rarely, if at all, affect the real-time airspace efficiency to a measureable extent	1
	intervention could not be assured then contingency arrangement would be for subject aircraft to be held in RNAV5 airspace until peak traffic loading on the RNAV1 routes has passed	1
	terminal airspace on RNAV1 specified routes with only a need for enhanced controller monitoring as necessary where radar separation between aircraft pairs has potential to be compromised	1
	Would not wish for non-compliant aircraft to be excluded but at same time do not expect benefits of LAMP airspace to be downgraded by need to accommodate a small no. of poorly equipped aircraft	1
	Not all aircraft are RNAV1 compliant, so need a clear understanding of exemptions policy, and effect on service of non-compliant operators	1
	Exemptions for non-certified aircraft should be carefully considered, particularly for users where retrofit is the only option making any business case extremely marginal	1
	Wrong to hold back benefits for those airlines that have invested in newer aircraft (hence non-compliant aircraft must have restrictions)	1
	Due to long lead-in times for delivery of new aircraft, it would be reasonable to accept non-certificated aircraft with restrictions	1
	Would seem wrong to introduce a new system that all aircraft need to have the latest on-board equipment to fly in the UK	1
	PBN route structure will encourage increased use of RNAV1 compliant aircraft	1
	Aircraft not equipped should have timely notice to upgrade their fleet	2
	Would not support an unreasonable delay in implementing airspace changes which would provide immediate benefits to the majority of users in terms of capacities/operating efficiencies	2
	Non-compliant aircraft should continue to be accommodated by ATC to be able to fulfil its agreed airport slot	1
	Carriers moving towards accommodation should be restricted. Those who refuse to move towards accommodation should not be accommodated	1
	Route network arrangements mean that continuous climb/descent arrivals are hindered, leading to suboptimal environmental performance	1
	Air traffic management is achieved by technical vectoring of aircraft for separation, leading to high workload for controllers and therefore sub-optimal capacity and ATC cost	1
	RNAV1 is only an essential enabler if the mode of operation actually switches to aircraft flying procedurally separated RNAV1 routes	1
	PBN is wasted if aircraft are taken off routes and put on vectors shortly after take-off for most of the time in the TMA	1
	Non-RNAV1 aircraft could be restricted if increased controller workload is required	1
	There are aircraft transiting the TMA, or accessing small airports that are not planned into the TMA route network. These must be accommodated	1
	If 90% of the time, aircraft of all capabilities are put on a heading shortly after departure, and RNAV 1 mandate is unfair	1
	An early RNAV 1 mandate in 2017 should be required only for arrivals and departures at the major airports	1
	Require continued access for state aircraft / for aircraft that may not be appropriately equipped	1
	No answer	2
	Base size:	21
Q18	Please state the reasons why you believe fuel for the Point Merge arcs should be considered part of the contingency fuel uplift or part of the flight plannable route fuel uplift?	
	Reasons for Part of the flight plannable route fuel uplift	1
	Needs to be like this until efficiency of PM system is known	1
	There should be no change to contingency total as it would be a huge risk if system results in aircraft crossing airfield boundary without minimum fuel required	1

	General comments	18
	Need fuel assumption guidance on how much of arc is flown	1
	Surprised about the question as maximum fuel reserves are paramount to aircraft safety/passenger safety	1
	Question for technical specialists/undecided/need more explanation	5
	Should be based on safety and operational procedures / safety should not be compromised	2
	PMFP/guidance needs to be developed	3
	Need regulatory guidance on fuel policy for PM operations	2
	Depends on the time of operation and relationship between foreseen invound traffic delays and fuel uplift	1
	Wish to flight plan the shorest flight-plannable route when traffic levels permit but recognise that without a robust fuel policy it is difficult to meet fuel planning criteria for PM structures	1
	Users will plan their fuel uplift for the whole length of the arc, potentially leading to inefficiencies and increased emissions if a smaller part of the arc is flown due to low traffic demand	4
	uplift to cooperate with PM arcs to be related to contingency fuel. For this reason, a PM fuel policy needs to be established	3
	Having to file and fly the full PM arc should only be considered as within the contingency fuel	1
	Any flight planning system must comply with the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) approved AIR-OPS requirements	2
	We need to be reassured that PM will not result in increased risk to Heathrow of fuel diversions	1
	Each airline needs to satisfy itself that EASA's requirements are taken into a/c for any change to the airspace design as a result of the PM or any variation of the concept	1
	It is assumed that flight plan fuel is meant to be called trip fuel	1
	Comments about PM structures being promulgated as linear holds and not STARS	1
	No view if proposal does not affect safety or noise	1
	No answer	2
	Base size:	29
Q19	Please state the reasons why you support or oppose the proposal seeking to reduce overall fuel burn across the fleet by as much as possible, even if it means some individual routes may be less fuel efficient as a consequence.	
