

I do not want to live under an illegal motorway! The sound of aircraft is much more disturbing than mere traffic - it builds up slowly then resembles a noisy electric appliance (with cheap parts) as it flies overhead then just as the noise starts to diminish the next one repeats the cycle- a form of torture that disturbs, sleep, thought and creativity. But obviously the proposed expansion will impact us all in many ways and I attach below a community letter which addresses those concerns.

Written Representation from Gatwick Obviously Not

Gatwick Obviously Not (GON) is a community group that campaigns on behalf of people living in west Kent and surrounding areas whose health, wellbeing and quality of life is adversely affected by Gatwick Airport.

GON strongly opposes Gatwick's proposals. Expansion would blight the areas in which GON operates and cause huge wider environmental damage.

This representation focuses on the climate and noise aspects of Gatwick's proposals. However, we also oppose the application on other grounds including:

- a. Gatwick has not put forward a policy compliant needs case. The ANPS requires airports (other than Heathrow) that are seeking to expand to demonstrate sufficient need for their proposals, additional to (or different from) the need which would be met by the provision of a Northwest Runway at Heathrow. Gatwick has instead assumed that there will be no development at Heathrow.
- b. The airport has substantial surplus passenger and ATM capacity without the proposed development. In our view there is no current or policy compliant need for development.
- c. We dispute the Gatwick's assessment of the economic and employment benefits of the project.
- d. We are concerned about the effects of the project on local roads and air quality near the airport, on water supply and flooding and on congestion on the rail and trunk networks which airport traffic uses but which are vital for communities much more widely.

Baseline

We are not confident that Gatwick's ATM and passenger volumes baseline is achievable with existing consented infrastructure, i.e. without the proposed development. If baseline conditions are not achievable, the environmental and noise effects of the proposed development will be understated.

Climate impacts

We oppose this application on the basis that it is likely to generate a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions, and other climate impacts, that run counter to the UK's net zero obligations. There is a high risk that the carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions reductions from aircraft, relied upon by Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) in its forecasts, will not be achieved.

The proposed expansion is also inconsistent with CCC advice that no airport expansions should proceed until a UK-wide capacity management framework is in place to assess and, if required, control sector emissions and non-CO₂ effects.

The Government's objective is to ensure that the aviation sector makes a significant and cost-effective contribution towards reducing global emissions.

Gatwick's proposal would materially increase emissions and is therefore incompatible with the government's objective.

The ANPS states that an increase in carbon emissions that would have a material impact on the Government's ability to meet its carbon reduction targets would be a reason to refuse development consent. In our view Gatwick's proposals clearly have the potential to have such a material impact.

Prior to mitigation CO₂ emissions attributable to Gatwick in 2038 are forecast to be 2.5 million tonnes pa higher than in 2018, an increase of nearly 50%.

Emissions attributable to Gatwick would grow from less than 1% of total UK emissions to over 5.5% of the CCC's recommended total UK emissions in 2038.

Much of this is attributable to the project. An increase in emissions of this magnitude would plainly be so significant that it would have a material impact on the UK's ability to meet its carbon reduction targets.

We recognise that some emissions mitigation may be possible. However, there are presently no proven measures by which emissions on the scale forecast by Gatwick could be mitigated.

IEMA guidance requires assessments to consider the certainty of mitigation proposals and whether they are realistic and achievable. Neither Gatwick nor the government have carried out any such assessment. Consequently, Gatwick's mitigation assumptions do not comply with IEMA guidance and should be reassessed on a compliant basis.

For these reasons Gatwick's assumption that the emissions reductions modelled in Jet Zero will be achieved is neither reasonable nor consistent with the precautionary principle and IEMA guidance. Jet Zero outcomes are "illustrative scenarios", not a set of policies that can be relied on to reduce aviation emissions. Gatwick should recognise the uncertainty and high risk in Jet Zero and model

alternative scenarios.

Gatwick has also failed to quantify the non-CO₂ effects of the project. These should be costed and presented for consideration.

In addition to the impacts of this proposal, the planning process should assess the scale and impacts of emissions from all proposed UK airport expansions against global and national targets and commitments.

If the airport feels confident that in fact the emissions increases will be aligned with Government's policies and measures then it should agree to a binding set of annual emissions caps in line - at least - with the Government's proposed CO₂ trajectory for aviation.

