Submission ID: 29810

I would like to oppose the plan regarding the proposal at Gatwick airport for the following reasons:

A Carbon Cap – (ISH9) Call for this, to ensure that Gatwick Airport's emissions are controlled and that they do reduce carbon (greenhouse gases) at the airport. Also demand that Scope 3 emissions are included in the cap, such as waste transportation to third party incinerators, and increase in flights to and from the airport.

Aircraft Noise – (ISH90) Support the 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 Environmental Statement Addendum Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report Book 5 May 2024. Re-iterate there should be a night ban.

Airspace is not big enough – As submitted by EasyJet and British Airways RR, the airspace needs modernisation to allow for the increase in flights from 2 runways. Therefore, the modernisation of airspace should have been included in this application, as Gatwick are progressing this in parallel.

Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB) and of historic importance are not addressed.

Congested Surface Transport – Gatwick has still not addressed the lack of comprehensive data encompassing all times of operations, such as early morning. It is also reliant upon third parties to provide services, without providing any adequate funding to facilitate sustainable transport modes (ISH9).

Lack of Housing and Amenities – (ISH9 HOUSING FUND) The lack of affordable housing and amenities has not been fully examined or considered. It is not acceptable for Gatwick to dismiss this, as a huge inward migration of workers will impact the existing housing shortage, as well as lack of schools, healthcare and amenities. There should be a housing fund to assist with the volume of construction workers that will migrate to the area to build the new runway, hotels, offices, and road.

Inward Migration of Workers – There is extremely low unemployment locally, so a new runway would necessitate an inward migration of workers. Most 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 not cheap.