

From: Alistair Persson

Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 5:11 PM

To: Gatwick Airport

Subject: The Development Consent Order for Gatwick Airports expansion plans TR020005

Dear Sir,

I am writing on behalf of Kirdford Parish Council as the councillor responsible for matters relating to Gatwick Airport.

I have various additional comments to make as listed below :

1. This expansion plan is not policy. It is a new runway and hence does not comply with 'Beyond the Horizons - Making Best Use of Existing Runways'.

2. We do not support the building of this new runway as the DCO has not adequately addressed the following issues, due to Gatwick Airport 'not accepting' any alternative viewpoint :

A) A carbon cap. (ISH9). We would call for this to be implemented to ensure that Gatwick Airport's emissions are controlled and that they make a concerted effort to reduce carbon (ie greenhouse gases) at the airport. Scope 3 emissions should also be included in the cap, such as waste transportation to third party incinerators, and increased flights to and from the airport.

B) Aircraft noise (ISH90) This is particularly important to our residents. We support the 0.5 decibel reduction every year in the noise envelope, as proposed by PINS (ISH9).

It is clear that if Gatwick disagrees, then they obviously don't believe that aircraft will get quieter as detailed in the Environmental Statement Addendum Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report Book 5 May 2024. We also strongly believe that there should be a night flight ban.

C) Airspace is not big enough. EasyJet and British Airways have submitted that the airspace needs modernisation to allow for the increased number of flights caused by 2 runways. Therefore, the modernisation of airspace should have been included in the application, as Gatwick are trying to progress this in parallel.

D) Insulation. There should be full and meaningful compensation for all residents impacted by both a new runway and the increase in traffic on the main runway, including outside of the current contour consideration. This is also very important for our residents as we are already greatly affected by excessive aircraft noise in our village.

E) The damage to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB) and of historic importance has not been adequately addressed.

F) 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 on many third parties to provide services, without providing any adequate funding to facilitate sustainable transport modes (ISH9).

G) Air quality (ISH9). Gatwick are offering nothing more than to 'monitor' air quality. This is clearly not acceptable and air quality standards must be legally binding in the DCO. Gatwick must not be allowed to have it in the local authority agreement known as an S106 condition. Air quality standards are rising, so the DCO must have stringent mandatory targets that must be met by the airport if it is permitted 2 runways.

H) Waste water flooding - The DCO must include a mandatory onsite wastewater sewerage treatment plant, to prevent local homes being flood by sewage as there is no provision by Thames Water. It should be borne in mind the continued example of waste water polluting streams and rivers caused by the water companies, and they are supposed to specialists. Gatwick must have their own on site waste water treatment plant.

I) The lack of housing and amenities. (ISH9 HOUSING FUND). The lack of affordable housing and amenities has not been fully examined or considered. It is clearly not acceptable for Gatwick to dismiss this, as a large inward migration of workers will exacerbate the existing housing shortage as well as the lack of schools, doctors, hospitals, dentists and amenities. There should be a housing

fund to assist with the volume of construction workers that will be needed to build the new runway, hotels offices and road. They cannot all come from the local population.

J) Inward migration of workers. There is a very low unemployment rate locally, so any new runway will force an inward migration of workers. Most of these workers will be on minimum wages, so they will not use expensive public transport and will seek to live locally in rented accommodation, which currently is in very short supply and is expensive.

K) Significant increase in Waste. There must be accountability about how much extra waste will be transported on our roads, and where will it go?

L) The community fund. This is definitely not fit for purpose, as it has set criteria that do not include areas of impact. It currently focuses on media opportunity events and charities, and hence does not reflect the impact that the airport currently has on communities.

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

N) And finally - This application is purely for the financial benefit of the owners of Gatwick Airport, and not in the national interest. At a time of climate emergency we should be looking at ways to reduce aircraft emissions and consequently the number of flights. It is the height of irresponsibility to be considering a second runway.

Regards

Alistair Persson

Councillor

Kirdford Parish Council