

Summary of Written representation

I reside at the end of the Gatwick Runway on [REDACTED], and as noted in Gatwick Airport Ltd's (GAL) Environmental Statement Chapter 14, paragraph 14.9.103 and 14.9.104, I live in one of a small number of properties that is expected to suffer "MAJOR ADVERSE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS" because of their plans to develop the Northern Runway.

GAL state the effects will be "MAJOR ADVERSE" for my home. Major is typically defined as important, serious, or significant, and adverse meaning harmful, unfavourable.

As a local resident, I understand that GAL brings economic benefits, however, I have MAJOR concerns about the ADVERSE impact that the development will have on me and my family, our health, wellbeing, and financial circumstances. The average increase in aircraft noise of between 3dB and 6dB that is expected at my home would yield somewhere between a 100% and 200% increase in the average noise that I experience. This is not trivial and it is unreasonable for GAL to consider the project can be mitigated by noise insulation alone.

Below I have outlined some of my concerns in the event the project was to proceed.

Insulation and home assistance scheme

GAL have proposed an "improved" noise insulation scheme. Upon reading the scheme 14.9.10, it appears incomplete and inadequate. Specifically, the noise insulation schemes have:

- A fixed £20k cap that is likely to be insufficient to insulate my home against the effects (I have 12 windows, 2 French doors, 2 outside doors and a loft conversion - where the cost according to Everest of the average uPVC Window costs £600 to £1,800) particularly in the context of the cost of current building materials. It seems unreasonable to expect me to cover any additional costs while GAL makes significant profits.
- No provision for inflation (surely this a mistake)?
- No consideration as to the useful lifetime of the measures (it seems a onetime only offer).
- No consideration for how violent vibrations caused by aircraft will be mitigated (no amount of insulation will stop my doors and windows vibrating violently when aircraft take off)!
- No references for how any damage caused to interior and exterior walls that would need redecoration because of the proposed insulation measures would be rectified!
- No consideration for how the increased noise will affect my ability to use outside spaces which will have a material detrimental impact on my mental health given the frequency with which I use and enjoy my garden, and will mean I can no longer entertain friends or family during the summer.
- No consideration for how I might enjoy fresh air from opening my windows – with the only solution offered being acoustic ventilation! GAL appear to believe that I should keep my doors and windows shut for the rest of my life!

I find the assisted moving scheme to be insufficient and would not cover anything close to the real cost of having to move home! E.g., The average cost of an estate agent, stamp duty on a new home and moving costs will undoubtedly be far more than the £20k arbitrary figure GAL have presented!

The impact of GAL's plans and the increased noise levels will undoubtedly directly impact the value of my property particularly in my circumstances (having named my address in their report in paragraph 14.9.103!). This is both from a pure value, but also marketability of my property. No consideration of the financial loss that I will suffer because of the project has been factored into any

of GAL's documents or proposed schemes; The Human rights act and land compensation act appear to have been ignored!

In addition, during the construction phase, will I be able to leave my washing out to dry if there is substantial dust in the environment? Who will pay for the additional costs of electricity associated with having to use a tumble drier more frequently? Will I need to clean my windows, car etc more frequently due to dust? GAL seems to have overlooked these concerns for residents in close proximity to the construction site.

Noise Modelling

The noise modelling that has been prepared has a number of shortcomings. Specifically:

- It has heroic assumptions that are predicated on the future development of the Aviation industry and investment by airlines (none of which GAL can guarantee). It is not clear to what extent this is supported by the Aviation industry; Airlines have also committed to investments in larger, noisier aircraft, such as Emirates investing in 777's!
- It is not clear to me how GAL have modelled the change in use of the existing runway.
- GAL have provided no evidence to support their assumptions about the transition in aircraft, and it appears that we are just meant to believe their assumptions.
- The noise contours do not adequately reflect the noise levels that I experience (and have recorded myself and attached as an appendix to this response), not least because the noise monitoring stations are over 1km from my home and are all parallel to the runway. They therefore can't accurately reflect the true noise levels that I experience.
- Only two scenarios are presented, a central and a reasonable downside case, which assumes a slower transition to newer aircraft. A single downside scenario given the wide range of observed impacts, is completely insufficient and lacks any level of statistical credibility against which to make any assessment for a project of this size and importance.
- The lack of further scenarios or even stochastic modelling to look at a range of outcomes is a real flaw in the noise modelling and analysis conducted.