	Reasons to Support	10
	Departures/ Arrivals from south and south east will have a positive impact on fuel efficiency	1
	Fuel Saving will allow extra passage	1
	Reduction in CO2 emissions	1
	System efficiencies	2
	Acceptable objective	1
	Support on proviso that noise is not increased	1
	Due to climate change / need to be reducing fuel burn as much as possible	1
	Generally supportive of robustness of evidence and intended outcome of an overall reduction in fuel consumption and CO2 emissions	1
	Agree with overall objective to reduce fuel consumption	1
	If fuel/emissions are reduced - support proposal	1
	Reasons to Oppose	5
	Do not support anything that will lead to more suffering/misery for those who are overflown	1
	Lack of information	1
	Environmental and economic benefits of lower fuel burn need to be understood and managed in context of other impacts of this objective	2
	Not supportive of changes that will result in economic benefit for operators at expense of negative implications (e.g. noise) for local people	1
	Seems flawed and unlikely	1

General comments/suggestions - Fuel Burn Efficiency for Specific Routes		23
	Respecting the QoL of people overflown is essential	1
	Question about fuel calculations	1
	Need for balance of environmentally sensitive areas	1
	This is a question for technical specialists	2
	Fuel considerations should not have priority over impact/noise on residents	1
	Success will be to ensure that there is a reduction in net CO2 emissions	1
	Unclear if some routes will be less fuel efficient	1
	There should be no adverse impact from other airports as a result of the changes	1
	Broadly supportive of holistic approach but must not come at a cost that one London airport receives major improvements at the cost to the others	2
	A safety margin for fuel should be kept to allow for requirements such as on landing	1
	Supportive of reducing fuel burn through greater fuel efficiency by aircraft	1
	Support reducing fuel burn through restricting the number of flights to the current level and greater fuel efficiency by aircraft	1
	Benefit analysis is often aggregated by the entire gate to gate operation and system effects must be addressed	2
	Where there is increased flight efficiency caused by LAMP proposals, NATS should work further towards minimising the effects of increased fuel burn on aircraft penalised by operations on these affected routes	1
	Objective is to reduce fuel use. The relevant metrics will need to be monitored by independent third parties such as Eurocontrol's Performance Review Commission	3
	Fuel burn costs should not be a factor for airlines as they can use more efficient aircraft to reduce those costs	1
	Airlines gain from reduced fuel use due to PM, so must share benefit as required by Aviation Policy Framework and CAA guidance about environmental impact	1
	Unable to make final conclusions, but in principle support objective to reduce overall fuel burn across the fleet	1
	Further work is needed in order for an informed view to be taken	1
	Note absence of data for 3 or 4 Eng heavy aircraft utilising the WILLO3B or WILLO4C arrivals in Table G4 for comparison	1
	Comments about the proposals should seek overall system efficiencies	1
	The routes to be used and resultant noise disturbance are the paramount concern, balanced with pollution emissions	1
	Comments about need for a trade-off between benefit/impact	1
	Need holistic view/transparency/independence	1
	No answer	1
	Base size:	21
Q20	If you believe it has an impact, please describe the operation(s) that would potentially be affected.	
