

Robert Alfred Routledge

Interested Party Reference number: GATW-S573333

I am writing to reaffirm my objections as previously reported to you and delivered personally by my wife (I was unwell) at the hearing with particular reference to NOISE. I list below my additional concerns basis my interpretation and scrutiny of hearings.

Gatwick Airport's plans do not comply with Policy (ISH1) as this new runway does not comply with Beyond the Horizons – Making Best Use of Existing Runways". I do not support the building of a new runway as there are many issues that have not been addressed and which have been effectively shut down by Gatwick Airport as evidenced at the hearings with their many statements commencing with "we do not believe". There has been a refusal to even listen to any alternative view point be it from a member of the public, KCs or even the Inspectorate themselves.

A carbon cap (ISH9) to control Gatwick Airport's emissions is needed so they are obliged to reduce greenhouse gases at the airport. Scope 3 emissions should be included with particular reference to waste being transported to third party incinerators impacting on local communities as well as the proposed increase in flights to and from the airport.

As far as Aircraft Noise is concerned (ISH90) I support the 0.5 decibel reduction every year in the noise envelope, as proposed by PINS at (ISH9). Gatwick Airport has been dismissive of our concerns and should they disagree with this proposal they cannot believe that aircraft will get quieter as detailed in Environmental Statement Addendum Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report Book 5 May 2024. A total ban on night flying should be initiated bearing in mind the adverse health affecting those on the ground.

Airspace is not big enough. EasyJet and British Airways RR submission that airspace needs modernisation to allow for the increase in flights from 2 runways. Therefore the modernisation of airspace should be included in this application as Gatwick Airport are progressing this in parallel.

Financial compensation should be allocated to all residents impacted by both a new runway and the increase in traffic on the main runway. It should not be based upon the whim of Gatwick Airport with regard to how any funds should be applied, be it insulation, windows or anything else they deem appropriate most of which is not applicable to and incompatible with our Grade 2 listed property and its historic importance to the area. Historic buildings have not been considered. Please refer to Surrey Council's Conservation Officer, Mr. Chris Reynolds. Vibration is a major consideration here. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty have also been overlooked.

Congested surface transport is a major issue which Gatwick Airport has failed to address. There is a lack of comprehensive data encompassing all times of operation, such as early morning. Consideration should be given to gridlocks on our motorways and A roads as Gatwick increases its draw from far afield as well as the use of "rat-runs" on minor roads through villages and therefore detrimentally affecting local communities. As ever Gatwick Airport has given no consideration to those living on the ground. Gatwick Airport are reliant upon third parties to provide services without providing any adequate funding to facilitate sustainable transport modes (ISH9).

Air Quality Issues (ISH9). Again Gatwick Airport's inadequate response to monitor air quality must be challenged as air quality standards must be legal binding within the DCO. The local authority agreement known as 106 is insufficient and should not be used by Gatwick Airport. Air quality standards as tightening and therefore the DCO should have compulsory targets that must be met by an airport with two runways.

Waste Water Flooding. The DCO must include a mandatory onsite wastewater sewerage treatment plant to prevent local homes being flooded with sewerage due to no provision by Thames Water. The airport was built on Gatwick Marshes and flooding should be of major concern.

The lack of affordable housing and amenities (ISH9 Housing Fund) has not been fully examined or considered. It is not acceptable for Gatwick to dismiss this, as inward migration of workers will impact the existing housing shortage, lack of schools, healthcare and amenities. Gatwick Airport should be obliged to set up a housing fund to assist with the volume of construction workers migrating to the areas to build the new runway, hotels, offices and roads.

There is extremely low unemployment locally, so a new runway would necessitate an inward migration of workers. Many of these workers will be on minimum wage, so they will not use expensive public transport and will seek to live locally in rented accommodation which is in short supply and expensive.

We need to know how waste will be transported on our roads and through where to where. We cannot rely on "muck away" transport companies to keep their extremely large and heavy lorries away from our rural roads and villages and trust them to adhere to the speed limits. Not only will these companies need to be licenced but the sites to where they are dumping waste will also need licencing. I have experience of building waste being transported almost to Sevenoaks in Kent via Lingfield and Edenbridge through country lanes and have witnessed mothers with pushchairs being forced into the hedges to allow these monsters access! Transporting waste through country lanes to a disposal site miles away is unacceptable. Gatwick Airport please note.

Fly parking is a problem as it cuts down on the accessibility to local villages as are unlicensed car parking on residential sites which not only draw traffic into the area but also add to the pressure on local roads and then by Gatwick taxis to and from the airport. This problem is spreading away from proximity to the airport and now affects villages over 7 miles away.

The Community Fund is not fit for purpose as it has set criteria that does not include areas of impact. It currently focuses on media opportunity events and charities, so does not reflect the impact the airport currently has on communities and specifically on the occupants of properties within those communities.

Safeguards need to be in place to protect residents as there is serious lack of detail on what odours (ISH9) will be generated by alternative fuels to meet decarbonising requirements.

The country is moving towards the aim of net zero while Gatwick Airport proposes an additional runway and by doing so is moving in the opposite direction. Gatwick Airport have attempted to “sweep under the carpet” the current “noise sewer” they have created by landing aircraft minutes apart. This is now. If planning permission is granted for this new runway (Gatwick do not intend to use it for landing any aircraft and will divert all additional aircraft for landing onto the main runway) it will exacerbate an already intolerable noise situation. They have also stated the intention to attract larger aircraft to the main runway by moving out smaller aircraft to a new (short?) runway.

This is not making best use of the proposed 2 runway airport. It will add to the noise which Gatwick refuse to take seriously. Additionally it is connected with the so called “modernisation of airspace” which Gatwick see as the next step in their devious plan and which we believe should be included in this application.

Gatwick Airport’s reports, sources of surveys etc. (if they exist) should be open to the inspectorate and public scrutiny for analysis and comment.

Robert Alfred Routledge

Interested Party Reference number: GATW-S573333