

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Subject: Response to consultation on Gatwick's proposed second runway
Date: 07 May 2025 11:07:17

[REDACTED]

Please note my response and objections below:

No new runway – Gatwick Airport has not provided a strong enough case for why there is a 'need' for a new runway, so the SoS should take the Planning Inspectorate's recommendation not to support a new runway.

Timing – Gatwick calls for an earlier approval of a new runway at Gatwick, before 27th October. This is unacceptable as due process must be adhered to.

Noise – Noise must be fully re-examined in view of the applicant detailing that the robust investigations by the Planning Inspectorate did not understand the applicant's submissions. Throughout the hearings, CAGNE has detailed the inconsistencies of the applicant's submissions. The applicant is now proposing new noise criteria, with a consultation of interested parties as the alternative. This would not be legally binding and seriously questions the merit of the planning process, as it will not have been independently examined with findings produced for all to examine before any planning permission is given for a new runway.

Any noise restrictions should be continuous throughout the year for arrivals and departures, not just for the summer months.

Gatwick consultations tend to favour the airport over residents, and a simple airport consultation post 27th October does not override PINS' rigorous examinations of the poor data responses provided by the airport during the hearings.

The applicant seems to wish to dismiss tranquillity as 'lack of ambient noise', using a flawed Noise Management Board report produced by the Gatwick noise expert. The report was very narrow in its investigation, so was not accepted by residents as factual during the NMB.

Ground and plant noise - I do not believe that ground and plant noise has been fully examined, so this must be re-examined, along with noise from aircraft in flight. It is not sufficient to acknowledge the noise without robust criteria of how it will be addressed, allowing for restrictions should the noise be an issue – there seems to be no baseline for the noise created.

Compensation – I do not accept the applicant's argument on a reduction of mitigation and an 'agreement on case by case' basis, as this offers residents no assurances of what they will receive or what the applicant feels obliged to provide. Residents should be assured of a robust DCO agreement that is legally binding, that can be appealed against should a resident feel inadequately compensated by the applicant for increase in noise and devaluation of home.

We do not understand how the economic projection can be reached without the modernisation of airspace, so this must be included in the SoS decision. The compensation being offered by the applicant does not account for changes to flight paths, and no compensation is being offered for greater concentration of flights, or new flight paths over new communities.

Surface Transport – The lack of surface access to the airport has always been Gatwick's Achilles heel, as detailed in the Heathrow vs Gatwick Airport Commission report submissions for a new SE runway in 2014.

The proposed increase in the drop-off fee to £7 simply pushes the congestion back to roads and stations that have not had the £200m investment of taxpayer's money that the Gatwick station has had. It also firmly places the bill with local authorities of a decline in air quality.

Thanks
Darren Perks