	Reason for answer	9
	Will Impact on Fuel Burn	1
	Will Impact on Noise	1
	Lack of information	2
	This is a technical question relevant to aviation specialists	2
	Hope that general aviation can be accommodated without disadvantage within the LAMP proposal	1
	Would not want commercial operations to be impacted by general aviation activity but would expect the airspace design to take a/c of VFR operations	1
	Although proposal affects a small part of Kent, lowering airspace by 1k ft and 2k ft would be noticeable in sensitive areas of the county. Therefore object to lowered CAS at 5.5k and 6.5k ft as would force some GA to fly lower to avoid CA	1
	This question is not applicable to our operations	1
	There is only one small airstrip located in Basildon Borough, therefore the issue is not thought to be significant at present	1
	Suggestions - CAB	5
	General aviation operations should be accommodated to the degree that they do not interfere with IFR operations	2

	throughput at Heathrow Airport is not adversely affected by introduction of PM, SID redesign or replication and the possible increase in SIDs due to respite	1
	Lower levels of CAS could be released following airspace changes reflecting the improved performance of modern aircraft	1
	Airspace should be designed in steps to include a less restrictive airspace classification at lower levels whilst still providing CFR access	1
	GA should have fair and reasonable access to UK airspace	1
	Amend Class A proposals in London TMA, Worthing, Clacton and Daventry CTAs as well as surrounding ATS routes to Class Charlie	1
	Not to use Class A airspace below FL100 in future airspace design proposals	1
	GENERAL - Negative comments about the Proposals - Controlled Airspace Boundaries	11
	Concerns about noise measurement / 57 DB Laeq 16h contour is wrong measurement / underestimates noise disturbance	6
	Concerns about final route positions	1
	Option chosen should have no negative effects on residents (e.g. noise / aircraft movements)	1
	Would not want aircraft to avoid restrictions in Controlled Airspace by flying lower to avoid it	1
	Oppose (no reasons given)	1
	Oppose due to negative impact to those on the ground	1
	Opposed to any changes in routes that result in more direct overflying of East Grinstead Town and increased noise disturbance to residents	1
	Base size:	102
Q21	Please provide any other information that you feel is relevant to the on-going development of the airspace covered by this consultation.	
	GENERAL	78
	OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS	73
	Positive comments on CDA/steep descent/this will help reduce noise	5
	Not affected by the proposals much/at all	8
	Area lies outside of the consultation area/ wouldn't affect their area	1
	People live too close to airport to notice change unless steeper departures adopted	1
	Some people/areas will be affected more and others less by the proposals / some people will be newly affected	7
	Narrow flight paths are welcomed, but not at the expense of peace and quiet of the countryside	1
	Improvements in technology should be pretext for increased flight traffic	1
	Proposals are of direct relevance to the organisations policies	1
	altitudes below 3289 ft. The proposals don't appear to overfly designated wildlife sites at lower than 3280 ft - and as such will not have a significant effect on wildlife sites	1
	Proposals would result in less London City Airport bound aircraft over the borough	1
	Not possible to fully assess noise impact / need to understand if there will be an increase or decrease in noise levels	2
	Proposals does not include Appropriate Assessment of the Habitats Regulations	1
	PBN increases efficiency which has potential to impact on local people through increased number of flights	1
	Needs to be precautionary approach adopted where noise cannot be increased until there is scientific evidence that it does not have detrimental effect on health	1
	Recognition that area will be affected by the proposals	1
	For intermediate airspace, the focus should be on minimising aircraft noise coupled with need for efficient flow of traffic that minimises emissions	1
	For over 7k ft, the priority is efficiency and to minimise environmental impact	1
	Recognition that a well-developed/balanced transport system is necessary to sustain economic growth	1
	Flight paths are important to residents	4
	London City airport will be allowing larger jets to be operated. Larger jets impact turning circle on departure. This will impact the consultation	4
