

I have attended hearings and have been appalled by the lack of professionalism and absence of any goodwill exhibited by the representatives of Gatwick Airport Ltd. Their justification for pushing through this application would appear to be that it would (according to GAL) only affect existing flight paths and therefore they are entitled to proceed. The approximately doubling of flights, using the emergency runway and landing all flights to the main runway is a manoeuvre constructed by Gatwick Airport in an attempt to avoid proper scrutiny and compensations. Additionally they are asking for approval before 27th October in an effort to further avoid due process. Please Secretary of State confirm the Planning Inspectorate's recommendation not to support a new runway.

GAL have an appalling record on NOISE and consider the airport as a 24 hour operation. Their complaints line is inadequate and ignored. I believe it likely that no other major airport is allowed to operate in such a way and now with the possibility hanging over us of a major uplift in aircraft movements these noise emissions will increase significantly. Further scrutiny must urgently be made of GAL's proposals as they appear to not be legally binding and not available for independent view and assessment under this planning process. Proper noise restrictions should be put in place applying all the year round with particular reference to the anguish caused by night flying. THE MAIN RUNWAY WILL LAND ALL THE AIRCRAFT ARRIVALS FROM 2 RUNWAYS INCLUDING AT NIGHT. This is disregarded by GAL and culminated in their inadequate response to noise during this entire process. We respectfully request that there should be a NIGHT BAN FOR BOTH RUNWAYS.

Based on GAL poor compensations record and their total lack of consideration of those living on the ground any proposals by them relating to their proposed new runway operations should be written into law with right of appeal.

Local authority opposition together with those most affected by GAL is based upon the Commission report of 2014. Congestion of roads and railways is one thing but a major stumbling block is inadequate infrastructure, poor roads which have no drainage and areas of considerable flooding. WHY SHOULD THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND ULTIMATELY THE PUBLIC pick up the bills for this cost because a commercial enterprise is attempting to exclude this cost from its obligations?

As far as the increase in drop off fee is concerned; this is unlikely to deter the intrepid, entitled traveller. Their priority is getting to the airport on time for their flight. With the proposed increase in flights and congestion thus created, coupled with poor infrastructure, a small increase in the fee will not deter them. Being dropped from a nearby location possibly by taxi ensures their timing and eliminates collisions that bring our motorways to a standstill. Passengers from outside the ULEZ already take advantage of this by bypassing Heathrow with its additional costs. Rail is also unlikely to guarantee arrival for a specific time for many reasons including for example of signal failure and shortage of train crew. Gatwick already attracts passengers from the East Midlands, Essex and Kent by passing many local viable airports on the way thus adding to the congestion towards Gatwick. Staying overnight in an airport hotel offering overnight accommodation, is now problematic. If the 54 percent of travellers proposed to arrive by rail is to carry any weight it must be legally binding.

Congested residential rat runs and the accompanied decline in air quality from traffic should be addressed by the applicant and not funded by residents, the NHS and the public purse. On top of this the roads will be expected to carry 350,000 tonnes of cargo by 2047 with no significant investment. Again please do not allow this commercial enterprise to evade its obligations. The offer of £10million for roads by GAL is derisory.

As far as AONB are concerned the figures offered by GAL are paltry sums which could never compensate these areas for what they will lose in terms of tranquillity and light pollution. In Lingfield we already endure so much we know what to expect from Gatwick Airport in terms of consideration. Greater clarity would be provided if these figures were to include changes in flight paths and lack of compensation for greater concentration of flights or in fact new flight paths over new areas. To this end the modernisation of airspace should also be taken into account in any decision.

The country is moving towards the aim of net zero while Gatwick Airport proposes a new runway and by so doing moving in the opposite direction. Carbon emissions must be counted for both runways as planes that depart from any new runway will arrive on the main runway.

It is difficult to know where to begin with the sewage treatment implications of such a potential expansion of Gatwick Airport. Thames Water does not have an impressive record on sewage treatment in this area and it is a far better option to expect GAL to provide an onsite waste treatment plant which should be legally binding. So called 'common ground' between Thames Water and GAL does not provide any guarantee of future capacity. If Thames Water is unable to provide capacity, Gatwick must have growth restricted.

Thank you

Pat Routledge, [REDACTED]

INTERESTED PARTY REF. GATW-S573014