

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Gatwick Airport expansion / Interested Party ref 20042175
Date: 20 May 2025 17:04:57

>

> Dear Sir / Madam - Interested party reference number 20042175. I refer to the letter dated 28th April 2025 from the DOT and hereby provide our comments on the additional information provided by Gatwick airport in their submission dated 24th April 2025 :

> Primarily we object to the 2nd runway as Gatwick Airport have not provided a strong enough case to prove the need , hence the Secretary of State (SOS) should follow the Planning Inspectorate's recommendation and not support a new runway.

>

> Noise : we are a small rural village 19 miles from Gatwick airport (by flight distance) and suffer loud aircraft noise on 3 flight paths in & out of Gatwick, but we do get respite when the other 4 flight paths are used. We strongly object to any increase in flight number caused by increased capacity at Gatwick airport.

> The question of noise must be fully examined in view of the applicant detailing that the robust investigations by the Planning Inspectorate did not understand the applicants submissions. Throughout the hearings, the inconsistencies of the applicants submissions have been detailed, and the applicant is now proposing new noise criteria with a consultation of interested parties as the alternative. This proposal will not be legally binding and undermines the planning process , as it will not have been independently examined with results produced for all parties to examine before any planning permission is given for a new runway.

> Furthermore, any noise restrictions should be continuous throughout the year and not just for the summer months. As always with Gatwick, their consultations tend to favour the airport over residents and a very simple consultation after 27th October does not override the Planning Inspectors rigorous examinations of the poor data responses provided by the airport during the hearings.

> The applicant appears to wish to dismiss tranquility as 'lack of ambient noise', using a flawed Noise Management Board report produced by the Gatwick noise expert (with a clear bias in favour of the airport). The report was very narrow in its investigation, and was therefore not accepted by residents as factual during the NMB.

>

> Surface transport : The lack of surface access to the airport has always been their Achilles heel, as detailed in the Heathrow vs Gatwick Airport Commission report for a new southeast runway in 2014. The suggested increase in the drop off fee to £7 is just a mechanism to push the congestion onto roads and stations that have not had the £200m investment of taxpayer's money that the Gatwick railway station has had. It also very clearly passes the bill onto the local authorities for a decline in air quality.

> Improvements to the roads and public transport should be paid for by Gatwick airport, not the taxpayer. Why should we subsidise this application in order for the shareholders to increase their profits?

> The figure of 54% of airport users travelling by public transport must be legally binding, as proposed by the SoS in the restrictions detailed on 27th February. If it's not legally binding, then residential roads will become further congested by increased passenger numbers leading to a decline in air quality adding to the cost to residents, NHS and the public purse.

> It should be noted that according to the applicant the highways will be expected to carry up to 350,000 tonnes of cargo by 2047 without any significant investment. This cargo will inevitably be transported in and out of the airport by road, leading to increased pollution and traffic congestion .

> The offer of £10m for roads is insultingly low, and if Gatwick are serious about an extra 32m passengers using the railway line then they should contributing far more than £10m.

> As was made clear during the PINS examination, the applicant is relying on 3rd parties to provide the surface access to the airport, without meeting the true cost.

>

> Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty : the offer of £320k by the applicant is laughably small as it will not offset the expected 20% increase in aircraft movements over some heritage sites and rural areas (including our village, Kirdford).

> One third of the village of Kirdford sits within the South Downs National Park, and the idea that a donation of £80,000 will in anyway offset the damage done to the Dark Skies Reserve by light pollution caused by Gatwick,

shows a complete lack of understanding of life in a dark skies area. Sleep deprivation caused by Gatwick (especially during the summer months) is already significant with 11,200 flights between 11.30 pm and 6 am.

>

> Night Flights : The applicants 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 10.00 to 11.30 pm and 6.00 am onwards. It must be noted that the main runway will have to accommodate all arrivals and departures from 2 runways, which includes night flights. We therefore strongly request a full ban on night flights for both runways.

>

> Climate Change - surely one of the biggest issues facing the planet. The applicant argues that this has been over counted, as the carbon emissions should be counted for the 'project' only. We would argue that 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 existing runway.

> There should clearly be a carbon cap to restrict growth if emissions are not reduced.

>

> Thames Water & sewage treatment plants : where are the details of the on-site waste treatment plant that Gatwick initially agreed to? We see no reference to this being legally binding if Thames Water (TW) cannot meet Gatwick's requirements for increases in passengers, workers, hotels and offices. There are clearly already issues with sewage flowing into homes on residential roads , as TW have a lack of capacity in their sewage treatment plants, and they also have a severe lack of funds as evidenced by their current financial situation. The suggestion that Gatwick and TW will reach 'common ground' does not provide any guarantee about future capacity and does seem rather naive. If TW is unable to provide additional sewage capacity then Gatwick must have its growth restricted. It is imperative that this must be enforced by the SOS as part of the DCO.

>

> Councillor Alistair Persson
Kirdford Parish Council

>

>

>