All statements of Government support for airport expansion are qualified with wording about justification and sustainability to be judged by the relevant planning authority. There is nowhere in Government policy that states that climate considerations should be excluded or given zero weight in the planning process for airport expansion. Instead, the Government establishes a clear test that the expansion of any airport must meet its climate change obligations. We therefore highlight here what we consider to be relevant evidence on the climate impact of this proposal to be taken into account in the planning decision-making process. We further argue that if the scheme is given approval, it must come with enforceable conditions that greenhouse gas emissions will be capped, at least in line with the emissions forecast presented by the Applicant.

This proposal would generate a larger increase in both passengers and emissions than any airport expansion proposal since the passing of net zero legislation in the UK, so the issue requires some close attention.

The Applicant is wrong to rely on the efficacy of current policy measures to reduce emissions to net zero by 2050. The emissions forecast from the Applicant has been based on the Government's 'High Ambition' trajectory for aviation in the Jet Zero Strategy. This includes modelling assumptions – on alternative fuels and more efficient aircraft – that are significantly more optimistic than earlier forecasts. Anticipated emissions associated with the project are therefore much lower than previously expected: using the Government's pre-Jet Zero assumptions, the increase in emissions associated with this project would have been in the region of 1MtCO₂ in 2050; the adoption of the Jet Zero assumptions sees this number fall to 0.513MtCO₂ in 2050. This highlights the sensitivity of the forecasts to the assumptions regarding proposed mitigation.

The Applicant claims that "Jet Zero commits the UK Government to implementing measures to fulfil its legal duty on net zero, and to management of emissions from aviation within this."

In fact, however, while the Jet Zero Strategy set out the Government's targets and aspirations for emissions reduction, many of the measures that would be required to achieve this are uncertain and some are beyond the Government's control. The rate of commercialisation of more efficient aircraft, for example, is not typically a matter for national governments and the Jet Zero Strategy makes no policy proposals on this topic. Similarly, the strategy makes optimistic assumptions about global carbon markets but beyond advocating for global policy change, the UK has no power to ensure that the CORSIA scheme does in fact become more rigorous after it ends in 2035, and the strategy does not propose any backstop policies if the plan to rely on the international carbon market is not successful. While the UK ETS, applicable to domestic and international departures to EEA destinations, offers a more robust scheme that the Government intends to align with net zero, its international route coverage is also subject to CORSIA rules and the Government is still "carefully considering the approach to [this] interaction".

On uptake of Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF), while the Government has begun to develop proposals for a SAF mandate, big questions remain to be addressed about issues such as feedstock sourcing, and proposals to develop a UK SAF industry, beginning with the construction of five SAF plants by 2025, already look off track. The Climate Change Committee's most recent Progress Report characterised the approach of the Jet Zero Strategy as "high risk due to its reliance on nascent technology" (echoing a similar conclusion from Element Energy, in a report commissioned by

AEF <http://aef.org.uk/uploads/2022/05/The-Role-of-Aviation-Demand-in-Decarbonisation-Full-Report.pdf>). The CCC report argues that the expansion of airports permitted by the Government in recent years is "incompatible with the UK's Net Zero target unless aviation's carbon-intensity is outperforming the Government's pathway and can accommodate this additional demand" and that "No airport expansions should proceed until a UK-wide capacity management framework is in place to annually assess and, if required, control sector CO₂ emissions and non-CO₂ effects."

We recognise that the Government has the right to reject the CCC's advice and has recently published its response. As noted by the Applicant, however, the Secretary of State ultimately has responsibility for ensuring that climate change

legislation is adhered to. The application states: "An important element of Jet Zero is that the emissions trajectory for the aviation sector will be monitored on an annual basis whilst the Strategy itself will be reviewed every five years. This acknowledges that decarbonisation will rely on new technologies which require time to develop and test. However, the Strategy explains (for example, on page 10) that the Government will intervene with new measures if the sector is not meeting its emissions trajectory."

It would seem to us that if the CCC is correct about the Government's strategy being unrealistic in its reliance on new fuels and technologies coming rapidly to the market, and if its modelling for airport expansion is therefore inappropriate, then the Government will in the near future need to act to rein in emissions by way of demand reduction. This should – at least – be recognised as a risk to the financial case being made for expansion at Gatwick (and at other airports). The downward revision of the level of demand forecasted by the Government from 70% to 50% within the space of a year (between the publication of the Jet Zero Strategy and of Jet Zero: One Year On) illustrates how vulnerable these estimates are to change.

