

## 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 [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], 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 [REDACTED]!). 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.**

<b>Aircraft type</b>	<b>Route</b>	<b>Noise currently generated when departing</b>
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 28<sup>th</sup> 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.