

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Gatwick Airport](#)  
**Subject:** Reference number: 20041905 Re the applicants letter and information 24th April 2025  
**Date:** 27 May 2025 17:39:37

---

[REDACTED]

The ExA's concerns follow its proper examination process and after taking on-board all of the comments from all parties involved, thus the applicant's commentary is somewhat insulting the ExA and through that same all other parties. In addition, the applicants continued references to what *it* deems good for the SoS and the UK's finances is not within its remit to so refer to, I am quite sure that the SoS is more than capable of understanding its own business without the applicants pointing out the obvious, the applicant should restrain its commentary to submitted fact and not attempt to tell the SoS its business.

The applicant also often refers to the treatment/limitations and outcomes for 'other' airport/similar schemes, this is an attempt to influence the outcome based on previous decision-making, whereas the entire point of holding an enquiry is to engage with the relevant parties affected by the specific proposals encompassed by the application. This application concerns Gatwick and the geographical area it is located within and those parties who operate businesses, live and work there and who will be affected by the outcomes. The development relates to Gatwick and its use of the North runway, not Manchester, Heathrow, Luton or any other location or project, irrespective of any policy framework it must at one and the same time be treated as 'specific' and 'individual' because projects of the scope/size 'plus' by their own unique geographical location, they require to be viewed through the lens of the specific and individual aspects concerning the locality. No single project in the UK is going to be the same and will be very, very different and for a huge variety of reasons. The applicant's broad-brush reference to 'other' projects are therefore irrelevant for the most part and are without merit.

#### 1. Air Noise Limits (Requirement 15)

The applicant wishes to change this requirement (by increasing the dB noise area) saying that the ExA used incorrect accounting methodology - this is a somewhat late in the day issue to be raising however it is also irrelevant. Noise is not something that can be dismissed, noise is one of the greatest concerns for the communities affected and no amount of noise attenuation, insulation or financial contributions can prevent noise and the very real detrimental effects that it has on the communities. Talking about a 'tiered' approach to this and that is not solving the noise concerns, it is merely batting away the truth about noise and its effects on human being's lives. If there are changes needed to the noise contour it should be to make it more onerous to the applicants business not less.

## 2. Receptor Based Noise Mitigation (Noise Insulation Scheme) (Requirement 18)

The entire first paragraph of the applicant's response demonstrates a complete lack of genuine concern, it even states *"the mitigation offered should ensure that the Proposed Development avoids significant adverse effects on health and quality of life"* - the word 'significant' is key here, that particular bar is far too high, the mitigation standard should be refined to state *"no further additional adverse effects immediately with a goal to reduce existing effects established within a reasonable timeline"*. Yet again the applicant refers back to the Luton expansion scheme and I would remind all that this is Gatwick!

The applicant goes on to discuss residential mitigation packages, financial packages, tiered-approach, expert-led dispute resolution and so on, claiming to create transparency it suggests using an independent arbitrator. The applicant clearly is stating on the record that, in spite of all its measures there will be additional noise and nuisance affecting residents' health and wellbeing. This is a 'Fact' that cannot be erased which is precisely what the ExAs have deliberated upon and hence why the ExO has stated the noise limitations, moving the goalposts now is simply not acceptable.

Were noise mitigation to be required then, while it may be true that *'some'* residents will be entitled to support to reduce the effects, these are in all cases a *minority* of dwellings affected by noise. It is only those most seriously affected dwellings that ever eligible for support measures when in truth, the number of dwellings 'affected' by noise from the existing airport is simply enormous, if the application were to be successful those dwellings already affected (but not entitled to any mitigation support) would be even more affected by noise - that is noise occurrence-frequency, noise duration and volume, it is simply not acceptable in the 21st Century to impose these types of burdens on society and elected Government should be protecting citizens by reducing these negative life effects on its citizens.

The applicants constant harping about policy as seen in their statement *"This means that a decision by the SoS to accept the ExA's approach for London Gatwick would reset policy, creating an unlevel playing field with significant implications for the growth of other airports and Noise Action Plans across the country"* is their view only (It is not for the applicant to tell the SoS or Central Government for that matter what is and is not policy) it is another null argument and should be struck down as irrelevant, for if that over-arching statement were to be considered a proper argument, then there would be no debate ever, nor democratic oversight of any project no matter how detrimental to any of the peoples in the UK full stop. A particular *local* decision does not reset Government policy, nor does it even 'set' policy, policy is the framework in which a project is assessed-only, not solely judged upon, judgement comes after due

process.

