

From: PAR
Sent: 19 August 2024 17:10
To: Gatwick Airport
Subject: Proposed New Second Runway, Gatwick Airport: Objections

To whom it may concern:

The PLANNING INSPECTORATE

Proposed New Second Runway, Gatwick Airport: Objections to Scheme and DCO

<https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/TR020005/examination/have-your-say-during-examination>

We do not follow which sections you referred to in the online document and do not have time to gratuitously complete all the various sections in that format. We wish instead to make an overall comment on the DCO process so far.

Whilst the Development Consent Order [DCO] hearings TR020005 for Gatwick Airport's plans for a proposed new runway may be complete, there remain many omissions in the process to the Planning Inspectorate [PINS].

We still do not support the building of any second/new runway, even more so since the DCO has not adequately addressed the following matters, due to Gatwick Airport's management "not accepting" any alternative viewpoint.

- **Not Policy (ISH1):** This is a proposed new runway, so, prima facie, it does not comply with the policy document 'Beyond the Horizons – Making Best Use of Existing Runways'. Why is a new runway even being considered?
- **A Carbon Cap (ISH9):** This must ensure that Gatwick Airport's emissions are controlled and that they actually reduce carbon (greenhouse gases) at the airport. 'Scope 3' emissions, such as waste transportation to third party incinerators, and increase in flights to and from the airport, should logically all be included within the cap
- **Aircraft Noise (ISH9):** Support the 0.5 decibel reduction every year in the noise envelope, as proposed by PINS (proposed at ISH9). If Gatwick management demurs, then it obviously doesn't believe that aircraft will get quieter as detailed in Environmental Statement Addendum Updated Central

Case Aircraft Fleet Report Book 5 May 2024. And there should be a night flight ban.

- Airspace: The surrounding 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 two runways. Therefore, the modernisation of airspace and its consequences should have been included in this application, as Gatwick Airport management is disingenuously progressing this in parallel.
- Acoustic Insulation for affected Properties (ISH9): There should be full, meaningful compensation for all residents impacted in any way by both any new runway and the linked increase in traffic on the main runway, including beyond of the current contour of consideration.
- Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB): The effects on the surrounding natural environment and areas of historic importance have not been addressed.
- Surface Transport Congestion (ISH9) – Gatwick Airport management 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.
- Air Quality (ISH9): Gatwick offers nothing more than to ‘monitor’ air quality. This is totally unacceptable; 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 s106. Air quality standards are rising, so the DCO should have *stringent mandatory targets that must be met by the airport if it is to have two runways*.
- Waste Water Flooding: The DCO should include a mandatory, on-site, wastewater sewerage treatment plant, to prevent local homes being flooded with sewerage due to lack of provision by Thames Water Co.

- Significant Increase in Waste Materials – (ISH9) There must be accountability over how exactly much extra site-generated waste would be transported away on the local roads, and to where.
- Odours from fuels – (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 future decarbonising requirements.
- Inward Migration of Workers – (ISH9 Housing Fund) there is extremely low unemployment locally, so any new runway would necessitate an inward migration of workers. Most of these workers will inevitably and undeniably be on minimum wage, so they will not use expensive public transport and will seek to live locally in rented accommodation which is in already short supply and costly.
- Lack of Housing and Amenities – (CAGNE submission REP1-149): the lack of affordable housing and amenities has still not been fully examined or considered. It is not acceptable for Gatwick Airport management to dismiss this, for a huge inward migration of workers would adversely impact the *existing* shortage of housing, schools, healthcare and leisure amenities. There should be a housing fund to assist with the volume of construction workers who would migrate to the area to build the new runway, hotels, offices, and road.
- 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.