

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Subject: Response to Gatwick Airport Norther Runway DOC Secretary of State Letter 03rd January 2025
Date: 13 January 2025 19:01:35

[REDACTED]
Interested Party Number:

20043253

Dear Secretary of State

I would suggest that this application is not policy, as Gatwick Airport seeks to build a new runway, and would ask that the following is taken into consideration.

Noise impacts residents far outside of the noise contours mentioned in the consultation and I support the Secretary of State's point that noise is a major issue for Gatwick as suggested for the area covered by the mitigation strategy, and that it should assume 54dB summer day-time and 48dB summer night-time.

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 Secretary of State to consider this.

In addition, Protected Landscapes must be considered due to light pollution and aircraft impact as a result of this application for a new runway as outlined in the DEFRA guidance:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-protected-landscapes-duty/guidance-for-relevant-authorities-on-seeking-to-further-the-purposes-of-protected-landscapes>

The economics submitted by Gatwick are questionable, as Gatwick will likely not reach its target passenger and aircraft numbers. As such, FASIS should have been included in this application so a new runway should provide compensation for loss of house value.

Also due to the seasonal leisure operations of Gatwick we saw how this airport was hardest hit in Europe post-COVID. 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, which is totally reliant upon third parties to meet their sustainable transport plan. There is no investment in roads nor rail by Gatwick to cover the cost of the impact of the construction of a new runway and increased passenger numbers. The Transport Forum is a talking shop with no community involvement, and is therefore an irrelevance.

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.

Sincerely

Lee Martin

