

## Agenda Item 6

<b>Executive Member</b>	Councillor Howard Jones		
<b>Strategic Management Team Lead Officer</b>	Jack Straw		
<b>Author</b>	Jack Straw		
<b>Telephone</b>	01306 879246		
<b>Email</b>	Jack.straw@molevalley.gov.uk		
<b>Date</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> June 2016		
<b>Ward (s) affected</b>	Charlwood	<b>Key Decision</b>	No
<b>Subject</b>	Support for Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>			
That a sum of £5,000 is given to the Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign, to help them in their campaign against a second runway at Gatwick and to achieve a more satisfactory distribution of flight paths.			
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITIES</b>			
This application supports the Council's priority that Mole Valley is a highly attractive area with housing that meets local need through the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment and by ensuring our areas of natural beauty are well looked after.			
<b>The Executive has the authority to determine the Recommendations</b>			

### 1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In 2014 the Government established the Davies Commission to provide advice on the need for additional runway capacity in the South East and if required where such provision should be made. MVDC advised the Commission that it objected strongly to an additional runway at Gatwick.
- 1.2 The Commission reported its findings in July 2015. It concluded that additional capacity is required and recommended that it should be provided at Heathrow Airport which provided the greatest strategic and economic benefits. It also concluded that the provision of a second runway at Gatwick Airport is feasible.
- 1.3 The Government responded by saying it agreed with the need for more runway capacity by 2030 and that the options for additional runways at Heathrow and Gatwick are all viable. It pushed back making a final decision to enable it to carry out further work to investigate the environmental impact of the options and ensure the best possible mitigation measures. It has indicated it will publish its conclusions by the summer of 2016.
- 1.2 In the meantime, the Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign (GACC) has written to MVDC requesting a grant of £5,000 towards the costs of running their campaigns against a second runway at Gatwick Airport and to achieve a more satisfactory distribution of flight paths. GACC have indicated that they are currently producing a series of research papers on various aspects of the runway proposal. They have requested financial support for this work. A copy of the letter from GACC is attached at Appendix 1.
- 1.4 MVDC is a member of GACC.

- 1.5 It remains to be seen what decision the Government will make about the provision of new runway capacity in the South East. Whatever it is, it is likely that there will continue to be pressure to provide a second runway at Gatwick. Under the circumstances, supporting the preparation of evidence now to influence Government thinking in advance of a decision and to underpin opposition to an additional runway at Gatwick if that should be the decision, would be timely and reflect MVDC's objection to a second runway at Gatwick.
- 1.6 There are also benefits in supporting work on the distribution of flight paths to and from the airport.

### **Financial Implications**

The sum of £200<sup>1</sup> has been paid by MVDC annually for membership of the GACC and previous requests by GACC for support from MVDC to oppose additional runway capacity at Gatwick have been supported. However there is no budget provision for the current request for £5,000. Payment could be funded from the Council's planning budget and its implications picked up through the budget monitoring process.

### **Legal Implications**

There are no legal implications as a result of this request.

## **2.0 OPTIONS**

- 2.1 The Executive could choose not to provide financial support for the Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign. To do so would be seen negatively by local residents that the Council is not following through its objection to a second runway at Gatwick. However the Council has limited funds and all requests for support have to be considered and inevitably some refused.
- 2.2 The Executive could agree to provide support in the sum of £5,000. This would be in line with the Council priorities to support the environment.
- 2.3 The Executive could provide support with a different sum.

## **3.0 CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Monitoring Officer commentary**

All relevant legal implications have been taken into account and are set out above.

### **S151 Officer commentary**

All financial implications have been taken into account.

### **Risk Implications**

The key risks are reputational. The Council is being asked by a local community group for assistance and it would be seen negatively if this support could not be provided.

### **Equalities Implications**

There are no implications as a result of this request

### **Employment Issues**

There are no implications as a result of this request

### **Sustainability Issues**

There are no implications as a result of this request

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None other than published documents

---

<sup>1</sup> Not £300 as referred to in the letter from GACC.

# Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign

# GACC

Campaign Office  
369  
Stan Hill

01293 863

[www.gacc.org.uk](http://www.gacc.org.uk)Charlwood  
[gacc@btconnect.com](mailto:gacc@btconnect.com)

Surrey RH6 OEP

Yvonne Rees  
2016  
Mole Valley District Council

31 March

*Dear Yvonne*

I am writing to request a grant of £5,000 from Mole Valley Council towards the costs of running our campaigns against a second runway and to achieve a more satisfactory distribution of flight paths.

GACC was founded in 1968, and has nearly 100 councils and environmental groups as members. Because we have established a reputation for responsible and intelligent debate we have strong support from all the MPs around Gatwick. We are the only environmental organisation concerned with Gatwick which covers the whole area around the airport.

We are leading the campaign against a second runway at Gatwick and this involves substantial expenditure on research, publicity materials, website design, public meetings etc. For example we recently sent an illustrated booklet *Gatwick Grounded* to all 650 MPs, and this cost us over £5,000. We are currently producing a series of research papers on various aspects of the runway proposal and need to give some remuneration to the expert authors.

I need not tell you about the impacts of a second runway on Mole Valley as they were well set out in the letter from Sarah Seed to the Secretary of State for Transport dated 23 March.

At present Mole Valley kindly pays us a subscription of £300 a year for which we are most grateful. In the runway campaign of 1993, however, you gave GACC £5,000 and employed a full-time member of

staff for six months. In the 2003 runway campaign you gave us £10,000. So I do hope you will be able to help us again now.

As you may be aware, a number of London Boroughs are spending considerable sums on publicity advocating a second runway at Gatwick.

You can find out more about our campaigns on the runway and on flight paths from our website [www.gacc.org.uk](http://www.gacc.org.uk)

With best wishes

*Brendon*

Brendon Sewill CBE  
Chairman