

Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

Report: Details of agenda items on which attendees wish to speak and/ or points they wish to make at Issue Specific Hearing 5.

Note:

This report presents the written submissions made at Procedural Deadline A using the Issue Specific Hearings Participation Form regarding agenda items on which an attendee wishes to speak and/ or points they wish to make at Issue Specific Hearing 5, where this information was provided alongside their event attendance request.

Contents

Sally Pavey, CAGNE	3
Malcolm Fillmore, Rusper Parish Council.....	4
Marie Killip, Mole Valley District Council.....	5
Patricia Routledge	6
Charles Lloyd, Gatwick Obviously Not (GON).....	7
Eleanor Girdziusz, Stantec on behalf of Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP.....	8
Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP	9
Stephen Harrison	10
Stephen Norman Rolph, Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council	11
Michael Bedford KC on behalf of West Sussex County Council, Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council, Surrey County Council, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council, East Sussex County Council	12
David Monk, Horsham District Council	13
Peter Barclay, GACC.....	14
John Sayer, Ardent on behalf of Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP	15
Ed Winter, Plane Wrong	16
Cllr Liz Lockwood, Lingfield Parish Council & Dormansland Parish Council	17
Rory Lillington, British Airways plc.....	18
Rory Lillington, International Airlines Group	19
Cllr Victoria Chester	20

Sally Pavey, CAGNE

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

aircraft noise

Malcolm Fillmore, Rusper Parish Council

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

Noise impacts on locality

Marie Killip, Mole Valley District Council

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

Item 7 - regarding the removal of the northwestern noise bund.

Patricia Routledge

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

Noise currently of low flying, landing aircraft into the prevailing wind 3 mins apart. This is noise hell now. This proposal, which will enable 100,000 extra flights a year is untenable, unreasonable and allows no consideration to those affected on the ground. All additional landing aircraft will arrive over Lingfield/Dormansland and this aspect is being ignored! We cannot sleep as aircraft are scheduled to arrive all through the night. In summer we cannot open our windows for ventilation (in temperatures sometimes in excess of 30c) and we cannot enjoy our gardens because of screaming, decelerating aircraft making conversation impossible and 3 mins apart. This is now. Gridlocked roads, no enforcement of traffic speed restrictions, airlines who attract their passengers (Easyjet, Ryan Air etc) from all over the country passing viable local airports on their way to Gatwick. Multiple flights/holidays taken each year passing East Midlands, Birmingham, Stanstead, Luton and even Heathrow taking advantage of phoney cheap flights. Clogging M25 with traffic and all feeder roads from the north, south, west and east. Lingfield is used as a cut through from Kent! This is now! A consultation was undertaken naming Heathrow as the best option for an additional runway. The result is being ignored and again our more rural villages are fighting Gatwick expansion perhaps without the clout of West London. Pollution from aircraft, passenger traffic and any uplift (debatable) in staffing levels will severely impact our communities and its poor infrastructure. An emergency runway is what it says it is for an emergency! This is a deceitful ploy by Gatwick implying there is an existing 2nd runway. What happens if permission is granted and a runway built do they then apply for another emergency runway which will eventually be promoted as a 3rd runway? This is how commercial enterprise works so please wise up! According to Gatwick's unsolicited propaganda: Additional jobs. Our reply all low grade and to become automated. Add to region's economy. Our reply the UK should not be encouraging rampant consuming. Multiple flights/ holidays abroad per year which is a drain not a gain to the UK economy. Connections: Our reply Gatwick is a holiday airport not a hub. Heathrow is the UK's hub. Landscaping: Our reply: After destruction. Propaganda Highway improvements: Our reply: Minimal around airport. Rural areas - poor dangerous roads, poor infrastructure. Surrey CC and Tandridge DC need to be consulted.

Charles Lloyd, Gatwick Obviously Not (GON)

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

LOAEL; noise metrics; noise envelope policy and proposals; inadequacy of noise envelope engagement and need for additional information; night flight ban; noise conditions

Eleanor Girdziusz, Stantec on behalf of Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

Agenda Item 7.3 “Reasonable worst-case assessment and choice of baseline” – On behalf of our Client, we will set out that the baseline noise data is not representative of current conditions (i.e. post-covid) and therefore future projections underestimate the noise impact; and Agenda Item 7.6 “Non-residential receptors” - The Applicant has not considered the Holiday Inn Gatwick as a noise sensitive receptor and have therefore not include suitable provisions to mitigate impacts at this location.

Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

Agenda Item 7.3 “Reasonable worst-case assessment and choice of baseline” – the baseline noise data is not representative of current conditions (i.e. post-covid) and therefore future projections underestimate the noise impact; and Agenda Item 7.6 “Non-residential receptors” - The Applicant has not considered HI as a noise sensitive receptor and have therefore not include suitable provisions to mitigate impacts at this location. Other issues on which to speak falling under this ISH to be kept under review.

Stephen Harrison

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

Agenda item 7: Assessment, control, mitigation, and compensation My comments and observations are based on a number of topics in agenda item 7. 1) Accuracy of the noise modelling results particularly in light of my own experiences; 2) Appropriateness of Leq (an average) as a highly misleading measure against which to base any assessment; 3) Inadequacy of the noise mitigants particularly as an individual close to the development who will be subject to a "major adverse significant effect"- e.g. noise insulation scheme having caps, no allowance for inflationary measures, lack of consideration for impact on outside spaces, overall impact on quality of life etc.

Stephen Norman Rolph, Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

Noise over our Parish: specifically Sidlow where the holding patterns for LHR aircraft combine with LGW aircraft taking off.

Michael Bedford KC on behalf of West Sussex County Council, Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council, Surrey County Council, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council, East Sussex County Council

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

All (TBC)

David Monk, Horsham District Council

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

Agenda Items 3 - 7. Will be available to speak on the various agenda items to assist the ExA's understanding of aviation noise.

Peter Barclay, GACC

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

All

John Sayer, Ardent on behalf of Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

Matters concerning the Applicant's failure to impose adequate controls and mitigation in respect of the Project's consequential noise related impacts on our client's property and operational business. Other issues on which to speak falling under this ISH to be kept under review

Ed Winter, Plane Wrong

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

7. Assessment, control, mitigation, and compensation. Comments on 7.1 Forecasting, modelling, and monitoring overview. 7.2 Total aviation noise caused by the Proposed Development. 7.3 choice of baseline. 7.4 Noise envelopes. 7.5 Methods proposed to avoid, reduce or compensate for likely significant adverse aviation noise effects and prevent unacceptable levels of aviation noise

Cllr Liz Lockwood, Lingfield Parish Council & Dormansland Parish Council

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

7.2 the totality of the increased noise in rural areas 7.5 inability to mitigate for this totality of noise or future route changes

Rory Lillington, British Airways plc

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

We would like to comment on the proposed plans impact on noise and the existing system of regulation

Rory Lillington, International Airlines Group

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

We would like to comment on the proposed plans impact on noise and the existing system of regulation

Cllr Victoria Chester

Agenda items/ points to be raised:

7. Assessment, control mitigation and compensation