

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Gatwick Airport](#)  
**Subject:** Interested Party No: 20041905  
**Date:** 03 January 2025 17:06:58

---

[REDACTED]  
Dear Sir/Madam,

I should like to provide my response re the 'Consultation letter from the Secretary of State for Transport'

### Noise - Requirement 15

The applicant's response to the regarding the noise envelope size, restriction duration and its overall position concerning noise affects on local residents is concerning. GAL is a Limited concern with shareholders and a fact that MUST NOT be overlooked by the secretary of State is that GAL's overriding interests are to its shareholders, Not - to the residents/homeowners of the surrounding Towns and villages, Not - to the Local authorities', Not even to the UK per se (although it does generate income the same as any business), the point is that when the applicant refers to what 'other airports/infrastructure projects' have done/not done 'in other locations about the UK' I would say that it is immaterial, every case of this nature is looked at under a set of guideline's as a starting point however, no two applications are the same because of the very nature of the existing location, previous history, Townships/villages, geography, Transport current issues & future planned growth, local amenities, density of population & planned future growth, environmental considerations and many, many more elements and therefore no-one can disagree that;

1. Every application is - due to the nature of its locality - unique

2. Just as every application is 'unique' then no argument by the applicant can be tolerated solely on the basis of policy or because the Secretary of State permitted it elsewhere or any other non-specific not related to the Gatwick airport application and the merits therein only.
3. Noise is an issue that demands more respect than the applicant has shown it. Noise from aircraft on takeoff and landing is pertinent and depends on the direction of takeoff currently. If the proposals are approved there will be less relief from noise for residents as runways will be in use all the time irrespective of wind direction - hence more passengers = more and noise more often, however the issue of noise from the airport ground operations is a major factor that is overlooked. Ground operations go on 24 hours, there is noise/hum emanating from the airports ground operations at all times which will be increased by more passengers/more flights with additional ground movements by aircraft, ground service equipment, generators, buses and other necessary ground equipment, noise from the airport ground operations may be more tolerable during the daytime when background traffic and noise is greatest however at night, noise from ground operations of course becomes far more intrusive to residents and depending upon wind direction/strength far more of a nuisance which does not seem to be accepted based on the applicants negative tone to the proposed restrictions on noise that are in my view reasonable for this specific application and based on my experience as a born and bred local.
4. In my view noise monitoring stations should be set up by the applicant at the edges of each of the noise 'envelopes' in sufficient

number to completely monitor both flying aircraft noise and ground operations noise. The data should be streamed 'live' and available for the Public to view live and historically going forward in order for the applicant to be held to account for infringement of its responsibilities. Failure to maintain any airport noise within the either the dB levels or permitted aircraft takeoff/landing time zones set/agreed, to be punishable by punitive fines to encourage the airport operator to stay within the levels/times set for the operation. The noise level requirements should be reviewed with the basic tenet of 'lowering' the thresholds for all airport-related noise every 15 years by a minimum of 1 dB across the board to reflect advances in aviation technology and noise mitigation improvements.

5. Ground equipment should be replaced over the first 15 thereafter as technology advances, with non-polluting and more quiet plant, vehicles, Tug's and machinery to reduce the not-inconsiderable din that ground operations create 24/7.
6. Aircraft that operate over a specified noise level should not be permitted generally, to operate from the airport (emergencies notwithstanding).
7. The applicant's push-back regarding noise 'costs' for resident improvement/compensation payment and other for other LA amendments are in my view irrelevant. Such costs are either one-off or pale into insignificance when viewed over the term of the airport's operation and the future profits.

#### Transport and level access

Roads and transport are truly relevant to the Local population. Already

over the years the Public roads and highways that surround Gatwick have been adapted mostly for Gatwicks benefit not the local people who use them. This includes roads that were previously available to the Public being subsumed into the airport's perimeter, changes/additions/modifications to road/highway infrastructure to access/egress the airport that by its nature increased road congestion for local non-airport users at multiple locations, creating additional environmental pollution of longer times of stationary traffic and making residential zones less pleasant for residents. Charges to drop off/collect at Gatwick and unreasonable restricted practices regarding private taxis allowed to wait at Gatwick for fares.