	May be affected in future, depending on when Heathrow's operations are published	1
	Increasing footprint of Horley will encroach on existing NPR	1
	Recognition that reduction in low-level flying has benefits	1

Wish to provide advice on specific heritage assets which may be affected by the proposals	1
Welcomes objective of reducing long low level routings on arrivals into LCY	1
Welcomes ability for planned descent profiles rather than stepped descents as increases efficiency/reduces noise	2
Concern about flight paths/changes in flight path concentration/routes/altitude	8
Concern about noise/threat of increased noise/need to reduce noise	10
Oppose proposed changes	2
Quality of life and impact of local people is a significant factor, but not considered by these proposals	1
Supportive of the work of LAMP / the proposals	3
Proposed changes should be aimed at bringing long desired improvements for air space users	2
Reducing emissions and delays are key to meeting the future performance of the airspace	1
Unacceptable to continue to use Class A airspace down to 2.5k ft and up to 19.5k ft. It means access is denied to general aviation (VFR) pilots	1
Proposals in isolation have limited effect on our area. But keen to ensure that cumulative effects of changes to management of airspace are properly assessed	2
Need to recognise that receptors are not static and don't only perceive flights overhead	1
Improvements in airspace design can deliver significant benefits (environmental /socioeconomic)	1
Worried that the proposals are expansion via the back door	1
Concern that new areas/properties will be overflowed and blighted	3
Most of Kent is rural, yet the proposals do not appear to give enough regard to the maintenance of their relative tranquility	1
No recognition that many of the areas of concern (in Kent) are above sea level	1
Unsure if proposals affect helicopters	1
Apart from PM, proposals do not appear to provide opportunity for creative solutions	1
Supportive of reducing NPRs	1
Concerns about knock-on effect to Heathrow operations	1
As routes unclear, HAL is unclear about what evidence is behind the statement in Part A that there will be less noise, as aircraft will climb higher, more quickly on departure and stay higher for longer on arrival	1
No evidence to back up statements about environmental benefits of route flexibility / HAL expect to see trials	1
Priority should be to reduce noise/visual impacts/emissions/these are more important than profit or efficiency	3
Agree to the redesign of airspace / change is needed	8
Sceptical of the proposals and will not support unless noise issues are addressed	1
Support proposed departure corridor in Figure E9 as altitudes should generally be above 7k ft over midway	1
Implications for East Kent indicated in figure F10 are noted, but considered reasonable given aircraft will be above 12k ft	1
Hope proposals can be implemented asap	1
Proposals indicate a significant number of flights above Eastbourne. But these flights would be above 7k ft and thus not a local significant issue	1
No further comment to make unless we receive complaints/enquiries from residents	1
Support accommodation of GA activities, this should not be at expense of safety of other airline users, or efficient or effective management of national air infrastructure	1
Southend Airport does not feel it should be penalised for the unique location of LCY against Heathrow airspace	2
Response relates to comments providing a strategic overview on concepts rather than on specific routes/areas	2
Concern over safety issues with planes below 4000ft with planes from Redhill Aerodrome	1
Proposals will affect residents health & well-being (negative)	1
Airspace changes have a significant affect on large population centres	1

More aircraft using TIG/ WIZ and less using LAMB/ BIG/ CLN/ DVR conflicts with legacy proposal	1
Concerns about visual impact	2
Region is losing more revenue than it gains / net loss due to more UK air travellers leaving the region than foreign visitors flying in	1
No benefits to local people / local economy does not benefit	1
Broadly supports aims of 'Our Countryside, Our Future, a fair Deal for Rural England' to preserve tranquility	1
Process ill-designed as fails to strike balance of benefits and impacts	1
Comments about stakeholders have more to gain from the proposals	1
Agree/support aircraft departing Gatwick to climb faster so as to reduce noise disturbance	1
Mentions of being affected by non-ionising electromagnetic radiation (EMR) and various chemicals	1