Leq measure and the N65 Day and N60 Night noise measures

Whilst the Leq measure is logarithmic, it is still an average noise measure which is misleading, quite simply because it ignores the number of spikes in noise. A 3dB - 6dB increase in the average Leq measure (which is expected in my home), means that the absolute noise level when aircraft are taking off (due to their increased frequency and proximity to my house) will increase significantly given the ambient noise is far lower.

It is the absolute frequency and severity of noise which will have the greatest impact on my health (including the number of times I am awoken) and my ability to enjoy my home, not the average measured over a prolonged period which paints a far rosier picture. I believe that the reports and modelling prepared by GAL understate the N65 Day and N60 Night numbers at my home.

Below I have extracted the figures from the Gatwick Northern Runway Project – Aircraft Noise viewer for my postcode RH6 0DJ.

	2019 Central case	2029 Central	2029 Slow
N65 Day	390	400.7	404
N60 Night	56.1	58.4	59.1

In my experience, commercial aircraft departing from Gatwick Airport typically generate peak noise levels exceeding 65dB when flying over my home (see appendix 1 below for my own readings) in a westerly direction (which is approximately 75% of the time), with most aircraft generating a peak noise of between 76db and 86db. Once the new runway is built, all aircraft from both runways flying in a westerly direction will exceed 65dB. The reports and tables presented by GAL show only a minor increase in the N65 Day and N60 Night levels, whilst the reality will be closer to 275 additional movements per day, which I don't believe is adequately captured within the figures presented by GAL in their reporting!

Human Rights 1998 and the land compensation Act 1973

The environmental statement on noise and vibration refers to a range of different legal precedents and statements. Importantly, I see no consideration of the Human Rights Act 1998, which sets out the fundamental rights and freedoms that everyone in the UK is entitled to, and I consider there would be a breach of my Human rights from the project going ahead.

Further, the Land Compensation Act 1973 (the Act) provides a right to homeowners to claim compensation where they suffer because of works undertaken for the benefit of the community.

The scheme and GAL's proposals should take note of both the land compensation act and my human rights and provide adequate compensation, which I consider to be lacking in their current proposals.

Final statement

GAL's shareholders intend to materially profit from increased flight operations, which appears to be at my expense (given the likely impact on the value of my property), and it appears that I will suffer materially from "major adverse significant" effects, which, according to global medical reports, may result in lower immune function, chronic illnesses, and potentially reduce life expectancy!

In summary, I object to the development on the basis that the package of measures outlined by GAL are inadequate and will have a "major adverse significant effect" on me and my family, and specifically the probable impact on our health, wellbeing, and financial circumstances.

Appendix 1: Table of noise levels created from various aircraft operating from Gatwick airport.

Aircraft type	Route	Noise currently generated when departing
Airbus A319	U28111 EasyJet to Alicante	78.0 dB
Airbus A320	U28527 EasyJet to Porto IB3715 Iberia express to Madrid	80.1dB 78.6dB
Airbus A321	W45701 Wizz Air to Vienna U28223 EasyJet to Chania	77.0 dB 76.0 dB
Boeing 737	EXS1PV Jet2 to Tenerife	81.2dB
Boeing 777	BA2157 BA to Antigua BA2037 BA to Orlando	83.7dB 85.9dB
Boeing 787	Z0711 Norse Atlantic to Los Angeles	79.6dB
ATR 72-600	GR603 Aurigny Air to Guernsey	67.3 dB

Source: Decibel Meter handheld in the garden of 1 Longmeadow Villas on 28th October 2023.

Smaller aircraft (such as A319's, A320's) all create noise levels in the excess of 75dB currently, it is therefore clear to me that if aircraft are operating closer to my house, the noise levels will increase significantly.