The Government's climate change obligations are not confined to 2050: the Sixth Carbon Budget (2033-37) and the Government's interim target of a 78% reduction in emissions below 1990 levels by 2035 are also notable milestones. The emissions associated with this project during the 2030s should be examined closely given that GAL forecasts a higher trajectory for emissions in this decade (and for its cumulative emissions generally out to 2050) compared to the Government's Jet Zero strategy (see Diagram 16.9.3 in TR020005).

The Applicant should have modelled the non-CO2 impacts of the proposal. There is a longstanding policy gap related to the non-CO2 climate warming impact of flying. The CCC states in its sixth carbon budget advice (box 8.6) "non-CO2 effects contribute around two-thirds of the total aviation effective radiative forcing – twice as much as historical CO2 emissions from aviation." The Applicant argues, however, that: "[Given] that there remains no well-established methodology for quantifying non-CO2 emissions impacts, and there is uncertainty on how to identify the magnitude of their impact, this assessment does not attempt to quantify non-GHG and RF effects of emissions at altitude. Providing a comparative set of figures alongside the CO2 emissions would be incompatible with an assessment against national CO2 targets, and as noted above, the generalised approach to providing CO2 equivalent estimates to reflect the combined impact of different GHGs is not transferrable to non-CO2 emissions." We don't agree with the decision not to provide an appraisal of the non-CO2 impacts of the proposal. While it is true that uncertainties remain about the correct methodology for quantification of these effects for the purposes of policy, failure to provide any estimate is not an adequate response. While we await policy proposals for tackling aviation's non-CO2 impacts (the Government, working with the Jet Zero Council, has launched a work programme on this issue), it would improve the transparency of the proposal for an estimate of non-CO2 impacts to be provided, for example using the approach recommended by the Government for company reporting of travel emissions (which is to apply a multiplication factor of 0.7 to the CO2 impact to account for non-CO2) in order for the inspectors to weigh this additional harm in the balance.

It should also be noted that the European Commission is consulting on the objectives, scope and first steps for establishing a monitoring, reporting and verification system for non-CO2 effects in aviation as part of the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS), while the UK Government recently consulted on how non-CO2 impacts could potentially be included in the UK ETS in the future. The Applicant should have made a commitment to cap aviation emissions as part of its Climate Action Plan

As set out above, our view is that a significant airport expansion such as the proposal at Gatwick should not be permitted in the absence of much greater certainty about the effectiveness of proposed mitigations for aviation emissions. If, however, the airport has confidence in the Government's plan – as indicated in its Environmental Statement and as reflected in its use of the Jet Zero modelling assumptions – then the Applicant should agree to the imposition by the planning authority of an enforceable annual cap on aviation emissions associated with the airport. The Applicant states. In relation to its Carbon Action Plan or CAP: "Our commitment to play our part in the UK's Jet Zero trajectory is not contingent on the Project being consented, but the CAP uses the legally binding nature of the DCO application to provide an additional level of assurance to stakeholders." However, aircraft emissions are essentially excluded from the Plan. While the airport may argue that these emissions are beyond its direct control, the same could surely be said of aircraft noise, which is nevertheless frequently subject to planning conditions and limits on capacity.

We note that despite adopting the Jet Zero modelling assumptions, Gatwick anticipates its own emissions trajectory being very different from the national

trajectory – increasing from current emissions levels and then flattening out but not falling nearly as steeply as the average across all airports (Diagram 16.9.3 in TR020005). We would suggest that - as a minimum – it should be required by way of conditions that the Applicant’s forecast level of emissions must not be exceeded in any year. A more stringent set of annual caps could also be considered.

The Jet Zero Strategy still allows for a high level (nearly 20 Mt) of emissions to be generated by the sector even by 2050, with ‘out of sector’ carbon removals assumed to be in place to balance these emissions. Arguably the curve towards zero should be much steeper. The setting of an emissions condition would help to provide accountability for the claims and assumptions being made. While this approach would be new, and would require some additional work to be done in terms of developing the appropriate wording for a planning condition, we see a strong case for introducing one if the scheme should go ahead given the importance of the climate change issue and the current lack of enforceability of hoped-for emissions reductions.

Noise

We comment below on government policy in relation to the levels at which aircraft noise has community effects, the extent of those effects, and the Applicant’s use of those limits.

Significant Observed Adverse Effects Level (SOAEL)

The ANPS says (paragraph 5.68) that development consent should not be granted unless the Secretary of State is satisfied that a proposed airport development avoids significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise, within the context of Government policy on sustainable development.

