

From: Jeremy Stirling
Sent: 14 August 2024 14:55
To: Gatwick Airport
Cc: James Bowdidge
Subject: Gatwick Airport Planning application for change of use of emergency runway

Dear Planning Inspectorate

This note is from the: Langton Green Village Society.
Sender: Jeremy Stirling
Role: Committee member with aviation brief

For: Phase 9 of enquiry process.
Close date: 21.08.2024

This society has submitted previous input to the planning inspectorate regarding Gatwick's application for change of use for then emergency runway. So you will have on record that our village, some 18 miles from the runway landing point, is at the point on the approach path for planes landing from the east (70% of all landings) where incoming aircraft congregate for their final approach to touchdown. Langton Green is in the eye of the landing "storm". Gatwick's application has a major impact on the quality of life of all of our community - as it does on the thousands of other citizens who live under or near landing and take off flight paths for the airport. Your records will show that our small village alone has some 3,000 inhabitants, all of who are impacted by this application which, if approved, would see Gatwick grow to an annual passenger number of some 74,000,000 people per year. As big as Heathrow is now.

Our village society has previously submitted the reasons for its objections to this application. But, in the light of the new Government's focus on business growth and easier planning we believe it worthwhile restating our objections because they are equally valid despite the changes in Governments priorities.

Having watched this application since inception we also have some comments on the planning process which we hope you will consider and react positively to:

We appreciate that the planning application process is a formal structure, but it fails on one major area. That of making it simple for affected communities to make their "lived experience" views relative to a major application understood and considered. The process may satisfy the needs of planners but does little for the people affected because you phrase your topics in planning terms which may have little to do with the impact on our lived experiences. Your process shuts down the opportunity for communities to say what is really important from their point of view. Not simply a NIMBY moan but a considered view. Langton's areas of concern are as follows:

1. **Pollution.** Air and sound. Despite technical improvements these are both issues that affect communities badly and those onus who are affected have to bear

the costs for other's mostly leisure pleasure. And Gatwick want to increase our pollution misery.

2. **The environment.** Global warming almost an existential threat. The pressure should be on reduction of flight numbers, yet Gatwick's application would result in a 30%+ increase in flight numbers. Totally counter-strategic.

3. **Need.** Gatwick is primarily a short haul vacation focus airport. The Aviation review of 2014 (approx) indicated a need for increased business flights and interconnectivity. That can only be achieved at Heathrow. Gatwick's application does not meet national needs. A fast rail connection between Gatwick and Heathrow is impossible. Gatwick cannot be a business satellite for Heathrow interconnectivity.

4. If **additional short haul flights** are needed, Stansted and Luton have extra capacity within their existing infrastructures. .

5. **Passenger origination.** We understand that 70% of Gatwick's passengers already come from London and points north. Gatwick does not serve a local need.

6. **Rail access.** The rail authorities already accept that the London to Brighton line is at capacity usage. Yet Gatwick anticipates passenger growth to 74,000,000. As 70% of all passengers already come from London and points north, how are they going to get to Gatwick with limited scope for increased train numbers?

7. **Road access** does not help. People driving from central London already have the challenges of the Purley bottleneck where there is limited scope for road improvement.. Again a proposal from Gatwick for which there is no easy solution.

8. **Benefit to UK PLC.** Gatwick is owned by foreign investors who have limited or no interest on their impact on communities affected. Gatwick has shown itself to be a very poor neighbour to the communities it affects. It has blocked agreements (NMB for example) and offered the absolute minimum to affected communities relative to the major impacts it causes. In terms of benefit, Gatwick ensures that the majority of financial benefits it receives from its operations go to its investors outside the UK. A very poor return on the gross sums processed.

9. **Flight corridor.** Gatwick have worked out that by concentrating all incoming flights into a very narrow corridor they can improve throughput. More movements in a given timeframe. Great for them, Increasingly poor for the affected. Totally antisocial.

10. **Night flights.** Heathrow has a night flight ban. Gatwick does not. We get disturbed by flights right through the night. And Gatwick want a 30% increase!

I hope you see that the things which are important to us don't always fit easily into your Planning inspectorate process, yet they have a major impact on all our lived experiences. I hope you can also see that many of our concern areas don't neatly fit into a planning process category yet to us with the lived experience they are real.

For The Langton Green Village Society

Jeremy Stirling