Additional detail supporting my summary written representation

Below I have provided further details on each of the key areas where I have concerns. This primarily relates to:

- 1) GAL's proposed insulation scheme
- 2) Assisted moving scheme.;
- 3) Vibrations caused by aircraft;
- 4) The noise modelling performed;
- 5) Appropriateness of using Leq measures,
- 6) Impact on my human rights;
- 7) How this development will impact on my ability to enjoy my property and outside spaces.

Noise Insulation scheme

GAL have proposed an "improved" noise insulation scheme. Upon reading the scheme in 14.9.10, it appears incomplete and inadequate. In relation to the scheme as outlined, I would make the following comments:

- I currently have double glazing (partially funded by the current Gatwick scheme), and aircraft noise can still be heard very clearly in my home. Double glazing will simply be an inadequate tool for stopping the noise entering my home and will not prevent excessive vibrations caused by aircraft taking off!
- The application of a fixed £20k Cap is very low, particularly in the context of the cost of current building materials. According to Everest, the average uPVC Window costs £600 to £1,800.
- The amount should be adjusted for inflation between now and whenever the scheme begins, particularly in a time where recent inflation has been as high as 10% per annum. £20k in the current inflationary environment would be worth far less in 9 years' time. Assuming an inflation rate of 5% for 9 years, £20k would be worth less than £13k!
- The scheme appears to only apply from 2032 despite activity starting in 2029!
- GAL state they expect to send a surveyor to each property to provide an assessment as to the requirements of the individual home. What is the surveyor's mandate? Surveyors should be mandated to ensure that noise insulation measures bring affected properties to a level of soundproofing comparable to pre-construction conditions
- The surveyors need to be independent of GAL to aid transparency and accountability.
- In my view the funds for the GAL noise insulation scheme should be held in trust and ring fenced to ensure compensation funds are always available and not diverted for other purposes.
- My experience, having used the current scheme, is that I have very little confidence in its success. The current operators of the scheme took a deposit from me, and didn't contact me for over two and a half years! It then took daily chasing of GAL's current supplier over a period of 6 months, to fit and supply my current windows. GAL need to offer alternative suppliers or guarantee a level of delivery and service.
- The current suppliers of my windows under the scheme left my property damaged from having installed the windows – They claimed that this is not covered by their work or the scheme and would be at my expense. I am now left with damaged interior and exterior walls that need redecoration. The scheme makes no reference to how this would be funded.
- The scheme during the construction phase would also appear inadequate. For example, will I be able to leave my washing out to dry if there is substantial dust in the environment? Who

will pay for the additional costs of electricity associated with having to use a tumble drier more frequently? Will I need to clean my windows, car etc more frequently due to dust? Will there be health hazards from dust? These seem like simple issues, but GAL are profiting at my expense with no consideration for the impact on me as a homeowner. GAL could provide compensation for increased utility bills or offering cleaning services to affected homeowners.

In conclusion, GAL's proposed noise insulation scheme presents several notable shortcomings and areas for improvement. From inadequate coverage of costs and inflation adjustments to concerns about surveyor independence and the lack of provisions for addressing homeowner grievances, there are crucial aspects that require further attention and refinement. It is imperative for GAL to address these concerns promptly and transparently to ensure that affected homeowners are adequately supported and that the scheme effectively mitigates the impact of aircraft noise. By incorporating the suggested enhancements and addressing homeowner feedback, GAL can ensure the scheme's success and uphold their commitment to providing meaningful assistance to those affected by airport operations

Homeowners Assisted Moving Scheme – inadequate.

GAL have proposed a homeowners assisted moving scheme. The scheme is captured in one paragraph and is not clear at all.

It states that *“Eligible applicants would receive a payment covering reasonable moving costs, estate agent fees up to 1% of the sale price, and stamp duty, up to a total maximum of £20,000. “*

Upon the scheme 14.9.10, it would appear incomplete and inadequate.

- According to Zoopla, a typical estate agent fee is c. 2% to 3% of the value of a property. For a property worth £462k (being the average house price in Sussex) that equates to £9,240 to £13,860.
- A typical moving fee is c. £1,000.
- For a £462k house, the stamp duty alone would be £10,600.
- For a typical Sussex home, this would equate to a total cost of over £20k in today's terms. The cap is therefore likely to bite in many circumstances.

