

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Subject: TR020005 – Gatwick Airport Northern Runway
Date: 14 January 2025 19:54:18

Application by Gatwick Airport Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

Dear Secretary of State

As a resident of Godstone living almost under the current Gatwick flight path, I would suggest that this application is not policy, as Gatwick seeks to build a new runway.

Noise: I support the Secretary of State's point that noise is a major issue for Gatwick, in the suggested area covered by the mitigation strategy, and that it should cover 54dB summer day-time and 48dB summer night-time. I would add that noise also impacts residents far outside of these noise contours - for example residents of Godstone where the aircraft noise can be intrusive in the summer.

I support the requirement to insulate all these properties and noise-sensitive buildings within 12 months. Grave concern must be raised that compensation for loss of house value is not included in the proposals due to aircraft noise so I would ask the SoS to consider this.

In addition, I suggest that Protected Landscapes must be considered due to light pollution and aircraft impact with this application for a new runway as outlined in the DEFRA guidance - 'The duty is intended to complement these requirements by ensuring that the purposes for which Protected Landscapes are designated for are recognised in reaching decisions and undertaking activities that impact these areas and including consideration of the 2020 All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) for Dark Skies.

Gatwick's response over economic viability: The economics submitted by Gatwick are questionable, as highlighted by local authorities (York Aviation submissions) as, without the modernisation of airspace (FASIS), Gatwick will not reach its target throughput of passengers/ aircraft. As such, it is felt that FASIS should have been included in this application, so a new runway should provide compensation for loss of house value.

The economics are very questionable due to the above and the seasonal leisure operations of Gatwick. This airport was hardest hit in Europe post-COVID, and with the changes to passenger duty on long-haul announced in the budget, removal of Emissions Trading Scheme on European departures, and Sustainable Aviation Fuel being more expensive and mandatory (as well as releasing the same emissions as fossil fuel when burned), the ticket

price of low-cost flights will have to increase, causing passenger numbers to decline. The cost of a new runway will also be passed on to the airlines, further increasing prices.

Wastewater treatment plant: An onsite wastewater treatment plant must be mandatory to any expansion at Gatwick. Thames Water is in financial difficulty and there is little capacity, as stated by TW in their recent submission. I would support the restrictions proposed by TW.

Incinerators: The new SoS ruling on incinerators and their movements should provide new grounds to argue that waste from the airport going to incinerators must be included in Gatwick's scope 3, not ignored or in scope 2.

Surface access: This has not been addressed by Gatwick. I would reiterate that Gatwick is totally reliant upon third parties to meet their sustainable transport plan. There is no investment in the roads by Gatwick, to cover the cost of the impact of the construction of a new runway, or operations of two runways on road or rail.

The Transport Forum is a talking shop with no community involvement, so it is just a tick-box grouping.

As the Planning Inspectorate's report to the SoS has not been published, it is difficult to fully understand what has been proposed, but I am concerned that air quality decline causing serious health impacts, as well as the big issue of climate change, will not be given the consideration they deserve.

This new runway should therefore not be permitted.

Yours faithfully

Robert Nicholds

Interested Party Reference number: 20043238

