

Oral statement made by Cllr Christina Coleman; 31st July 2024:

There is a certain causal relationship between the consent of a second runway at Gatwick and increased emissions from additional flights. Indeed, increased passenger volumes and a greater proportion of long haul flights is the primary purpose of the expansion (as stated by Stewart Wingate, the Chief Executive of Gatwick airport). The Aviation Environment Federation has calculated that the proposed runway and passenger growth would add a million tonnes of CO2 per year by 2050.

Therefore the landmark Supreme Court ruling of *Finch vs Surrey County Council* is relevant. In that case it was found that:

There had been an overly narrow interpretation of the Environmental Impact Assessment regime.

*Finch vs Surrey County Council 2024*, Para 16 & 17 says that Article 3(1) requires the EIA to describe and cover the "direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, transboundary, short-term, medium-term and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of the project."

The climate impacts resulting from the end use consumption must be considered in an Environmental Impact Assessment.

*Finch vs Surrey CC* found that the exclusion of end-use or down-stream emissions from the Environmental Impact Assessment were inconsistent and legally flawed (regardless of where these emissions actually took place - as the atmosphere know no borders).

The same principles apply in this case:

This application narrowly focus on the direct emissions generated as a result of the airport building itself, rather than the emissions the expansion will generate, which is not an honest assessment of the full consequences of the development. Reliance on the Government's jet zero aspirations is premature, insufficient and irresponsible in regulating emissions. The sustainability of alternative fuels must be properly assessed and not assumed, which can only take place once the technology exists at scale.

Reliance on jet zero as a justification for expansion represents an act of wilful blindness of the extent of climate damage that would be caused.

Responsibility for the emissions from international aviation must be fully accounted for, regardless of where those emissions take place.

Therefore the exclusion of down-stream emissions from this DCO dishonest and unlawful.