

From: Jo Lewis
Sent: 21 August 2024 00:08
To: Gatwick Airport
Subject: Re: Development Consent Order (DCO) hearings TR020005

Interested Party Reference number: 20043404

Dear Sirs

I would like to share my many concerns for the proposed second runway at Gatwick Airport. I have tried to complete the online form, but am finding it far too confusing and do not wish to miss the opportunity for having my reservations taken into account.

You do not support the building of this new runway as the DCO has not adequately addressed the following issues, due to Gatwick Airport 'not accepting' any alternative viewpoint.

I believe that there should be a Carbon Cap – (ISH9) which should ensure that Gatwick Airport's emissions are controlled and that they do reduce carbon at the airport. Scope 3 emissions should also be included in the cap, such as waste transportation to third party incinerators, and increase in flights to and from the airport.

Aircraft Noise – (ISH9) I 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. There should also be a night ban on flights since it is often the case that as soon as I try to sleep an aeroplane flies very close indeed to my house and other aircraft quickly follow afterwards. The noise is so great that I cannot get to sleep. Early in the morning too the pattern is repeated only this time I am awoken and unable to return to sleep. Why is Gatwick Airport allowed to have night flights when it appears that Heathrow Airport has flying time restrictions? The situation is even worse when during the summer in particular my bedroom windows are left open to facilitate the flow of fresh cool air.

The airspace is not big enough and this is backed up by both 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. How is it possible for so many additional flights to operate from two nearby runways when they already have to fly lower in order to allow Heathrow flights access to the airspace above them? Far greater consideration should be given to the many families living and going on with their daily lives below these aircraft, who have to suffer the on-going noise and pollution from these often seemingly never ending low flying planes.

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.

It appears that Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB) and of historic importance are not addressed. Those of us living in this area are very fortunate to be surrounded by the beautiful and calming Ashdown Forest. We value this very highly and do not take it for granted. However, with a substantial increase in number of overhead flights due to a second runway, we fear this feature may soon be eroded due to the additional pollution in the air. Likewise, our own health may suffer due

to the stress of listening to and seeing so many frequent and numerous low flights overhead with no real respite for anyone. Mental stress cases are due to increase substantially in the near future as the current situation is far from perfect and will only worsen if a second runway is sanctioned.

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 two operational 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 no provision by Thames Water.

Lack of Housing and Amenities – 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 currently 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) there must 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.

You will no doubt recognise that many, many others share the same concerns regarding a second runway at Gatwick which definitely require much more in depth investigation before a permanent decision is taken. Many ordinary people have a lot to lose, including peace and quiet in a relatively unpolluted environment to which we are all entitled.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Joanne Lewis