

## Objections to Gatwick Airport's proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> Runway

Alan Mitchell, RR No. 20044135  
[REDACTED]

When my wife and I moved, in 1996, to our present home [REDACTED], [REDACTED], an important listed property with medieval origins and an extensive range of farm buildings and barns, one of which is separately listed, all located within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), this was a relatively quiet, beautiful, location. Over the intervening 28 years, we have been increasingly plagued by aircraft noise from Gatwick, mainly from Route 4. Over the years the noise has worsened significantly, not just because of increased aircraft traffic but also in view of the Route 4 flight path having changed, such that several aircraft fly much nearer to our home as they complete their U-turn to the east. We understand the reason is to enable the aircraft to take off under reduced throttle to save fuel. We experienced a couple of years of respite as a result of the pandemic, but the noise and disruption have returned with a vengeance in the last couple of years. Life here is now dominated by overbearing aircraft noise and disruption.

We used to complain regularly to Gatwick about flights straying from the then-designated path of Route 4, but from a couple of years or so ago, they said there is no longer a complaints procedure and the aircraft can 'do what they like' while Route 4 is being re-designed!

The fact is that Gatwick's sole aim is to squeeze as much profit out of their business, before they sell the airport to another owner at vast profit. They do not care in the slightest about the households and communities that they overfly. They merely pay lip service to our concerns, such as noise, pollution, night flights, pressure on local infrastructure etc. We understand no compensation is available for the degradation in the value of peoples' homes. Trying to object to any further expansion, or at least trying to get Gatwick to modify their plans to something more reasonable from the standpoint of local communities is well nigh impossible, because they keep chopping and changing and have protracted their actions and proceedings for so many years that we are all more or less completely worn out. Why are they doing it? – because it maximises their prospects of ultimately getting more or less all they want, to our detriment.

To add insult to injury, Gatwick want to add a 2<sup>nd</sup> runway. We are fearful that all the adverse consequences that I have referred to above will worsen. If so, life here will be intolerable. Innumerable other households in this locality, and in others suffering similar historical detriment from Gatwick flights, will also be adversely impacted. And all in the cause of Gatwick Airport's greed for ever-increasing profits.

It is essential to point out that Gatwick's desire for a second runway flies in the face of the Government's drive to reach net-zero emissions by 2030.

In addition Gatwick have been disingenuous in asserting that they are seeking to make best use of existing facilities, i.e. their emergency runway, in accordance with government policy, when in fact what they want to construct is a **new**

**runway in a different position** (because the 2<sup>nd</sup> runway would need to be located further away from the current main runway than the emergency runway is).

**For the above reasons, I am strongly opposed to the 2<sup>nd</sup> runway being allowed in any form, or if the Planning Inspectorate is minded to allow Gatwick's application for a DCO, then as many safeguards and conditions as possible to protect presently-overflowed and newly-overflowed communities must be included within the DCO.** Surely, the quiet enjoyment of local communities, involving tens or maybe even hundreds of thousands of people, is much more important than the commercial greed of Gatwick Airport and its owners.

Going to the specifics that I find objectionable, these may be summarized as follows:-

- **Aircraft noise:** Currently intolerable & will be much worse with 2<sup>nd</sup> runway, unacceptable, newer aircraft seem to be just as noisy, Emirates A-380 flights deafening! Aircraft noise is much more intrusive in rural locations than in cities/towns.
- **Climate change/air pollution:** Increased emissions, pollution and damage to the environment. No current prospect of low-emission aircraft, e.g. electric.
- **Obligations on noise and air pollution reduction:** Legally binding obligations on Gatwick to reduce noise and air pollution year-on-year must be made conditional in any DCO.
- **Inadequate transport links to/from enlarged airport:** London-Brighton and Reading Gatwick trains already often overcrowded. M23/M25 and major roads already running close to capacity.
- **How will Gatwick's additional employees needed be absorbed into local communities?** Low employee salaries, but expensive housing in South East. Where will new housing be built? What about their travel requirements to/from Gatwick? Where are the additional shops, medical facilities, schools for their children, etc? There is already a huge problem with water supplies and adequate sewage facilities for nearby Horsham.
- **Impact on the Surrey Hills AONB:** Parts of the AONB will suffer significantly from noise and air pollution. This will affect not only local residents, but also the countless walkers, hikers and lovers of the countryside who use the AONB.
- **More communities overflowed:** Expanded flight traffic resulting from 2<sup>nd</sup> runway will impact ever more communities. Is there enough airspace over Surrey/Sussex to safely accommodate all these flights, particularly in view of future increases in flights?
- **Compensation for impacted residents:** All residents adversely impacted by 2<sup>nd</sup> runway flights and additional flights using the main runway must be properly and fairly compensated in full for losses incurred of all types, including diminution in value of their homes and reduction in quality of life due to noise, pollution, etc.