

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Subject: Response to Gatwick 2nd Runway Application
Date: 16 January 2025 18:21:00

[REDACTED]
Dear Transport Infrastructure Planning Unit,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this application for the owners of Gatwick Airport to build a second runway. I object to this application to expand flights to the detriment of the local and global environment, to enable a private company to increase their profits. The application minimises the devastating impacts of airport expansion and relies heavily on technological advances, yet to be invented, to brush these issues under the carpet.

My primary objection is that of dumping millions of additional tonnes of CO₂ into the environment when we are struggling to make significant progress in reducing emissions with the Paris agreement target for limiting global warming to 1.5C already exceeded in 2024. I question whether Gatwick expansion is needed for what will be primarily holiday flights, when we all should be flying less. No clever schemes can deny the simple fact that more flights means more Co₂ pollution at a time when we should be actively cutting emissions. We are already seeing impacts both in this country, and abroad, that climate change is real. The fires that still burn in Los Angeles being the current reminder that the climate crisis is real and the negative impacts that this is/will have on the economy and population cannot be ignored. The government should not be allowing any increase in aviation emissions whilst we have no effective way of reducing Co₂ in the atmosphere. Gatwick should be responsible and pay for cleaning up all its emissions, including those related to all operations related to the site. One assumes that those proposing the plan to increase flights either believe they will be long dead before the full horrors of climate change are realised, or sufficiently wealthy to be insulated from its effects.

The second runway will have significant negative impact on the health and wellbeing on the local population and this is not limited to those identified by the noise contours published by the airport. The area Gatwick flights impact is far wider. I live in [REDACTED], just to the west of Tunbridge Wells and have done so for over 20 years. During that time, although not on the final flight path, the narrowing of the approach to that flight path has meant increased flights overhead, day and night, fundamentally making my home life poorer without any mechanism to stop this. The noise complaint system set up by the airport is meaningless; Gatwick is safe in the knowledge that there is no accountability and no requirement for action. The installation of noise reducing plaster board in the ceiling in our living room now means that the TV volume does not need to be increased on busy overflowed evenings. Outside the noise is obviously worse. Increasingly the impact of noise and its negative impact on sleep and health is being recognised in scientific studies. I do not believe a private company should be allowed to pollute in this way with absolute immunity. This application will only make the current situation worse.

Gatwick expansion will have a major impact on the local roads, rail and infrastructure to

the detriment of their current users. There is also the current issue with sewage and pollution of the local water course exacerbated by increased heavy rainfall events (secondary to climate change) which will worsen with increasing passenger numbers.

Gatwick claims that new jobs will be created. These are likely to be low paid and relatively short lived considering increasing automation and the efficiencies of artificial intelligence. Current examples include self-service checkouts in retail, automated check in by some carriers and self-drive taxis/coaches on the near horizon. I understand there is already pressure on housing around the airport and so the work force will need to travel from further away. It will also mean further concentrating jobs in the south.

Thank you for considering this response to the application and the reasons why the government should not support it.

Kind regards,

Mike Champion (registration identification 20045870)