The scheme should not have a cap of £20k, and if it is to have, it needs to consider the effect of inflation between the date that figure was calculated and the date a person wishes to move, as the above costs will all increase.

Finally, the scheme makes no consideration as to the impact on the value of the property because of the new runway. The Land Compensation Act 1973 (the Act) provides a right to homeowners to claim compensation where they suffer because of the use of works undertaken for the benefit of the community.

In summary, the scheme and GAL's proposals should take note of the land compensation act and my human rights and provide compensation accordingly, not just an inadequate noise insulation and assisted moving scheme with fixed caps that provide insufficient compensation for the true losses suffered.

Vibrations

Aircraft create significant noise when taking off and landing which creates sound waves causing vibrations in my home. For example, 777 aircraft when taking off shake my home to its core with my windows and doors in my lounge rattling as the aircraft take off (both easterly and westerly). This causes issues when I am speaking to my family and listening to the television. Increased aircraft operations that are closer to my home that results in an average doubling of the current sound energy generated will in all likelihood, result in:

- Increased risk of disturbances in my sleep from vibrating windows and doors which is likely to impact on my overall health and wellbeing.
- An increased risk of damage to my property from vibrations.

No consideration has been given by GAL of the impacts of these increased vibrations and no mitigation for the effects are proposed for me or my home. No amount of noise insulation will protect against these effects or stop my doors and windows from vibrating, rattling, and shaking!

In summary, I believe GAL should enhance their proposals to consider the impacts caused by vibrations from aircraft.

Noise Modelling

I have the following observations in respect of the accuracy of the noise modelling conducted by GAL.

- GAL have used a noise measuring stations (as per 14.6.18 or Figure 14.4.1) which have been used to create a model to estimate the current noise levels observed and expected to be observed because of the project. Noise monitoring locations are exclusively in populated areas parallel to the runway, and therefore are not representative of my home which is at the westerly end of the runway. The closest noise monitoring station is c. 1 km away from my home and situated parallel to the runway. Between my home and this noise monitoring station are a multitude of natural and manmade barriers which would absorb sound, making any accurate representation of the sound impossible to calculate and is almost certainly understated in GAL's calculations.
- The table below shows the projected N65 Day and N60 Night figures according to Gatwick Airport (source Gatwick Northern Runway Project – Aircraft Noise viewer for my Postcode RH6 0DJ)

	2019 Central case	2029 Central	2029 Slow
N65 Day	390	400.7	404
N60 Night	56.1	58.4	59.1

- The implications from the data provided by GAL, are that a large number of current aircraft movements, and almost all future aircraft movements (once the new runway has been built) do not generate noise levels above 65 and 60 decibels. I strongly contest this as wholly inaccurate!
- I am directly overflowed by aircraft departing westerly from Gatwick Airport (on average 75% of departures take off over my home). I have independently measured (from my garden) the noise levels that currently occur when Airbus A319's, A320's, A321's, A380's, Boeing 737's, 777's, 787's and even an ATR 72-600 propeller aircraft are taking off from the current runway. Each aircraft generates a peak noise more than 65 dB of noise when departing, with

most aircraft generating a peak noise of between 76dB and 86dB. These are contained in appendix 1 below.