Concerns over increased traffic levels	2
Potential for Peace & tranquility to be affected by Air traffic	2
Sensitive conservation areas affected	1
Oppose any noise increase over Warnham	1
Concerns about economic impact of changes	2
Concerns about air quality	1
Need to carry out further research on flight paths/ respite routes/ health effects	3
Concerns that simplification of operational procedures may adversely affect amenities of some residents on one of the new flight paths	2
Supportive of the proposals as they increase fuel efficiency	3
Concerns about noise measurement / 57 DB Laeq 16h contour is wrong measurement / underestimates noise disturbance	1
Development outside of the 57 DBA Leq 16h contour but may still be impacted by noise	3
Airspace change/modernisation is long overdue	2
No objection to the proposals	9
Supportive of the proposals as they seek to minimise carbon emissions	4
Support overall objective of increase fuel efficiency, minimising CO2 emissions while managing noise impacts	1
Intention to improve safety is welcomed	3
General aviation operations should be accommodated to the degree they do not interfere with IFR operations	2
Supportive of the proposals to streamline air traffic management	1
Reference to noise studies and impact on health and well-being	5
Recognition of benefits of future airspace strategy (inscope)	2
SUGGESTIONS	30
Incoming flights should be spread over a wider area	1
Favour a flight path south of Dedham Vale AONB	1
Safety buffer should be applied outside of danger areas / other military airspace	1
Need for more research/more understanding of impact on noise/pollution/environment	5
Research needed to weigh up noise impact / impact studies / need to measure noise effectively	11
Wish to learn about arrangements for monitoring noise pre and post new routes / information should be made public/monitoring must be undertaken	2
Studies show that UK aviation industry can grow while reducing impact (noise, CO2 emissions etc)	1
Research needed to on visual impact of flights	1
Would like further consideration on ensuring the best possible constant descent profile within final design	1
Using mandatory transponder zones would also provide the necessary protections amongst airspace users	1
Airspace changes/profits should not come before safety	2
Proposals should deliver on FAS commitment to safe and efficient airspace that has capacity to meet reasonable demand	1
Proposed changes should be deferred until after 2017 to coincide with new transition altitudes	1

Aircraft should be fitted with transponders to help ATC to identify intrusive aircraft	1
More flights can only be accommodated if aircraft are quieter and have lower emissions as per Government Guidance	1
Forecasts in proposals do not appear to take a/c of fact that air traffic movements are lower than a decade ago, and should therefore be aligned to current ATMs and latest DfT forecasts	1
There is no need for immediate airspace change	1
Routes need to stay within existing swathes when airspace redesigned	1
1332 Any redesign of airspace needs to protect safety of operations and reduce delays whilst optimising between a number of competing factors (such as fuel burn, route mileage, impact on local communities and noise implications)	1
1333 Increased efficiency and capacity would only be an acceptable outcome provided it does not prevent a diminution in noise annoyance for the population overflown and countryside	1
New flight paths are needed urgently. But they must avoid areas not previously overflown	2
Strong objection to narrow flight paths as this will cause harmful impact on residents/business constantly overflown	1
Unhappy that all aircraft will follow one or two flight paths towards Gatwick Airport	1
If flight path restricted to two, consideration should be given to one being to the West of the Mayfield beacon and then onwards towards Edenbridge, joining the localiser at Marsh Green, and another either lying slightly to west of Mayfield/Marsh Green line, turning onto finals at Bottom Wood, or east of Tunbridge Wells and over the Medway Valley near Tonbridge	1
Avoidance of high ground will minimise noise impact	1
It is wrong for NATS and GAL to make these proposals. Proposals should be presented by CAA and NATS only	1
GAL is an interested beneficiary - should not be involved in proposals	1
Reference to Aviation Policy Framework which states that it is appropriate to explore options for respite that shares noise between communities on an equitable basis	1
