Submission ID: 29991

I 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.Not Policy – (ISH1) This is a new runway, so does not comply with ‘Beyond the Horizons – Making Best Use of Existing Runways’.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 – (ISH9) 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. Insulation – (ISH9) 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 of consideration. 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). Air Quality – (ISH9) Gatwick offers nothing more than to ‘monitor’ air quality. This is not acceptable; 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 a 106. Air quality standards are rising, so the DCO should have stringent mandatory targets that must be met by the airport with 2 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.Lack of Housing and Amenities – (CAGNE submission REP1-149) 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 – (ISH9 Housing Fund) 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.Significant Increase in Waste – (ISH9) Demand that there be accountability in how much waste will be transported on our roads, and to where.The Community Fund – (ISH9) this is 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, so does not reflect the impact the airport currently has on communities.Odours – (ISH9) Safeguards need to be in place to protect residents as there is a serious lack of detail on what odours will be generated by alternative fuels to meet decarbonising requirements.