- The measurements I have recorded are based on the current runway configuration and show that every aircraft movement from Gatwick airport would generate noise levels far more than those quoted by GAL in their report, which would be further exacerbated were the project to go ahead. To that extent I question the validity and accuracy of the modelling without their being a noise monitoring station closer to my own home.
- Smaller more modern and quieter aircraft (such as A319's, A320's) all create peak noise levels in excess of 75dB (measured in my garden) when departing Gatwick Airport, therefore, if the project were to proceed, the noise levels will increase significantly, and far in excess of those presented in GAL's report.
- It is my assertion that there are currently no aircraft that generate noise levels less than 65 dBs operating from Gatwick Airport (that fly over my home), which is in direct contrast to the table above produced by GAL. The increase in the N65 Day and N60 Night levels look materially understated as it pertains to the location of my property! The reports and tables presented indicate only a small increase in the N65 Day and N60 Night levels, whilst the reality will be closer to 275 (i.e., 100,000 additional aircraft taking off over a year) additional air traffic movements per day (a massive increase)!
 - On the basis that the measurements relating to my home appear inaccurate, this would call into questions the accuracy of other measurements produced by GAL's noise modelling.
- The noise modelling makes a range of assumptions about the mix and blend of aircraft in operation, together with material assumptions about future operations and an expectation of a transition to a quieter fleet of aircraft. This causes me a number of concerns, and GAL have provided no evidence to support these assumptions.
 - 1) Have airlines committed to acquire new planes? i.e., is this in Boeing and Airbus's order books and have airlines such as Easy Jet committed to this expenditure? It takes just over a year from order to delivery of an A320 to put a new plane on the runway, so surely there must be data available to support the assumptions being made?
 - 2) Airlines have also committed to larger aircraft – e.g. Emirates have recently agreed to purchase 90 Boeing 777's. Airbus 777's create a greater amount of noise and disruption, therefore, I would assert that Airlines are not just investing in quieter aircraft, they are also investing in larger aircraft that will generate increased revenue per flight for their operations. How have GAL factored this into their plans?
 - 3) It is not clear to me how GAL have modelled the change in use of the existing runway, and what impact moving smaller aircraft to the new runway would have on the use of the old runway? For example, does this create more space for larger aircraft such as 777's to operate from the existing runway? Larger aircraft generate far more noise!
 - 4) Only two scenarios are presented, a central and a reasonable downside case, which assumes a slower transition to newer aircraft. A single downside scenario given the wide range of observed impacts appears to be completely insufficient and lacks any level of statistical credibility against which to make an assessment for a project of this size and importance.
 - 5) The lack of further scenarios or even stochastic modelling to look at a range of outcomes is a real flaw in the noise modelling and analysis that has been conducted.
 - 6) As a minimum when evaluating such a proposal, it would be typical to consider a range of different scenarios and to assign potential probabilities to these, including for example:

- a. An upside scenario where there is an acceleration of aircraft development.
- b. Scenario's where an alternative aircraft mix is considered.
- c. A scenario whereby Heathrow airports third runway does not go ahead leading to increased demand.
- d. A worst case where there is no investment in new aircraft, however, unlikely.
- e. It may also be helpful for GAL to assign probabilities to each of their scenarios and develop a fan of outcomes.

In summary, I believe the noise modelling has a number of flaws, would benefit from increased stress and scenario testing, and enhancements should be made to the accuracy of the modelling by taking additional noise measurements at alternative locations and back testing the model.

Downplaying of the impacts of what a 3 dB – 6 dB impact really is.

The report as outlined by GAL (Gatwick Airports Environmental Statement Chapter 14) indicates that there will be an average increase in aircraft noise of between 3dB and 6dB at my home. At face value, this might sound small.

As I understand it, decibels are based on a logarithmic scale. This means that a small change in the decibels can result in a significant change in the intensity of noise. A 3dB change in sound yields a 100% increase in sound energy and the impact on hearing health is doubled (according to the institution of Occupational Health and Safety). A 6dB change will therefore result in a 200% increase in sound energy from aircraft noise. This does not seem insignificant! A 3dB - 6dB range in the context of a 100% to 200% increase in noise levels is very wide, and I would question why the noise modelling and outcomes predicted are not more accurate. Such an increase in noise will have a large number of implications on the health and mental wellbeing of my family and I.

Leq measure

Whilst the Leq measure is logarithmic, it is still an average noise measure which is misleading, quite simply because it ignores spikes in noise. A 3dB - 6dB increase in the average Leq measure, means that the absolute noise level when aircraft are taking off (due to their increased frequency and proximity to my house) will increase significantly given the ambient noise is far lower.

