Submission ID: 30008

I strongly object to the building of the new north runway at Gatwick Airport for the following reasons.

- 1. The proposal is a NEW RUNWAY, it is not using the existing second runway and does not comply with the policy to make best use of the existing runway. On this point alone the application should be turned down otherwise there is little point in having policies at all.
- 2. Excessive and increasing aircraft noise. I have been troubled by aircraft noise at night for many years and the additional traffic generated by the NEW RUNWAY will exacerbate this problem. In my view there should be a total ban on night flights or, as suggested, a 0.5dB reduction every year as aircraft get quieter.
- 3. Air quality. Gatwick Airport have a responsibility to improve air quality and this goes hand in hand with their desire to increase aircraft traffic. Gatwick Airport must have legally binding air quality targets if the development goes ahead.
- 4. All carbon emissions from Gatwick Airport, including aircraft movements, transportation to and from the airport and the airport operation itself must be covered by mandatory binding carbon emissions targets if the development goes ahead.
- 5. I understand that the modernisation of the airspace to cope with additional aircraft movements is being done separately from the submission to build a NEW RUNWAY. This is ludicrous, the two must be done together is the development goes ahead.
- 6. Transport to and from Gatwick Airport is already totally chaotic. Neither the road nor the rail systems are large or robust enough to carry the existing passenger and worker traffic. A comprehensive plan backed up with proper data is required to ensure that future communications links are more than adequate to carry the number of passengers and workers should the development proceed.
- 7. Overall I feel that Gatwick Airport has 'greenwashed' this application and been on a massive charm offensive to persuade would be objectors that building a NEW RUNWAY is a desirable thing to do. It isn't, the