

CAGNE
Communities Against Gatwick
Noise and Emissions

**The umbrella aviation community and
environment group for Sussex, Surrey, and Kent**

19th January 2024

TR020005

GatwickAirport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Dear Planning Inspectorate

CAGNE has looked to engage constructively over the current Gatwick Airport new runway DCO consultation and proposed project changes and yet we have not received any satisfactory responses. We are therefore as the umbrella aviation community and environment group for Sussex, Surrey and Kent requesting that the planning inspectorate consider the following request.

The changes proposed by Gatwick Airport during the month of December 16th – 21st January have serious ramifications on the new runway project as such the DCO submissions.

We strongly oppose the planning inspectorate accepting these changes and ask that a full consultation be conducted by the applicant. At present the consultation has failed to consult a wider audience or those that have submitted RR to PINS.

- The leaflet is a glossy, pretty picture, lack of substance document.
- We are not aware that parish and town councils have been consulted.
- The power point provided to local authorities was poor with a truly lack of detail.
- The information provided to date does not provide any mapping to where changes will be housed.
- Additional details were added to the website (12.23) but no notification was provided to any consultees. This time location maps were included.
- To hold a consultation over the Christmas period is known as not being best practise.

The ramifications of the project changes are significant as such the process of hearings should be delayed allowing for a fuller, more comprehensive consultation to be undertaken ensuring that all have a fair opportunity to have input on these significant changes.

We believe the link provided [REDACTED] by the applicant is confusing to those seeking to participate. CAGNE wrote to Mr Norwood, copied to PINS, offering ways in which a more constructive consultation could be undertaken but these appear to have been ignored.

We seriously question the release of the PR on 3rd December to notify residents as this will have been lost by local authorities and residents due to Christmas. Since January Gatwick has made no effort to re-issue or raise awareness of the consultation.

CAGNE oppose proposed changes on the following grounds –

Project 1 - Question updated construction waste proposals that would not cover the removal of material nor the necessary additional lorry movements. It would also not cover the noise impact of this as well as the climate change ramifications.

Project 2 - the incinerator is removed from the plans which should reduce visual impact of a tall chimney and reduce pollution so close to residential areas. However, the transportation of waste needs to be addressed in the reassessment of lorry movements to and from the airport waste site.

The site looks very cramped for such a process and the number of lorry movements that will be required within the site.

There is no detail to where materials will be transported to for the demolition of the incinerator.

There is no end of use waste detail or mention of any recycling.

All of which would have a carbon footprint which is not detailed in any literature.

Project 3 – The removal of MBBU is seen as a cost cutting exercise by the applicant. We see only negatives the vast quantities of surface water that will come from new construction and the new runway which reed beds will not be able to accommodate.

The size of beds does not seem sufficient to deal with the volume of water that Gatwick and new highway will create. There is no details of volumes or capacity of beds.

We do not believe the consultation has been far reaching enough. Gatwick should have consulted all that had written RR submissions to allow them to change submissions to reflect the impact the proposed changes will have on key topics such as air pollution, traffic movements and flooding.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sally Pavey
Chair of CAGNE
On behalf of CAGNE committee

Est Feb 2014



