

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Subject: TRO20005- Gatwick Airport Northern Runway
Date: 13 January 2025 20:41:35

Interested Party Reference number 20041930

13/01/2025

Dear Secretary of State,

I wish to express my further concerns regarding Gatwick Airport's application to construct a new runway, as I believe it raises significant issues that go beyond current policy considerations.

Noise Mitigation

I support your recognition that noise is a major issue for Gatwick. The proposed mitigation strategy should indeed cover 54 dB for summer daytime and 48 dB for summer nighttime noise. However, it is critical to acknowledge that noise impacts extend far beyond these contours. I urge you to require sound insulation for all affected properties and noise-sensitive buildings within 12 months of project approval. Furthermore, I am deeply concerned that compensation for loss of house value due to increased aircraft noise is absent from the proposals. I respectfully request that you consider including this as part of the mitigation measures.

Protected Landscapes and Light Pollution

The impact of this development on Protected Landscapes must not be overlooked. Light pollution and aircraft operations can significantly affect these areas, as outlined in DEFRA guidance:

"The duty is intended to complement these requirements by ensuring that the purposes for which Protected Landscapes are designated are recognised in decision-making and activities impacting these areas, including nationally significant infrastructure projects."

I urge you to ensure that this consideration is given due weight in the decision-making process for Gatwick's application.

Economic Viability

The economic case presented by Gatwick is questionable. Submissions from local authorities, including York Aviation, have highlighted that without the modernisation of airspace through the Future Airspace Strategy Implementation South (FASIS), Gatwick is unlikely to meet its target throughput of passengers and aircraft. This raises serious doubts about the airport's projected economic benefits. Moreover, the lack of provisions for compensation related to house value losses due to the new runway is unacceptable and should be addressed.

Additionally, Gatwick's seasonal leisure operations and vulnerabilities were evident during the COVID-19 pandemic, where it was among the hardest-hit airports in Europe. Changes in passenger duty for long-haul flights, the removal of the Emissions Trading Scheme on European departures, and the mandatory use of Sustainable Aviation Fuel (which remains costly and emits similar levels of carbon when burned) are likely to increase ticket prices

and reduce passenger demand. These factors further challenge the financial feasibility of the proposed expansion.

Infrastructure and Environmental Concerns

Wastewater Treatment Plant

Given the financial difficulties faced by Thames Water and its limited capacity, an onsite wastewater treatment plant must be mandatory for any expansion at Gatwick. I strongly support the restrictions proposed by Thames Water in their recent submission.

Incinerators and Scope 3 Emissions

Recent rulings on incinerators should prompt a re-evaluation of waste management in this project. Waste generated by the airport and sent to incinerators should be included in Gatwick's Scope 3 emissions reporting, rather than being overlooked or included under Scope 2.

Surface Access and Transport Infrastructure

Gatwick's plans fail to address the strain on surface access infrastructure. The airport is heavily reliant on third parties to meet its sustainable transport commitments, yet it has made no investments in road or rail infrastructure to offset the impacts of constructing a new runway or operating two runways. The Transport Forum is insufficient, as it lacks meaningful community involvement and functions merely as a "tick-box" exercise.

Environmental and Public Health Impacts

I am concerned that critical issues, such as air quality decline and its serious health implications, as well as the broader impacts on climate change, may not receive the consideration they deserve. These factors must be prioritized, and I believe they provide compelling reasons to deny this application.

Conclusion

In light of the above concerns—regarding noise, economic viability, infrastructure, and environmental impacts—I urge you to reject Gatwick Airport's application for a new runway. Approving this development would come at an unacceptably high cost to local communities, the environment, and public health.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours sincerely,

Glyn Woodage.

