

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Subject: Response to Gatwick Northern runway
Date: 03 January 2025 12:54:18

Objection to the planning application

There are almost too many reasons why this should not go ahead that it is laughable that this has not been thrown out before now. Some of the reasons, which I would expect response to, are listed below:

- People not able to peacefully enjoy their lives who live in the south east of England and particularly under flight paths due to noise and pollution - against Human Rights Act
- People not being able to sleep due to noise under the flight paths causing life altering impacts on their health, wealth, mental stress and longevity - against Human Rights Act
- Pollution and foreshortening of people's lives who live under the flight paths and beyond due to the chemical pollution - micro particle pollution - harmful and criminally liable and against Human Rights Act
- Impact on protected landscapes - complete loss of tranquility and areas of quiet space in the south east of England - national parks, AONB - against national planning policies
- Impact on property prices across the south east of England - individuals lose whilst the polluters gain profit - recent cases against London City airport and others under case law show this to be enforceable.
- Inability to meet target levels of Co2 emissions to meet legal requirements - against national climate laws and recent case of drilling in Surrey - pollution accounting of carbon must account for downstream emissions i.e. emissions from flights and not just ground operations.
- Impact on carbon emissions causing climate change - the polluter makes profit whilst the tax payer has to pay for the alleviation both in terms carbon reduction plans (taxation to meet carbon targets). One sector gains and pollutes whilst another sector has to pick up the cost - national climate laws
- Pollution impact to biodiversity and habitat destruction (chemical pollution, air pollution, noise pollution impacts) - against national planning laws.
- If the runway was to be a safety requirement before - how is it not still a safety requirement? - health and safety CAA
- We have enough flights and do not need more - it should not be a lever for growth to increase flights - we need growth from less carbon polluting industries and sectors
- Transport impact to airports causing further pollution, congestion and noise - national and local planning policy contravention

THE CONSULTATION FOR THIS AND THE PROPOSED FLIGHT PATH CHANGES ARE BEING UNDERTAKEN IN RELATIVE SECRECY WITH MOST PEOPLE WHO WILL BE EFFECTED UNAWARE. A LETTER SHOULD BE SENT TO EVERY EFFECTED HOUSEHOLD AND BUSINESS (everyone under 10,000 feet of a current and proposed future flight path).

THE ABOVE POINT IS PROVEN BY THE 16th DECEMBER submission date and RESPONSE BY MID JANUARY - a typical time to submit and hide a planning application due to the christmas holidays.

Utterly disgusting and disgraceful that a planning application such as this should even be considered and time and money wasted on its consideration.