Expect that Southend Airport traffic should be seen to benefit equally to the LCY traffic from airspace management efficiencies arising from PAMP Phase 1A	1
LSA requests that airspace in the overhead of Southend is delegated to Southend at 4k ft, and also any airspace between Southend and TRIPO between 3.5k and 5.5k ft that might be subsequently become unused by NATS post LAMP	1
Substantial improvements should be made to published and achieved routing levels of ICY outbound traffic in the level band 3k to 7k in proximity to LSA	1
LAMP development team should ensure that 4k ft becomes a strategically safe and acceptable outbound level for ISA departure of all routes	1
Capping of LCY outbound SID procedures to 3k ft is a hindrance to effective strategic integration of LSA traffic into LTMA	1
It should not be the responsibility of LCY to develop IFPs which are of significance to the effective ATM operation of its neighbouring airport and the operation of which must transgress the consultation division. LSA may have cause to object if issues not addressed	1
NATS should take steps to accommodate a northbound route out of Southend allowing climb straight to 4k ft	1
LSA requests that wherever possible, the airport is given free-flow for departures on routes where this can be accommodated under LAMP	1
Concern is to ensure efficient use of the airspace as a whole, whilst achieving adequate level of safety, and to achieve operating efficiencies and benefits to all LTMA users, including LSA traffic through the strategic design of published outbound and arrival procedures to higher levels than are currently achieved	1
Welcomes removal of London City STARS away from the overhead of Southend, including the final approach track for Runway 24	1
LSA notes that no opportunity has been taken to totally dis-establish the SPEAR holding pattern located overhead Southend airport	1
If the SPEAR hold cannot be dis-established by NATS, then the lowest level that is utilised for holding SPEAR is increased to 5k ft minimum as was the case around 5 years ago	1

Concern at future handling of Missed Approach traffic from LCY under LAMP	1
Many aviation and community stakeholders viewed the limitation of departure levels available to LSA traffic as contrary to both LAMP and the Future Airspace Strategy and one which should be resolved between NATS and LSA (and the CAA)	1
Council is looking at LAMP to resolve conflict between London City and London Southend Airport	1
LSA has not been considered in the LAMP proposals and does not appear to have been given equal weighting	1
Local airspace changes must be integrated into the overall network	1
Operating procedures must take a/c of international nature of aviation and application of relevant standards	1
Wherever possible, flightpaths should avoid areas not previously overflown, or increase overflight over areas that currently experience little overflight	1
NATS/GAL through consultation results can urge the CAA to work with the industry to support independent research to improve understanding to enable the industry to respond and communicate its work	1
Urge NATS to protect the quality of life of residents and protect peace, quiet and tranquility of landscape for future generations	1
Absence of detail controls on alternative respite measures (including restrictions of night flights and noise levels) needs addressing	1
Proposals ignore health issues of flight concentrations	1
Electrosensitive people cannot live under flight paths / new flight paths would be devastating / negative health impacts	1
Against flightpath changes	1
There are safety benefits if VFR operations are not forced to fly at below 2,500 ft	1
COMMENTS ABOUT THE CONSULTATION / CONSULTATION PROCESS	68
Not enough information/unable to comment because incomplete/need to know more	20
Need for further consultation/would like to be consulted again/duty to have 2nd consultation	34
Organisation wishes to be included in future consultations	16
Organisation would like more information / to be kept informed as proposals develop	10
Consultation should cover all London Airports	1
Reorder consultation so it based on noise impacts	1
Welcome the consultation / opportunity to comment / interested party	20
Consultation should be redone with main aim of reducing disturbance	1
Concern about technology used for consultation/should make hard copies available	2
Change is needed due to busier skies	1
Willing to share experiences / provide advice	1
