

From: John Shelley
Sent: 20 August 2024 21:54
To: Gatwick Airport
Subject: DCO process comments.

Dear Sir

I writing on behalf of my Aunt, Marion Dallison resident of [REDACTED],
[REDACTED],

Marion has no computer, so is unable to access the Gatwick DCO process, and has found the DCO correspondance sent to her impossible to understand.

However as a lifelong Charlwood resident living near the runway Marion will be heavily affected by Gatwick Noise. Marion is very aware of proposed Gatwick expansion, and has asked me to comment on her behalf regarding the overall Process being used to evaluate a new runway.

Not Policy – (ISH1) This is a NEW runway, so does not comply with 'Beyond the Horizons – Making Best Use of Existing Runways'.

Marion does not support the building of this runway

Marion believes the DCO have not involved her adequately (as a non computer literate person), who will be heavily affected by runway expansion..

The DCO have not addressed the following issues, due to Gatwick Airport 'not accepting' any alternative viewpoint.

- In Charlwood we all struggle with sleep due to early morning aircraft movements, so with any Gatwick expansion there should be a Total Night Flying Ban.
- 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.
- Insulation – (ISH9) Gatwick is not a positive for the Earth, the local Enviroment, or for its Residents, Increase in the number of runways is all about profits of Gatwick a private company, as such, 'the polluter should pay' and 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.

- Houses in noisy areas such as Charlwood Village are often built of historic materials such as oak and thin brick walls . these need to be individually acoustically considered by professionals to understand how they react with aircraft noise.
- From personal experience those magic words 'Double Glazing' does not solve aircraft sound issues for a great deal of the historic housing stock, meaning people keep being woken by early morning manouvering aircraft.
- And what about Charlwood residents using their own gardens? are they supposed to wear noise cancelling earphones ?
- In the application plans, the existing L shape earth bund at one end Charlwood end of the runway now appears to been reshaped..., a limb of the L shape has been removed, I believe its removal is in a direction that will potentially inflict significantly more noise on Charlwood Village residents, Has this change to the existing earty bund design been acoustically checked or discussed with sound modelling programmes?
- Research needs to be carried to reduce noise through correctly positioned Ground based noise attenuation bunds and sound absorbing walls . Increase in sound travel measures should must with any proposal to protect Charlwood residents from noise from Maneuvering Aircraft. APU high on Aircraft tails make a lot of noise during ground maneuvering, and the distances planes will need to travel on the proposed layouts to the end of runways means a lot more noise at Charlwood.
- Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB) such as 800 Year old village of Charlwood and the effects on its 80 listed buildings are not being properly individually addressed.
- The Community Fund – (ISH9) is not fit for purpose, As a Charlwood Resident the community the Fund does not reflect the impact the airport currently has on Charlwood and its residents..

- regards

Marion Dallison (written by John Shelley on behalf of Marion Dallison)