The Applicant’s ES (paragraph 14.2.53) states that “Government guidance, as summarised above, does not explicitly define SOAEL for aviation noise”. The Applicant argues, by reference to planning precedents, that SOAEL is 63 dB LAeq, 16 hour. We do not agree with this view.

The Noise Policy Statement for England says that it is not possible to have a single objective noise-based measure that defines SOAEL that is applicable to all sources of noise in all situations and consequently that SOAEL is likely to be different for different noise sources, for different receptors and at different times.

It is therefore necessary to consider what aviation policy says about the level at which significant adverse effects occur in relation to aviation noise. The Aviation Policy Framework says (paragraph 3.17) “We will continue to treat the 57dB LAeq 16 hour contour as the average level of daytime aircraft noise marking the approximate onset of significant community annoyance” (emphasis added). As far as we are aware this is the only reference to significant adverse effects levels in government aviation noise policy.

The 57dB LAeq 16 hour contour should therefore be regarded as the level from which significant adverse effects occur (i.e.SOAEL) and accordingly, in accordance with the ANPS, development consent should not be granted unless effects above that level are avoided.

We note that some past planning cases have determined aviation SOAEL to be 63 dB LAeq, 16 hour but consider that this view is not properly rooted in policy.

We note with concern the fact that the Applicant has failed to reference in its ES the APF policy on the level at which significant impacts occur.

Lowest Observed Adverse Effects Level (LOAEL)

The Consultation Response on UK Airspace Policy: A Framework for Balanced Decisions on the Design and Use of Airspace, October 2017, (Consultation Response) sets LOAELs for aircraft noise at 51 dB LAeq 16 hour for daytime, and 45 dB LAeq, 8 hour for night-time.

The Applicant asserts that by using these LOAEL metrics it will have ensured that the total adverse air noise effects on people arising from the proposed development have been assessed. It justifies this view by reference to the comment in the Consultation Response that “These metrics [LOAEL] will ensure that the total adverse effects on people can be assessed and airspace options compared.” We do not agree with the Applicant’s interpretation of this comment. It is widely acknowledged in UK government aviation policy documents and consultations, and in research, that some people living in areas outside LOAEL contours are adversely impacted by aviation noise. The 2014 Survey of Noise Attitudes (SONA) shows that some 7% of people were highly annoyed by aircraft noise at levels below 51 dB LAeq 16 hour.

In addition, the World Health Organisation’s strong recommendations, following a comprehensive review of the scientific evidence, is that noise exposure averaged across the day, evening and night, should be reduced to below 45 dB Lden, as aircraft noise above this level is associated with adverse health effects, and that night noise exposure should be reduced to below 40 dB Lnight, as aircraft noise above this level is associated with adverse effects on sleep.

At Gatwick specifically there is clear evidence from complaint data that many people living in areas outside LOAEL contours regard themselves as being significantly adversely impacted. Virtually all campaign groups set up around Gatwick since 2014 have been based in areas outside LOAEL contours.

More broadly we do not believe that the LOAEL levels the government has set have been sufficiently robustly derived to be used as the exclusive measure of air noise impacts in a planning process and we urge the Authority to take account of wider evidence, as it is entitled to do,

The LOAEL levels derive from SONA. SONA is both now old and its conclusions are subject to significant doubt particularly in circumstances where noise is increasing or changing as it would if Gatwick was allowed to expand. Amongst other things SONA did not survey people in areas below 51dB LAeq. It therefore did not generate any data on levels of annoyance in populations outside LOAEL. Crucially, it also did not assess attitudes to aircraft noise in areas in which there had been change or expansion.

There is wide and authoritative acceptance that LOAEL metrics are not reliable measures of annoyance in the circumstances in which the Applicant has used them, i.e. in support of an application for expansion. The Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise (ICCAN) stated that SONA was not designed to consider the change in noise attitudes caused by an airport undergoing a period of volatility in its operation, such as expansion. The International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) is clear that exposure-response relationships are not applicable to assess the effects of a change in the noise climate, for instance where a new runway is opened, and that common noise exposure variables (such as Leq) only account for about one third of community impacts.

For all these reasons it is clear that aircraft noise below LOAEL has adverse impacts on large numbers of people which should be taken into account in planning assessments. By excluding these people, the Applicant has materially understated the effects of aircraft noise. We note that the relevant representation from the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) made clear that many people in areas outside LOAEL contours are adversely affected by aircraft noise, and particularly highlighted vulnerable subgroups, including those that are highly noise sensitive.