- It is the absolute frequency and severity of noise which will have the greatest impact on my health and ability to enjoy my home and garden, not the average measured over an extended period which paints a far rosier picture!
- Aircraft take both easterly and westerly paths, with aircraft making far more noise when taking off than landing. The Leq measure significantly averages out the expected noise levels on the days where aircraft would be taking off over my house by blending this into an average.
- It is the spikes during the day and overnight, that will cause me to awake with a far greater frequency, and impact my overall sleep quality which has been shown to lead to increased risk of lower immune functions and chronic illnesses.
- Regardless of this fact, a 3dB-6dB increase in Leq noise will be material and affect the value of my property and damage my health!

Consideration of my Human Rights

The proposed development by GAL may be good for the economy and local jobs, but this is at my expense and in breach of a range of my human rights. The environmental statement on noise and vibration refers to a range of different legal precedents and statements. Importantly, I see no consideration of the Human Rights Act 1998, which sets out the fundamental rights and freedoms that everyone in the UK is entitled to.

I consider there would be a breach of my human rights because of the project proceeding as follows:

- Article 2 – “Everyone’s right to life shall be protected by law. No one shall be deprived of his life intentionally”
 - It is my view from the evidence presented that were the project to proceed, there would be an increased impact on me and my family’s health and wellbeing, and therefore an impact on the quality and length of our lives.
- Article 8 - “Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.”
 - It is my view that the project will breach my right to enjoy my home peacefully without intrusion from noise, physical vibrations, and environmental pollution.
- Article 1 of the first protocol – “Protection of property - Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.”
 - It is my view that the project will breach my right to peaceful enjoyment of my home.
 - Further it is my view that insufficient consideration has been given to reasonable compensation under the Human Rights Act for the loss of my ability to enjoy my home.
- Article 14 – “The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status.”
 - It is my view that the project will breach my Human Rights of not being discriminated against on the grounds of property.
 - I.e., I consider that I am being discriminated against relative to GAL in respect of my health and wealth which would be materially affected were the project to proceed.

In conclusion, while the proposed development by GAL may promise economic benefits and job opportunities, it cannot be overlooked that its implementation poses significant risks to my fundamental human rights. The absence of adequate consideration for the protections afforded by the Human Rights Act 1998 raises serious concerns about the potential disregard for individuals' rights to life, privacy, property, and freedom from discrimination. Further, the lack of comprehensive mitigation measures or compensation (as outlined above) exacerbates these concerns. Therefore, it is imperative that GAL and the relevant authorities ensure that any development proceeds in a manner that respects and upholds the fundamental human rights of all individuals affected.

Ability to use and enjoy outside spaces.

The current measures proposed by GAL, such as the Homeowners scheme and noise insulation scheme, primarily focus on mitigating the impact within individuals' homes. However, it's crucial to recognize that the proposed development will also significantly affect my ability to enjoy the outdoor spaces, including my garden, which is an integral part of my property.

The noise generated by aircraft taking off, as measured in my garden, currently ranges between 70dB and 86dB, depending on the aircraft. With the new runway bringing flights closer to my home, there will inevitably be a notable increase in both the frequency and volume of flights, surpassing the current noise levels. Consequently, the new runway will directly impede my ability to enjoy the outdoors.

Specifically, the increased noise and flight frequency will disrupt my ability to host barbecues or socialize with friends and family in the garden, as conversation becomes challenging amidst the noise. Moreover, my garden serves as a sanctuary where I can unwind from the stresses of work. However, the amplified noise from the new runway threatens to impact my ability to enjoy my garden, which will significantly impact my mental well-being.

Current operations

It is important for those opining on the decision whether the project goes ahead or not, to be aware of the day-to-day impact on a local resident living near Gatwick Airport and being overflown, as the proposal will make this situation far worse!

With aircraft operations as they currently are, it materially impacts my ability to freely enjoy my property because of the noise. The impact will be amplified by the new proposals to a MAJOR degree!