The ideal would be for Gatwick to have road access via the M23 motorway *only*, and revert previously 'local roads' i.e the A23, to non-airport use to improve traffic flow once again.

Airport third party services and support industries likewise should use only the M23 thus reducing use of 'local' roads as far as is possible.

I differ from the LA and Government thinking in that I recognise that 'people' do not want to use Public transport for a number of good reasons therefore in the spirit of the application being 'unique', it would be in my view, more preferable to provide easier access/egress to the airport by car and without charge via the M23 only. As the Government has committed the UK to Net zero, all cars will (in the mid term) have to be electric or other non carbon based powered and potentially self-driving, therefore it is not unreasonable to plan for people to be able to retain the door-to-door experience afforded by their own transport

without incurring lengthy Public transport journeys. Public transport should of course be improved where possible as an alternative for those that need and/or prefer such travel modes.

### Parking

I differ from the LA proposal to restrict parking at Gatwick airport in that I believe that as a general rule airport parking should ONLY be permitted at the airport as opposed to in and around the local area. The current model of allowing off-airport parking has created a huge amount of additional traffic around Crawley, Horley and local villages, that in turn has created additional traffic and pollution in the affected areas more especially with the constant movement of transfer buses and taxis, and it has used land that might be more suitably re-purposed for residential building or restored to farmland.

Off airport parking should be phased out and land used for more beneficial social/economic/food production purposes.

### Environmental

I have discussed the pollution that is spread about the locale as increased traffic to/from the airport on local roads and the off-airport parking and their associated transfer buses/coaches. Adopting an M23 access/egress route would confine air and noise pollution more to the existing motorway routes.

Likewise providing airport parking on the airport (perhaps at controlled prices to avoid monopolised excess fees)

Setting and adopting a ground equipment 'replacement strategy' to eliminate the use of Diesel or Petrol or other fossil fuels, would reduce air and noise pollution for everyone.

Third party support services to the airport should also be encouraged to move away from the use of fossil fuels to power their delivery/service vehicles and adopt environmentally friendly replacements to again reduce air and noise pollution.

### General

Gatwick airport has been a double-edged sword to the Sussex and Crawley area since it became an International airport, while it created jobs over the early years the wages earned at Gatwick sucked up much previously 'skilled' labour much to the chagrin of the local industries. Over time the wages and related benefits of working at the airport have fallen into line with that of general businesses and so that imbalance is not such an issue.

Gatwick continues to employ a large number of people in the Southeast, there is in my view a concern should air transport suffer a downturn as it did in the early 80' when 3 major airline/holiday businesses went out of business overnight and Crawley became known as the Town whose 'employment' went from one of the highest in the land to the most-unemployed in the shortest time! and this was due to the airport and related businesses. Indeed, speaking of job security, during the Covid pandemic the airport 'laid off' a large number of security employees without even offering them the Governments very fair 'Furlough' scheme and even had the temerity to state security and staff shortages when criticised for the delay in getting the airport fully up and functioning after the pandemic. There is a significant risk in the airport growing so large and employing ever greater numbers of people creating, potentially, a devastating risk to the Southeast's economy.

Gatwick's previous main development has been undertaken in a century where frankly the concerns and wellbeing of the Public were less considered than they ought, which is the exact reason Public consultation is as rigorous as it is and could be more so. The Local authority (CBC) are quite right to ask for the benefit and protection of its constituents, for demanding rigorous amendments for the applicant to abide to for the greater interest of the local community because as I

said at the beginning GAL is a private business, whose sole aim at the end of the day is to maximise profit for the shareholders.

Would Crawley and the surrounding Towns benefit?

- Noise - Without strict lifetime controls and guaranteed including future noise-measurement and improvements - No, with controls - Yes
- Without changing access/egress to the airport to the M23 only - No - because roads will continue to be altered to suit Gatwick while local residents are left to negotiate ever busier roads, with road layouts designed more fairly (not biased to Gatwick) - Probably yes
- To employment - Yes - with the caveat that Gatwick would become too-big-to-fail and a systemic risk to the South East

Thank you

Chris Morris