## 5. Other matters

### Policy, Needs and benefits

Again the applicant is relying on the complaint 'why treat us different from them' - while that argument can have weight, in this instance and the nature of this issue, it does not have any merit re my comments earlier regarding Why? the need to have any form of consultation, if one is simply going to continually refer back to 'other' unrelated decisions. It is a null point.

The applicant goes on once again to attempt to coerce the SoS to 'side with' it just because..., Airport expansion is occurring elsewhere and there may be a need for it to continue elsewhere, however the case at Gatwick is not yet made, there is already 'not' a good balance between National infrastructure and local's needs which will worsen should the application be approved, the applicant quoted EU directive 598/2014 which in part states - *measures should improve the noise environment around airports in order to maintain or increase the quality of life of neighbouring citizens and foster compatibility between aviation activities and residential areas, in particular where night flights are concerned.*

The applicant is doing its best to undermine key noise concern aspects, lets be honest with the sole reason that it will make money, it's not for National Infrastructure, its not for the local residents it is pure and simply to make more money for shareholders, there is a clear distinction needed to be made here.

### Greenhouse gas emissions

The applicant states that the first component of the ExA's conclusion regarding the additional carbon addition to the 6th carbon budget, contains a serious error. If that is so the applicant failed previously to ensure that did not occur however the ultimate outcome remains the same - that Gatwick will (assuming the application be approved) *will* emit 3.459% towards the UKs Carbon budget and the applicant is nit-picking to try to change that fact.

### Applicants summary section 2

2.1 In respect of Requirement 15 regarding air noise limits and the 125Km<sup>2</sup> air noise contour, it is NOT for the ExO to demonstrate anything, the ExO has undertaken its role diligently and based on the available information from all of the sources has arrived at a reasonable recommendation, that the applicant doesn't like it must not allow the recommendation in its entirety to be watered down at all.

The applicant should not have any special 'clause' that allows it to return to the SoS any time it wants, regarding measures needed for events outside of the applicants control, the phrase speaks for itself 'outside of their control' should any such instance occur then it would need to be investigated A) to confirm that indeed it is/was outside of the applicants control and B) if it WERE in the applicants control so that remedial action including legal action and so on would follow to ensure future compliance, the applicant cannot be allowed to have a free 'get out of jail card' as to prevent legal challenge otherwise why would the applicant need to be compliant?

In its last paragraph of Requirement 15 air noise limits, the applicant goes further to now ask the SoS to join in and help draft any exceedance of noise requirements! The applicant doth protest too much, it is clear and evident from their submission that they believe they are highly likely to exceed the air noise requirements and are seeking to nullify or limit any future ownership of responsibility for being in breach of the requirements where (and after due fact finding process) the breach is found to 'not be' outside of the applicants control after all. Perhaps all the residents of the area should be invited to help draft the air noise requirements as well as the SoS and ExO for completeness.

#### Requirement 18

Gatwick is not Luton nor anywhere else, due process has been done, the applicants constant asking for the moving of the goalposts by the SoS is asking the SoS to ignore the proper conclusions of the bodu set up to examine the application in the first place. The applicant is asking for due process to be thrown aside against the conclusions.

Lastly, thanks to UK net zero legislation, ICE vehicles in the UK will be phased out leading to a reduction in Carbon emissions most especially locally. It is therefore churlish to demand that airport users use Public transport when what the majority of the Public want to do is drive to the airport for door-to-door service either in their car or via a taxi. Public transport is one method of transport not however without potential significant downsides - industrial action, transport failure, Rail track/signals/other failure, cost, increased travel-times, increased distance travelled, dependency and the fact that it is outside of an individual's control when things do go awry.

GAL has recently increased its drop-off fee to £7 and this is scandalous, the Public have the right to travel how they please especially as vehicles become more environmentally sound which is already far more than aircraft emissions, therefore the proposals should not only provide for drop-off by personal vehicle, it should be

completely free of charge with the only cost being for the parking of the vehicle and in this way, transport to/from the airport will be equitable for all with drivers no longer used as a scapegoat for the environmental failings of the airline industry.

Thank you

Mr Chris Morris