

I am writing to oppose this application and to formally complain about failures in the process of consultation and in the scope of the assessment and the application:

1. a new second runway will Definitely require expanded and additional flight paths - the impact of these should be considered as an integral part of this application – As submitted by EasyJet and British Airways RR, a new second runway will require the expansion and creation of new flight paths, there will fly over hundreds of thousands of residents previously unaffected by aircraft noise. This should be considered as part of this application, and should not be allowed to be a separate and parallel process, pretending it is somehow an unrelated issue. This application is not viable without expanding and adding to flight paths.

2. compensation – If this plan goes ahead the value of my home will halve - if this were a major new road being built the DOT would compensate me for that. There should be full and meaningful compensation for all residents impacted by additional noise and the expansion of noise corridor to impact those previously outside of the corridor.

3. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB) and of historic importance are not addressed. There should not be flight path changes taking planes out low over areas of outstanding natural beauty bringing noise blight and pollution to previously quiet and beautiful countryside and villages (such as Coldharbour, Holmwood, Brockham and Leigh) and the North Downs

4. Non compliance with Policy – (ISH1) This is a new runway. This application does not comply with 'Beyond the Horizons – Making Best Use of Existing Runways'.

5. Ignoring Scope 3 emissions is ridiculous in the application, and incompetent in the assessment – (ISH9) Scope 3 emissions should be included in the assessment of the application and in any emissions cap, the massive increase in flights will drive a massive increase in emissions. In addition other scope 3 sources will increase such as waste transportation to third party incinerators.

6. Aircraft Noise reduction targets should be mandatory – (ISH90) there should be a 0.5 decibel reduction every year in the noise envelope, as proposed by PINS (proposed at ISH9). If Gatwick disagrees, then they obviously don't believe that aircraft will get quieter as detailed in their submission. There should also be a night flight ban.

7. Air Quality targets should be mandatory, not just passive monitoring – (ISH9) Gatwick offers nothing more than to 'monitor' air quality. This is not acceptable; air quality standards must be legally binding in the DCO.