

From: Alan Smallwood
Sent: 21 August 2024 22:48
To: Gatwick Airport
Subject: Gatwick Airport Northern Runway

Dear Sirs.

As a resident [REDACTED] we have long been concerned at the approach adopted by Gatwick Airport when seeking to expand their operations but consistently failing to address germane, substantive issues.

In relation to the latest application the creation of a north runway is not a policy; This is a new runway, so does not comply with 'Beyond the Horizons – Making Best Use of Existing Runways'. (ISH1).

We 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.

- A Carbon Cap – (ISH9) is needed to ensure that Gatwick Airport's emissions are controlled and that they do genuinely reduce carbon (greenhouse gases) at the airport itself and also the ancillary transport to and from the airport for all aspects of its operation. This should include Scope 3 emissions in the cap, such as waste transportation to third party incinerators, and the desired (by GAL) increase in flights to and from the airport.
- Aircraft Noise – We support the 0.5 decibel reduction every year in the noise envelope as proposed by PINS (ISH9). If Gatwick Airport Limited disagree with this do they not believe that aircraft will get quieter as detailed in Environmental Statement Addendum Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report Book 5 May 2024. There should continue to be a night flight ban.
 - According to EasyJet and British Airways RR, the airspace needs modernisation to allow for the increase in flights from two runways. Therefore, the modernisation of airspace should have been included in this application, as GAL are well aware of this because they are working on this as a separate exercise.
- Sound Insulation – (ISH9) There should be full and proper compensation for all residents impacted by both any new runway and the increase in traffic on the main runway, including outside of the current contour of consideration. It should be noted

that even this does nothing to address residents when outside their houses, such as in their gardens.

- Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB) and of historic importance are not addressed.
- Congested Surface Transport – Gatwick has still not addressed the lack of comprehensive data encompassing all times of operations, including early morning. It is reliant upon third parties to provide services, without budgeting adequate funding to facilitate sustainable transport modes (ISH9).
- Air Quality – (ISH9) GAL offers nothing more than to ‘monitor’ air quality. This is not acceptable; air quality standards must be comprehensive and legally binding in the DCO. It must not be merely included in any Section 106 local authority agreement. Required air quality standards are rising, so the DCO should have stringent mandatory targets that must be met by the airport with one or two runways.
- Waste Water Flooding – The DCO must include a mandatory onsite wastewater sewerage treatment plant, detention pond system and controlled discharge mechanism to watercourses with adequate capacities, since stream gradients in this part of the River Mole catchment are very low. This is to prevent local homes being flooded with treated or untreated wastewater since there is no obligation for such provision by Thames Water. Given the current financial situation at Thames Water it would be very unwise to rely on their provision in any case.
- Any significantly enlarged facility will generate a corresponding Increase in Waste generated. (ISH9). There should be a clear detailed assessment of how much extra waste will be created and how it is to be disposed of (transported on roads or by rail), and to where. This should include clear demonstration that any proposed receiving facilities will be able to handle this extra waste, entirely in this country.
- 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 major inward migration of workers will exacerbate the existing housing shortage, as well as lack of sufficient schools, healthcare and other amenities. There should be a housing fund to assist with the volume of construction workers that will migrate to the area to build the proposed new runway, hotels, offices, and roads. Subsequently, other workers will be needed to for the increased operations such a runway would entail. There is extremely low unemployment locally already. There is also the question of where such additional housing would be sited.

- The Community Fund – (ISH9) is not fit for this purpose as it has set criteria that do not include all the areas of impact. It currently focuses on media opportunity events and charities, so does not reflect the impact the airport currently has on communities, let alone any future enlargement.
 - There is a serious lack of detail on what odours will be generated by alternative fuels to meet decarbonising requirements. Mandatory safeguards need to be in place to protect residents accordingly.

Yours faithfully,

Alan Smallwood