

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Response to Dept of Transport Letter of 27 Feb 2025
Date: 20 May 2025 16:02:17

Interested Party Number 20046232

Response to Gatwick Planning Inspectorate

Horsham Trafalgar Neighbourhood Council May 2025

As a council we represent the views of our residents and we are supportive of keeping Gatwick Airport as it is.

There is no proven case for expansion, which we see largely as very damaging for the vast majority of residents in the area, mainly due to the prospect of almost constant noise, particularly overnight and in the summer, the almost constant extra traffic that will be generated on the roads, the almost constant air pollution caused by all transport going to and from the airport as well as the planes themselves, alongside the health costs and financial costs to the NHS that this noise and air pollution creates.

In addition, an extra 40 million passengers will create huge amounts of sewage while Thames Water is already failing and raw sewage is routinely added to our rivers, damaging the water courses and polluting the marine environment. It has even flowed onto roads and into homes as Thames Water fails to meet Gatwick's current requirements, let alone with millions of extra humans.

With 40 million extra visitors each year will come millions of extra cars, causing a need for far more road repairs (costing approximately £1m for each mile of road to be resurfaced) and many more car parking spaces would need to be found somewhere. The shopping areas of the airport would become busier and therefore generate more waste and there seems to be little or no provision for dealing with the extra plastics in particular, that would need be processed somewhere either locally or transported 'away.'

Gatwick is not well placed to be used as a cargo airport, as the railway, which recently underwent a £200,000,000 taxpayer funded refurbishment, has no further capacity.

Alongside residents suffering, there would be huge damage to all manner of wildlife, when the UK is already one of the most nature-depleted countries in the world.

Most people do not fly but they will bear the brunt of the damage caused by building a new runway, which will serve a small percentage of the population both in terms of creating jobs and in using the planes for recreational or business purposes. A second runway at Gatwick would serve a minority, taking more tourists out of the UK than it brings in, while spoiling the lives of many.

Here in the south east, we already have Luton, Heathrow, Stanstead, Brighton City airport, London City airport, and many other expanding private airports such as Farnborough and Dunsfold. There are already well over 1,000 such private airports across the UK.

A donation of £80,000 for the South Downs National Park Dark Skies Reserve is poor compensation when light pollution from Gatwick can be seen for miles around as well as almost constantly moving overhead. If building expansion continues on this scale how will it leave the UK in seven generation's time? Would we be deprived forever of priceless, peaceful, starlit nights?

Gatwick Airport is suggesting that only the building carbon costs of the new runway need to be counted, while obviously the running costs of an airport which has doubled in size is going to impact climate change enormously. For example, opening a third runway at Heathrow Airport could result in pollution equivalent to an additional 2.4 million tons of carbon dioxide being released into the atmosphere each year by 2050, according to the government's own estimates.*

The data, obtained through a Freedom of Information request, sets out Whitehall's forecasts for the additional environmental damage caused if another runway is opened at Heathrow in 2039.

The UK operates carbon accounting where nearly half the emissions are treated as an externality. This hiding carbon emissions by simply not counting them is absolutely not acceptable, when we have already passed the global tipping point of 1.5°C and we are on course for continuing disruption to climates and weather worldwide, which already is impacting Gatwick itself and other airports, as well as food production. Relying on things which are only in people's imaginations so far, such as sustainable aviation fuel, or efficient incineration of waste emissions is not a sound enough way to decide something so huge and so important.

In conclusion, Gatwick Airport has not provided a robust case for a 'need' for a new runway despite a lengthy consultation and the Planning Inspectorate's recommendation not to support a new runway.

We hope the Secretary of State honours and respects the process and its conclusions and is not pushed into a hasty decision by Gatwick Airport calling for an earlier approval, or persuaded to override rigorous examinations which have flagged up serious omissions.

*A F.O.I. seen by POLITICO May 14, 2025 by [Abby Wallace](#)

Morag Warrack

Chairman

Horsham Trafalgar Neighbourhood Council

