

Dear Secretary of State

INTERESTED PARTY REFERENCE NUMBER; GATW-S573333

This application is for a **new runway** and is therefore **not Gatwick policy**. We have been plagued by **noise** from Gatwick Airport with aircraft 3 minutes apart. Gatwick has never given any consideration to people living on the ground and I see this not changing as they attempt to build a new runway. 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 support the requirement to insulate all these properties and noise-sensitive buildings within 12 months. This will not be achieved by the double glazing of windows or loft insulation as it is no improvement from other proposals put forward by Gatwick. The amount of value offered was laughable and has no impact on noise particularly with regard to our property which is Grade 2 listed and has rooms in the roof. The only way to insulate is to remove tiling from the outside and insulate beneath. We cannot be constrained by a one size fits all (the cheapest) proposed by Gatwick neither can we be restricted to their contractors for this work. This is primarily why Gatwick should **compensate financially** those affected allowing them to carry out the works needed. 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.

We are restricted by Gatwick concerning matters related to their aircraft movements. We in turn as a **Protected Landscape in a conservation area** demand the same protection. For example light pollution and aircraft impact with a new runway.

Quote 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.... Where this should apply - decision making in respect of development management, planning applications and nationally significant infrastructure projects.

Unquote

Economic circumstances have changed and the economic viability put forward by Gatwick is out of date.

The economics submitted by Gatwick are out of date as highlighted by local authorities (York Aviation submissions) as, without the modernisation of airspace (FASIS), Gatwick will not reach its target of passengers/ aircraft. We believe FASIS should have been included in this application for a new runway and provide compensation for loss of house value.

Gatwick is a holiday airport, seasonal and hit badly by Covid. 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 will result in the airlines passing on the additional costs to passengers. Gatwick and the airlines will attempt to reduce employment due to increased Employers National Contributions and ultimately pass on their costs by raising ticket prices and thereby causing passenger numbers to further decline. The cost of a new runway will also have a knock on effect and be passed on to the airlines and ultimately passengers.

Please note here the environmental aspect of sustainable aviation fuel when burned releases the same emissions as fossil fuel.

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 Thames Water in their recent submission. We support the restrictions proposed by Thames Water.

The new Secretary of State's ruling on **incinerators** and their movements mean new that waste from the airport going to incinerators must be included in Gatwick's scope 3, not disregarded or placed in scope 2.

Surface access has not been addressed by Gatwick. 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 impact to B roads and other rat-runs would be catastrophic.

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 Secretary of State has not been published, it is difficult to fully understand what has been proposed, and we are concerned that **air quality** decline causing serious health problems, as well as **climate change**, will not be given due consideration. This new runway should therefore not be permitted.