Organisation does not wish to submit a response at this stage	2
Not possible from the consultation material to determine new flight paths / heights	3
The consultation is too early/premature - needs to wait for recommendations from the AC about runway capacity in the SE	1
The same principles of this consultation will be applied to other airports, but we don't know what the implications will be for our area/borough	1
Some parts of the consultation are very technical, and without the relevant information, the organisation is unable to comment on the technical aspects	1
Consulting on a single respite skews the consultation and options	1
The consultation should have been clear that only currently overflown routes will be in the swathe for the new narrow flight paths	1
Disjointed / not linked to other consultations (CAA report / Night Time Flights etc) / unsure why there isn't a holistic approach	2
Commends approach of the consultation in terms of how it sets out how to reduce noise impact	1
Support page A11 in consultation document about air routes below 7k ft should avoid ANOBs/National Parks	1
Do not have much faith in the consultation about flight paths changes	1
Impossible to consult without considering effects of Heathrow Airport	4
Criticism of not consulting about flights under 4k ft at London City Airport	4

Consultation is inaccessible / incomprehensible / difficult to understand / material difficult to interpret	6
Comments about runway capacity in the SE (raising issues for the LAMP P1A Consultation)	3
Recognition that this is an early consultation	2
Agree with policy not to show defined tracks on the consultation documents because of congestion - it is very unlikely that any of the consultees at a local level will avoid being overflowed	1
NATS and not LCA need to carry out a consultation for those under 4k ft	1
Would be useful for next/Phase 2 consultation to present cumulative effects	1
Consultation does not appear to recognise requirements of the European Noise Directive for there to be no increase in noise/emmission to meet the Climate Change Act	1
Consultation fails to comply with Guidance to CAA on Environmental Objectives Relating to its Air Navigation Functions 2014	1
Climate change emissions and also to non-CO2 effects of aviation appear to have been omitted	1
There appears to be no reference to air quality - air quality impacts cannot be considered negligible and therefore need assessed	1
Vital to consult all residents affected/concerns that not all those affected have been properly consulted	4
There are many unanswered questions	1
Disappointed/concerned that the consultation excludes changes to airspace below 4k ft, apart from at GAL	2
A holistic approach must be adopted and adapted to changing nature of airport growth, with new entrants considered alongside existing operators	1
Consultation should be completed without delay as there is considerable environmental benefit to be achieved	1
No view at this stage given current consultation is on airspace above 4k ft	1
Consultation too restrictive / limited	1
Stated objective of balance between efficiency and community impact cannot be achieved by this consultation	1
Questions about impartiality of decision-makers / credibility of the process	1
Consultation period is too short	1
Comments about lack of awareness of the consultation	1
Mention of disability Discrimination Act	1
Requires a response to organiation's letter/response	1
No definition of what respite is	1
Unclear how Appendix K has been produced	1
Question if consultation meets CAA requirements	1
Evidence needs to be supportive of changes and benefits need to be clear, not available in current consultation	1
Difficult to assess potential impacts as there are no defined routes	1
Consultation should explain objectives that are being sort for arrivals phase	1
ENDORSEMENTS	13
Agrees with / endorses GACC's response	8
Agrees with EdenBridge Town Council's response	2
Shares the view of Tandridge District Council	1
Agree with the position taken by GAPAN	1
Supports response made by IATA	1
Supports responses made by LACC/ADC	1
Endorses CPRE Kent's response	1
Endorses CPRE's response (unclear which CPRE)	1
Agrees with Sevenoaks District Council's response	1
REFERENCES / DIAGRAMS	19
Reference to maps	5
Reference to other papers / correspondence	14
Diagram provided with submission	1
COMPENSATION	17
Residents/businesses affected should get compensation	13

Those affected should be compensated (e.g. financial compensation / noise abatement such as double or triple glazing)	4