- With windows closed in my home:
 - I currently have difficulty hearing the television or engaging in conversations in my property when aircraft are taking off over the property. For example, I am constantly pausing live TV!
 - My doors and windows regularly vibrate and rattle when aircraft take off.
 - My house guests and I are woken on regular occasions, particularly with late night and delayed flights.
- If the windows in my property are open:
 - It is not possible to hear the television or engage in a conversation in my property when aircraft are taking off or landing; and
 - I am not able to open my windows during a hot summer's night, due to the noise from aircraft. I have air conditioning in one room; however, it is not economically feasible to have air conditioning in every room given the costs to install and run.
- In my Garden:
 - It is not possible to engage in a conversation with house guests or my neighbours when aircraft fly over (taking off or landing). This is once every couple of minutes.

Under the proposal outlined, with the increased noise and frequency and intensity of operations, it will be almost impossible for me to enjoy my home or garden.

The sheer level of noise cannot really be appreciated until you try to have a conversation with someone in my garden whilst any multitude of aircraft take off overhead! I seriously dread to think what this will be like if the project proceeds.

What the Impacts of increased noise levels will mean for me in my home

As outlined in GAL's report, the new runway will have a material impact on my ability to enjoy my home. The new runway will:

- Result in an increase in noise that will make simple activities like watching television and sleeping more difficult.
- Mean that opening windows in my property – to get fresh air will be impossible.
- Result in increased number of times that I am awoken at night by aircraft (from increased night flights).
- Impact on guests visiting my home, who will feel uncomfortable as they cannot open windows or sleep comfortably.
- Impact my mental health – if I'm unable to use outside spaces and invite visitors to my home (for example to have a bbq during the summer).
- Impact my financial well being if the value of my property reduces.
- Potentially mean I am unable to move home if the value of my property reduces.

In relation to night flights, Document 14.9.2, paragraph 7.4.7 states

“The area where these additional 12 flights will create the highest noise levels over an average summer night is under the departure route from the Northern Runway in the [REDACTED] area, south of Charwood. There is a relatively small population here who will experience these 12 additional flights, and the higher noise levels of the flights moved northwards from the main runway, with noise levels over a range of Lmax levels. The modelling shows that when the effect of the change in Lmax levels here is summed across all aircraft, each person on average would experience 0.8 additional awakenings per night”.

I understand that this only impacts a small number of properties (20), one of these properties is mine, and I do not relish the increased likelihood of being woken up at such regular intervals.

I can understand that one estimated additional “awakening” as GAL refer to doesn't potentially sound much in the context of 20 awakenings as they refer to it, however, there is a huge difference between an awakening when you roll over (which is a typical awakening), and caused by an A320 roaring overhead that truly wakes you up!

To that extent GAL have stated in their documentation that they expect to wake me up every night. GAL state that this “seems likely to have a small health effect” – however, from my perspective as an affected resident, I don't believe the project should have **any impact** on me and my families sleep and hence our health!

GAL themselves state that *“it is currently unclear how many additional noise-induced awakenings are acceptable and without consequences for sleep recuperation and health”* – without offering any evidence. This is simply not good enough to allow a meaningful conclusion to be made. I personally doubt any of the GAL team would appreciate someone knocking on their front door every night to create an additional awakening!

In conclusion, the anticipated impacts outlined in GAL's report pose significant challenges to my daily life, well-being, and financial wellbeing. From disrupted sleep patterns to diminished enjoyment of my home and outdoor spaces, the proposed increase in noise levels threatens to have profound consequences for me and my family. Moreover, the uncertainty surrounding the acceptable threshold for noise-induced awakenings and their potential health implications only adds to my apprehension. It is imperative that these concerns are thoroughly addressed and mitigated before any decisions regarding the project are finalized.

Purchase of my Property

During the consultation process, I was challenged by GAL that as a resident living close to Gatwick Airport that I was aware of aircraft noise when I purchased the property.

When I purchased my property in 2017, I did so knowing that I was moving close to Gatwick airport. However, this was after the UK Government made its decision to push forward with a second runway at Heathrow (October 2016), and therefore I felt comfortable that Gatwick airport would not be expanding. No reasonable person could therefore anticipate Gatwick to submit plans that lead to a 40% increase in aircraft operations, 70% increase in passenger numbers or the increased noise that is anticipated under the Gatwick development because of aircraft flying more frequently and closer to my property.