We therefore propose:

- First that the Applicant should be asked to report and cost noise impacts using the limits strongly recommended by the World Health Organisation in 2018, being 45 dB Lden across the full day and 40 dB Lnight, as aircraft noise above this level is associated with adverse health effects and adverse effects on sleep. Although these targets have not yet been adopted by the UK government, they are likely to provide a more accurate indication of noise impacts than LOAEL.

- Secondly that the Authority asks the CAA to advise whether the ongoing Aircraft Noise Attitudes Survey suggests any change in attitudes to aircraft noise. ANAS is being conducted in two waves the first of which was undertaken in September 2023. We understand there were over 3,000 responses in the Gatwick area. The CAA therefore now has the data from that survey wave and has had time to analyse it. It would be unfortunate if data that the CAA and government possesses was not made available to the Authority so it could be properly taken into account.

Noise envelope consultation

The ANPS requires noise envelopes to be “defined in consultation with local communities”.

The CAA’s guidance on noise envelopes, CAP 1129, states that “... it is essential that full agreement is achieved between all stakeholders on the envelope’s criteria, limit values and means of implementation and enforcement”.

Although the Applicant consulted and engaged on its noise envelope proposals its process did not meet either of those tests.

Community groups repeatedly requested changes in Gatwick’s noise envelope engagement process in order to align it with CAA guidance and the ANPS. For example, we asked for:

- the terms of reference to be changed to comply with CAP 1129
- the process to be independently chaired
- additional time to allow issues to be explored in necessary detail; and
- independent technical advisory support.

The applicant refused each of these requests.

Community groups also requested additional data and analysis that was essential to effective noise envelope engagement and which only Gatwick was able to provide. This was also refused. We made clear that the lack of additional data and analysis precluded informed engagement and meant that GAL’s process would not be able to generate policy-compliant outputs.

Finally, Gatwick rejected the overwhelming majority of comments on its noise envelope proposals. It also rejected most of our comments on its Noise Envelope

Group Output Report which does not reflect community group views.

We note that there were nearly 6,000 comments on noise in response to the Applicant's 2021 consultation and that less than 10% of respondents supported its noise envelope proposals. Despite this overwhelming opposition the noise envelope presented to the Authority is in all material respects the same as the one proposed in the 2021 consultation.

For the reasons above the Applicant has failed to engage on its noise envelope proposals in a meaningful or policy compliant way. It should be required to engage properly, under independent chairmanship, to develop new noise envelope proposals. We note that the UK Health Security Agency also encourages the Applicant to continue engaging with local stakeholders to define a noise envelope that best meets their needs.

Non-compliance with noise envelope policy

The Aviation Policy Framework (APF) states that "as a general principle, the Government therefore expects that future growth in aviation should ensure that benefits are shared between the aviation industry and local communities. This means that the industry must continue to reduce and mitigate noise as airport capacity grows."

The Applicant contends that these policy principles were removed by the 2023 Overarching Aviation Noise Policy. We do not agree. The new Overarching Policy clearly replaces the overall objective on noise set out in the APF. However, it does not, in our view, replace the policy principles set out above. In the APF the government's noise objective and the policy principles are stated separately. The latter can best be seen as providing guidance on the meaning and practical application of the former. We believe the same applies now, with the principles providing guidance on the application of the new overarching policy. We note that the Government has not suggested removal of the policy principles in any consultation and that the announcement of the new Overarching Policy did not state or imply that the principles had been removed.

In addition, the ANPS says that noise envelopes must "... achieve a balance between growth and noise reduction" and states "the Airports NPS must be used as the primary policy on noise when considering the Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme, and has primacy over other wider noise policy sources".

The Applicant's noise envelope proposals do not achieve the APF policy principles or achieve a balance between growth and noise reduction.

In the first noise envelope period the benefits of growth would accrue almost entirely to the industry, which would benefit from a 62% increase in passenger capacity while communities suffer substantial increases in noise.

In the second noise envelope period the noise impacts on communities would continue to be substantially greater than in 2019 once account was taken of the frequency of aircraft, a key measure of community annoyance. Thereafter, the proposed review process would allow noise to increase above the 2019 base year level on any measure.

Rather than the airport reducing noise as capacity grows, noise would increase very substantially and potentially indefinitely. And rather than the benefits of growth being shared, benefits would flow almost entirely to the industry.

The APF also requires noise envelopes to give communities certainty about future levels of noise. The Applicant's proposals do not do so. There are no restrictions on noise in the winter period and future noise envelope reviews could increase noise without limit.

