

David Hunt

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I wish to raise objection to the proposed expansion of Gatwick Airport to open a second runway. My comments are relating to the overall process and outcome so far.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

- Not Policy – (ISH1) This is a new runway, so does not comply with ‘Beyond the Horizons – Making Best Use of Existing Runways’.
- There has been an ongoing and long-standing conflict between Gatwick Airport and local communities over Route 4. This tension arose after Gatwick made a unilateral decision to alter the route, operating flights outside of the agreed times and deviating from the designated Route 4 SIDs path. Gatwick Airport continues to disregard the concerns of local communities by misusing Route 4 and dismissing complaints about its operations that extend beyond the permitted route.

The DCO has not adequately addressed the following issues.

- 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. This feels like a “cart before the horse” approach.

- 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. In particular Route 4 which operates close to the AONB and where Gatwick Airport flights continually trespass over the AONB during their take off turn. This area is of local and national importance and all steps should be taken to not only preserve this important landscape but be taking measures to reduce disruption from Gatwick Airport.
- 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 lack of 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.