The Parish Council feels it is entitled to apply for grants from the Gatwick Airport Community Trust	2
REFERENCE TO OTHER AIRPORTS	14
Heathrow Airport	8
Southend Airport	4
Luton Airport	1
Stansted Airport	1
Thames Estuary	4
Manston Airport	1
Lydd Airport	1
AIRPORT EXPANSION	17
Aviation should grow - but there needs to be a balance to deliver environmental goals and protect quality of life in local communities affected by aviation noise	1
PM proposals alone could provide sufficient additional capacity for NATS traffic forecasts to 2015 - it means a significant increase in number of planes using airports without effective control	1
Comments about a second runway at Gatwick	10
Opposed to proposals due to increased number of aircraft below 4k ft	1
Recognition that something has to be done to facilitate growing levels of air traffic	1
Gatwick Airport's location does not lend itself to further expansion	1
References to London City Airport expansion planning application	4
Reference to undemocratic airport expansion / proposals allow airport expansion	1
Subtext of this consultation is to permit a large increase in air traffic	1
MISCELLANEOUS	21
A genuine attempt to reduce CO2 would focus on less flights / make people take alternative forms of transport	1
Air transport is not a sustainable form of transport	1
Altitude-Based Priorities set out in CAA Guide to Environmental Objectives is flawed	1
Aviation Policy Framework 2013 is likely to be severely flawed	1
Do not wish to see increased restrictions on timings into/out of LCA as existing restrictions already strictly controlled	1
Organisation content with proposal to lower controlled airspace within the Pompeii Triangle subject to certain conditions being met (safety buffer applied within CAS but not withing EGD037)	1
Area most affected currently is the southeast corner of the borough, including Alford	1
The current enforcement regime is inadequate for planes that do not follow flight path /harsher penalties needed	1
Concerns about current take-off routes which turn north of Gatwick Airport	1
Noise around Gatwick Airport has gradually reduced over the years, this should continue	1
Bletchingley village already suffers from noise pollution	1
Bletchingley village already suffers from air pollution	1
Often, there appears to be no adherence to CDA / should be enforced	3
Airbus A319/320 is particularly noisy	2
Pressure should be brought upon the airlines using A320 aircraft to make modification to the wing fuel filler caps to avoid noise problems	1
Night flights using Gatwick Airport should be banned until A320 planes make noise modifications	1
Comments about abolition/reduction in night flights into Gatwick	3
Request measurement controls for landings to replicate measures that apply to noisy departures	1
Runway 26 arrivals should only be permitted when wind conditions do not allow landings in other direction as this affects less people	1
Aviation noise is a trade-off - for there to be twice as many planes, noise needs to halve	1

Criticism of previous/earlier consultations/other NATS consultations being extended in the past	4
NATS/DfT/CAA should take a closer interest in London City Airport as Newham Council has failed to police the airport/to ensure agreements are adhered to	4
Heathrow planes use the City new air corridor, contrary to CAA guidance	3
GAL and London City Airports use different models to assess noise	4
Comments about Runway 08	2
Comments about joining GACC	1
Support proposals incorporated in the interim report from the AC where modernisation of airspace in SE England is a vital component	1
There has to be penalties for exceeding noise thresholds	1
Reference to documented evidence that noise monitoring needs to be carried out much further away from runways	1
Forecast airport growth rates to 2015 are of concern and may conflict with the Committee on Climate Change limitation of a maximum of 60% growth by 2050	1
OUT OF SCOPE-MISCELLANEOUS	4
Interested to know what is the definition 'any reasonable level of overall demand' in E3.11 given NATS remit has nothing to do with allowing more flights	1
Proposals need to be rigorously assessed and implemented to ensure impacts are not increased and stay within legal and advisory limits	1
While appreciated PBN not part of this consultation, organisation supports its introduction	1
Supports retro fitting of vortex generators on all A318/319/320 series of aircraft to eliminate high pitch whine / reference to whine	2