Policy additionally requires noise envelopes to incentivise airlines to introduce the quietest suitable aircraft as quickly as reasonably practicable. Gatwick's has assumed a slow transition from current to less noisy aircraft in its noise envelope proposals. This would remove any incentive for airlines to introduce quieter aircraft at Gatwick, and might motivate them to do so at other airports first.

New noise envelope proposals must comply with policy. Specifically, noise should reduce as capacity grows, at a pace that achieves a genuine sharing of the benefits of growth between industry and communities. New proposals should cover all periods of the year and reflect a best-case fleet transition that incentivises airlines to introduce quieter aircraft quickly.

Noise envelope metrics

The Applicant's proposed noise envelope uses a single, average noise, metric, Leq. It is widely accepted that Leq does not portray aircraft noise as experienced by communities, and all relevant policy and guidance advises against its use as a sole metric.

The APF says "... we recommend that average noise contours should not be the only measure used when airports seek to explain how locations under flight paths are affected by aircraft noise. Instead the Government encourages airport operators to use alternative measures which better reflect how aircraft noise is experienced in different localities, developing these measures in consultation with their consultative committee and local communities. The objective should be to

ensure a better understanding of noise impacts and to inform the development of targeted noise mitigation measures”.

The CAA’s noise envelope guidance, CAP 1129, recommends using a “combination of parameters” and states that “where unilateral agreement cannot be achieved using standard metrics, consideration should be given to designing envelopes using other metrics provided that they are scientifically valid and robust”.

The ANPS requires noise envelopes to be tailored to local priorities and to be defined in consultation with local communities.

The Applicant’s proposed noise envelope is based solely on Leq metrics and therefore does not meet any of these tests.

We note the Applicant’s assertion that use of Leq is supported by SONA but do not believe the evidence supports that claim. ICCAN stated that SoNA was not designed to consider the change in noise attitudes caused by an airport undergoing a period of volatility in its operation, such as expansion. ICAO is clear that exposure-response relationships are not applicable to assess the effects of a change in the noise climate, for instance where a new runway is opened and that common noise exposure variables (such as Leq) only account for about one third of community impacts. In our view SoNA provides no evidence that Leq is a reliable indicator of community impact over a period in which an airport is growing in the way the Applicant proposes.

The Applicant’s proposal to report secondary metrics is irrelevant because no limits would be set for those metrics and they would impose no obligations or noise limits on the airport.

Revised noise envelope proposals should include a suite of metrics and limits to be agreed with all stakeholders.

Noise envelope reviews

The Applicant has proposed noise envelope review, compliance and breach arrangements that are wholly one sided and do not comply with policy. New review, compliance and breach arrangements should be developed and agreed.

Noise objective

We do not support the regulation 598 noise objective the Applicant has proposed, because it selectively omits key elements of government policy. The objective should be amended to refer to and reflect all relevant government policy.

Night flights

The ANPS requires a ban on scheduled night flights between 11pm and 7am. That requirement clearly applies to any Heathrow third runway project.

However, the ANPS is also clearly stated to be an important and relevant consideration for any airport nationally significant infrastructure project in the South East of England, not just Heathrow.

The Applicant has not proposed a ban on night flights or made any other night flight commitment other than the summer night noise envelope, which provides headroom for additional night flights in the summer period and offers no protection in the winter period. It has instead assumed that government night flight restrictions will limit growth in night flights, but made no commitment to limit the number of night flights it might seek in the future. In fact, the Applicant envisages growth in night flight numbers over the full eight-hour night period. By making specific reference to a night flight ban in the ANPS the Government has made clear that relying solely on future government night flight restrictions is not a sufficient measure and does not provide sufficient community protection where an airport is seeking consent for major expansion.

The Authority should therefore, in our view, advise that there should be a ban on night flights as a condition to any approval of the DCO. In addition, the Authority should require that a comprehensive package of measures is put in place to incentivise the use of the quietest aircraft at night outside the hours of a ban, as also required by the ANPS.

Conditions

There should be no expansion at Gatwick. However, if consent for the development was granted it should be conditional on a wide range of additional measures including:

- A ban on all night flights for a full eight-hour period every night.
- A noise envelope agreed with local communities which achieves the government’s policy requirements that noise must be reduced and mitigated as capacity grows and the benefits of growth shared.
- A enforceable, progressive and material reduction in the emissions and total climate impacts attributable to the airport from a 2019 baseline.
- No increase in road traffic to the airport.
- A legally binding commitment that there would be no further runway, terminal or associated development at Gatwick including no full new runway.