

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Subject: Application by Gatwick Airport seeking consent for Northern Runway
Date: 05 January 2025 13:34:02

[REDACTED]

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your letter of 3rd January 2025 inviting responses. I have previously objected to Gatwick's proposal as a resident in [REDACTED], adversely affected by the disturbance and noise of Gatwick's aircraft.

I continue to be worried by Gatwick's runway proposals on the grounds of damage to the environment (climate change) and damage to the AONB and to the health and well-being of local residents. As I understand it, the aim of the proposal is to generate wealth for foreign investors with no interest in our country except profit. I understand that the government seeks growth to our economy, but long term growth must be on a basis that is sustainable and avoids further destruction to the environment, as well as damage to the quality of life of a significant proportion of the population adversely affected by the proposals. The speed of climate change requires expansion of the aviation industry to be halted at least until better technological solutions can be found.

I am no expert in this field but I have two more detailed comments.

I have noted Annex A to your letter of 9th December (Schedule 2 requirements of the draft DCO). While I would welcome the para 19 (2) prohibition on the northern runway's use between 23.00-0.600 as better than no restriction at all, the exception applying when the main runway is temporarily non-operational does not seem to impose any duty on Gatwick to minimise these situations – eg in how they plan their maintenance work. Furthermore, as residents disturbed at night, how can we be confident that Gatwick are complying with the rules – will there be penalties for abusing / stretching the rules and who will be the monitor / judge of this?

With regard to para 3 of your letter of 3rd January, I am mystified as to how the change in guidance by DEFRA for Protected Landscapes could NOT have implications for ensuring that the Gatwick scheme complies with the amended, higher, duty. The new duty requires relevant authorities to 'seek to further' the statutory purposes of Protected Landscapes, rather than simply 'have regard to' them. Your invitation to Gatwick and the relevant authorities to set out an agreed position on whether the new guidance has any implications for ensuring the scheme complies with the amended duty seems to me a loaded question, encouraging authorities to disregard or minimise the impact of the new guidance. Surely the question should be what those implications are and how they can be resolved (if at all).

Looking at the DEFRA guidance, I do not understand how the Gatwick proposals can possibly be consistent with the statutory purposes of protected landscapes. Surely the relevant authorities must seek to prevent proposals which spoil the natural beauty/ wildlife /cultural heritage/ public enjoyment of protected landscapes or interfere with the setting

of a protected landscape. In the context of setting, the DEFRA guidance talks about protecting tranquillity, dark skies, a sense of remoteness, wildness, cultural heritage and long views. All of these are damaged by increased air traffic. Not to mention the long term damage and problems cause by climate change.

I very much hope that the Secretary of State will refuse Gatwick's application.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Anya Heilpern,

