

- To: the Planning Inspectorate
-

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

16th January 2025.

Re: Gatwick Airport application to convert the emergency runway to full time use as a second Northern runway for Gatwick, with up to 74,000,000 passengers per year passing through the airport.

This letter is from the Langton Green Village Society. Langton Green is a village some 18 miles to the east of Gatwick, directly under the flight path, at the point where Gatwick congregates incoming planes to line them up for their final approach, when the wind is from the west..... i.e some 70% of the time for all Gatwick landings.. Our village has some 3,000 residents, and this is letter reflects the view of the vast majority, all of whom would be negatively affected by this application.

The Society appreciates that the current Government is committed to ensuring the UK increases national productivity and is keen to see new major infrastructure projects being undertaken. Our government might be initially keen for a major project such as Gatwick proposes to proceed. Regardless of any Government direction, the society's stance has always been that this application should be rejected because:

1. This application for increased flight volume is absolutely in the wrong place.

- a. The 2014 government sponsored UK (SE) air transport requirements report showed clearly that what was needed was an increase in the availability of "interconnecting business" flights. Likewise the report, even in 2014, cast doubt on the need for additional leisure flight capacity.
- b. Heathrow is a majority business flights airport.
- c. Gatwick is 70%+ leisure fights.
- d. Communications between Gatwick and Heathrow are limited. The average travel time, Gatwick to LHR, from leaving the passenger exit at Gatwick to arriving at a terminal at LHR must be nearing 2 hours and can't be improved on. (The 2014 proposal for a high speed connection between Gatwick and LHR was rejected). This renders Gatwick as being genuinely unsuitable as a provider of a solution for the growing aviation needs of British business.
- e. Equally, Increasing business flights at Gatwick would be of limited value to business travellers. The main connecting flights would still depart from LHR. Gatwick simply cannot provide the business connections identified in the 2014 survey.
- f. It is reported that LHR is at risk of stagnating because it lacks sufficient runway space and that discussions of a 3rd runway for LHR have stalled.

2. The Environment

The application for increased leisure flight volumes in the South East needs challenging in view of the increasing negative impact aviation has of and on global warming, linked to the fact that the considerable emissions of CO2 from the leisure aviation industry are currently heavily

discounted. The time has come for the aviation industry to be held more accountable for the damage it does to the environment.

Our Society has previously listed several other reasons that show why this application is for the wrong development in the wrong place and although we have submitted those reasons for suggesting rejection of the application we feel the two main reasons for objecting have always been:

A. Proven Business Need.

Gatwick's application does little to answer the UK needs clearly identified in the 2014 survey and analysis of increased interconnecting flights from SE England.

B. Environmental.

The impact of Global Warming has meant for some time that we (UK) need to reduce our reliance on air travel and its impact on CO2 levels by reducing our reliance on (leisure) aviation. The Gatwick application would mean a serious CO2 increase with limited business gains in an area where Governments and societies are being asked to reduce CO2 emissions.

As we have already said, the wrong solution in the wrong place mainly for the benefit of foreign investors who have excellent tax advisors and make the minimum possible contributions to the UK exchequer.

C. The need for an emergency runway.

It was deemed necessary 40 years ago to stipulate for the provision of an emergency runway at Gatwick. Technology has improved greatly since Gatwick opened but flight volumes have also increased dramatically. Is the Planning Inspectorate really convinced that Gatwick does not need an emergency runway taking into consideration the volumes of flights that Gatwick intend to process. Gatwick will of course give a highly optimistic and probably undeliverable set of reasons as to what an emergency runway is not needed. Caveat emptor.

We hope that the government will be strong enough in its commitment to the real needs of UK business – and the environment – to reject this opportunistic application.

Jeremy Stirling.

For the Langton Green Village Society.

Jeremy Stirling. Committee member.

