

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Subject: Comments on Responses to SoS letter 9 Dec 24 (Interested party 20041511)
Date: 16 January 2025 10:40:18

Interested Party reference: 20041511

Comments: Gatwick Second Runway - on responses to SoS letter 9.12.24

First and foremost I would like to comment that this application does not follow government policy to make best use of existing facilities, but is really the building of a new runway. The massive changes that this project will bring to the area, together with the work involved in moving the emergency runway to the north, means that this is a new runway and is not making best use of existing facilities.

Noise is already a major problem in the area surrounding Gatwick and the SoS is right to look into this further as suggested to cover the 54db summer daytime and 48db summer night time contours. However, noise from Gatwick operations already severely impacts people in areas far outside these contours. A requirement to support insulation of properties is welcome, but nothing has been done to compensate owners for loss of value of houses that are impacted by excess noise from Gatwick operations. This is a serious omission and owners should be compensated for damage to value that is brought by Gatwick expansion.

Changes to airspace due FASIS have not been assessed nor taken into account in this application and that is wrong. Existing airspace use may not be able to accommodate the increase in passenger numbers that Gatwick anticipates. Changes to airspace to accommodate increased traffic may be very detrimental to people living the areas that may be newly affected by noise and others may suffer from greatly increased noise.

The fact that there is too much dependence on Gatwick making the area vulnerable to changes in the aviation market was highlighted during Covid. It would be wrong to make it even more dependent. Therefore, the economic forecasts are very questionable. Flying will undoubtedly get more expensive as fuel becomes more expensive which is inevitable as sustainable aviation fuel is more expensive. As flying gets more expensive, passenger numbers will likely decline.

Wastewater and sewage concerns do not appear to have been adequately addressed. Thames Water is right to require restrictions.

The problem of incinerators and transport of waste has not been properly addressed by the applicant.

Surface access has always been a problem at Gatwick as it is poorly served by public transport. Gatwick does not appear to have any plans to meet the cost of road improvements that would be needed to cope with increased traffic to the airport. Local roads are likely to become even worse than they already are.

There is already a problem with poor air quality and the impact on health of residents around Gatwick and this does not appear to have been addressed. A new runway will only

make matters even worse.

Caroline Tayler