

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Gatwick Airport](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Gatwick Airport Expansion Comment  
**Date:** 14 May 2025 20:02:10

---

[REDACTED]

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed expansion of Gatwick Airport and the construction of a second runway.

First and foremost, I do not support the expansion. The case for a new runway is unconvincing and does not demonstrate sufficient need, particularly in light of the environmental and social costs such a development would impose on local communities.

Should the government choose to proceed with this expansion despite public concern, I urge that it be subject to stringent environmental, noise, and planning controls. The current proposals for noise limits, even as revised by the Secretary of State, fall short of achieving the government's stated policy objective: that the benefits of growth should be shared fairly between the aviation industry and local communities, balancing economic advancement with meaningful noise reduction.

To fulfil this policy, noise limits should be reduced further, and reductions should occur at a rate that ensures the community experiences tangible benefits. Alternatively, the government should implement meaningful compensatory measures—such as a comprehensive ban on night flights, as already mandated for Heathrow.

Furthermore, any expansion must include:

- Legally enforceable noise limits for all seasons, not just the peak summer period, covering both arrivals and departures, as well as ground and plant noise;
- A formal mechanism for periodic downward revision of noise limits to reflect improvements in technology and operational practices;

- An unequivocal ban on night flights, to protect residents' health and well-being;
- A delay in any decision until at least 27th October, to ensure due process is observed and communities are fully consulted.

Compensation for affected residents must be guaranteed through a robust and legally binding Development Consent Order (DCO). This should include a clear appeals process for those who feel inadequately compensated for increased noise or the devaluation of their property.

Surface transport also remains a critical and unresolved issue. The applicant—not the taxpayer—must fund necessary upgrades to roads and public transport infrastructure. Existing roads are already overburdened and ill-equipped to handle additional traffic volumes, while the risk of deteriorating local air quality from increased vehicular journeys is unacceptable.

In addition, the broader local infrastructure—schools, hospitals, GP surgeries—is already under significant strain. A project of this scale would necessitate substantial investment in public services to meet the additional demand that would inevitably follow increased housing linked to airport-related employment growth.

More broadly, there appears to be a troubling absence of strategic, national planning for airport infrastructure across the UK. Expanding Gatwick in isolation risks deepening regional inequalities. The South East of England is already the country's most affluent region, while transport connectivity in the North remains underdeveloped. Economic benefits generated by aviation growth could—and should—be more equitably distributed across the UK to support regeneration and development in areas where such investment would have far greater impact.

Moreover, the current model of encouraging mass, low-cost air travel to unremarkable destinations does little to support environmental

sustainability or to elevate our global standing. That so many travellers now seek only the closest foreign equivalent of a British pub is a sad reflection of travel's potential squandered. It is difficult to see how this model justifies further expansion, particularly when the cost is borne by local communities and the environment.

Finally, the environmental toll of concentrating two of the country's largest airports within the already congested South East is indefensible. The region is already overpopulated and overburdened. The additional pollution—acoustic, atmospheric, and ground-based—that such a development would produce is both excessive and unacceptable.

In conclusion, I urge the government to reconsider the proposed expansion of Gatwick Airport. Should the project proceed, it must do so only with stringent, enforceable controls in place and a genuine commitment to balancing economic growth with environmental and community well-being.

Yours faithfully,

Suzanne and Christopher Cahill