

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Subject: Gatwick Airport New Runway
Date: 11 May 2025 19:54:36

[REDACTED]

Dear Planning Inspectorate

Below are my comments to Gatwick's responses to the Department's letter of 27th February.

Gatwick Airport has not provided a strong enough case for why there is a 'need' for a new runway.

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 must be fully re-examined in view of the inconsistencies in the submissions. The Noise Management Board report produced by the Gatwick noise expert is not factual.

Ground and plant noise has been fully examined. I live 6 miles away and can hear the ground noise of planes.

How can 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 or existing communities.

The proposed increase in the drop-off fee to £7 pushes the congestion back to local roads, the major impact being Horley and Povey Cross / Hookwood.

Improvements to the roads and public transport should be paid for by the applicant, not the taxpayer. People travel by car to the airport and create congestion to residential roads comes a decline in air quality impacting the community residents.

The offer of £10m for roads is inadequate and does not stop people cutting through the countryside and local roads. As detailed throughout the PINS examination, the applicant is relying on third parties to provide the surface access to the airport, yet they are not now obliged to meet the cost. the tax payer and local Councils should not have to meet these costs.

The offer of £320,000 by the applicant is a dereliction of duty as it does not improve ANOBs, as some areas of them are expected to withstand a 20% increase in aircraft movements over heritage sites and rural areas designated as AONB.

Gatwick contributing to a major loss of dark skies South Downs National Park Dark doe snot take into account the light pollution that can be seen for miles (impacting the local community of Horley, Hookwood, Charlwood, Sidlow, Leigh and Newdigate as well as overhead.

Night flights – The applicant's offer of an agreement not to use the northern runway at night does not stop this new runway from being used during the 'shoulder' periods of 10-11.30pm and 6am onwards, when sleep is being sought (timing known to carry health risks). It must be noted that the main runway will have to accommodate all arrivals from departures on two runways, which includes at night. We therefore ask for a night ban for both runways.

Climate Change – The applicant argues that this has been overcounted, as the carbon emissions should be counted only from the 'project'. The emissions from both runways must be accounted for, as with the construction and road transport. All planes that depart from the new runway will arrive on the main runway.

The applicant does not account for incineration of waste emissions, or for non-CO2 gases and the lack of capacity in neighbouring sewage treatment plants.

regards Jill Nash