

*The applicant (Gatwick Airport) is making a mockery of the planning process, by introducing a third scheme outside of the examination time frame. We urge the Secretary of State to demand that noise and surface transport be re-examined and that the planning process be halted and re-instigated, to allow for full and transparent examination of the facts to ensure Gatwick Airport's new runway does not cost the planet, communities and the public purse dearly.*

*In my opinion having sat through three days of last summer's public enquiry, the airport failed to present a case, failed to clearly articulate what it would do if given approval, and also failed to demonstrate it would take necessary urgent action prior to any further development, i.e. the water drainage system is already overwhelmed, parking is inadequate, the road system is overcrowded and dangerous, (there are sadly accidents on the motorway, including during the three days of public hearings), there are already unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution, there is already a housing crisis in the area, and the train system cannot currently meet demand, (e.g. there are insufficient services, (nothing from Tonbridge), and the train station is already at maximum capacity). The outworking of this, is that the budget for completing this work clearly needs to be around £5bn, not £2+ bn, and this insufficiently funded proposal should not have been put forward at all.*

Airports pursue their own interests, we have recently seen that in Heathrow's recent response to a power outage, their response was utterly in their own interests and showed no understanding or concern for the infrastructure around them, nor for the disruption to the Global community of travellers who were stranded in many places.

Gatwick Airport is also owned by an asset investor, (BlackRock), during last year's National Infrastructure enquiry the airport was unable to demonstrate any interest in the wellbeing of the wider community; their responses were limited to the confines of the airport, they showed a total disregard for the wellbeing of the community, their offers of compensation were derisory, and they showed a total disregard for the effects and stresses on the community of their plans, especially in respect of traffic and where workers would live, it was wrongly assumed that 'more' meant better.

In respect of the water and drainage: -

- For example, the water treatment facilities have been left totally inadequate, arguably for a couple of decades, with inevitable impacts and flooding around the local communities and environment. However, the airport has not strategy and investment planned to address this, (already late the airport envisions doing nothing before wanting to start work on further expansion. The Airport is arguing about a known problem that is persistently has and will ignore, and on that ground alone this expansion proposal should be rejected.

In respect of the housing: -

- The area around the Airport already has a massive housing and also water table and drainage issue, further house building and construction is not safely possible. In addition to this, and partly because of the airport, the area around Crawley has already additional housing needs for those seeking asylum. This has already created an emergency, further stress on the housing stock cannot be helpful.

In respect of the transport infrastructure: -

- The airports proposal ignores the need for massive road investment, which will be left to the state to fund.
- The rail next work can neither cope with current demand, e.g. it is not possible to run trans to Gatwick from Tonbridge and will be unable to service additional travellers.
- An adequate supply of sustainable fuels is decades away, currently there is about .5% of all demand, no one yet knows what the side effects will be, e.g. smell or other issues, so environmentally this expansion proposal looks like a disaster, air travel already being a major cause of pollution, and the industry shows no concern for efficiency, offering low cost short term travel to destinations such as spa weekends with no thought to the effect of the noise or all the other forms of pollution.

In respect of flight paths: -

- The CAA has not made its position clear, CAA failed to attend the enquiry, instead it chose to express its views through the applicant. This was acutely odd, why was it allowed to happen. The inquiry should have been halted at the point in time, we should not be at the point this process has reached. It remains wholly unclear how the air traffic routes will cope.
- *Shockingly not only did CAA fail to represent itself, but it is also now apparent (May 2025) that there is a whole new set of air traffic lanes proposed, so the evidence and information, (IE ANYTHING IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN pre UKADS) that the inquiry considered was invalid. This is unacceptable as those living in the area have been denied the opportunity to respond to the airports plans in context. On that ground alone, this airports application should be rejected out of hand, a submission can only be made after 2027 when all of that new information is available. No wonder the CAA avoided the enquiry, but they also voided the inquiry.*

In respect of travel and parking: -

- The present and proposed arrangements for car parking are inadequate and will not meet the anticipated demand. The mutually plan to manage surface access is ludicrous when public transport already cannot cope, traffic and parked cars are simply going to

spread out everywhere, this is not environmentally sensitive, tis ludicrous, and will cause further pollution.

- Off-site parking which is such a blight on the local community will get worse, forests filled with cars, local streets used for unofficial airport parking.

In respect of safety: -

- The two runways will be very close together, anyone seeing an A380 land will know how vast these aircraft are and will know that a dangerous situation can rapidly develop.
- The airport was reluctant to explain clearly what would happen if a plane failed to successfully take off from the emergency runway, it appears it will hit the south terminal, but Gatwick has refused to answer questions about this.

In respect of customer demand and airport capacity: -

- In respect of capacity Gatwick has never demonstrated how the expansion will work, at the moment the emergency runway services the main runway, with the emergency runway unsalvageable it is not clear how the additional traffic will safely move on and off the runways, unless the airport then wants to demand further expansion.
- With the other airports expanding, especially considering the disruptions to international trade, supply will vastly exceed demand. The state will be left to remedy the mess left by the failed and ludicrous proposal.

In respect of compensation: -

- Gatwick's proposed offers of compensation to those who will undoubtedly suffer are mean and minimal and will in no way meet the costs that local people will incur, there is no thought to offering reasonable redress.
- Gatwick demonstrated at the enquiry complete indifference to the effect on the community whilst development took place, or afterwards, the airport has offered minimal compensation, that clearly will not meet the cost of home owners addressing noise issues, and the offers proposed to those who will suffer from anxiety issues etc are derisory

In respect of the community: -

- Gatwick has skewed development around the airport, from the lost race course at Gatwick at the end of World War 2, to the blocked IKEA development, or the impeded creation of a Centre Parcs in the area, to the massively unsafe smart motorway, with flooding it has caused, every move by Gatwick has been to the disadvantage of the local community. Nothing has been ever done to address such issues, Gatwick functions as a local community airport, its aspiration to be 'more than that' is totally misplaced. The Beehive building that was the airport reminds us of what a small regional airport could have been, an asset to the community, to the noisy polluting thoughtless monstrosity, poor controlled by CAA, and working constantly against Local Authorities, the Airport looks like it will be happy when it has polluted the water ways and the air, and produced gridlock on the road, railways and parking.

I attended the enquiry, I was not sure what to expect, I came away with one word cheap, the airport has presented a proposal at lowest cost, the trajectory will only be one way, and the community and the state would pick up the bill, this is neither a wise nor a good investment.

The Airports proposal should be rejected absolutely and finally, it was delivered as acutely vague, and further examination produced no answers, the Airport should be substantially fined for submitting such a poorly thought out and presented proposal, and for wasting a huge amount of public time and money, an absolute disgrace. Allowing this ill-considered idea to proceed would be catastrophic for the community and probably catastrophic for the airport, both financially, economically and in term of safety.

As Stewart Wingate as CEO failed to attend a single day of the public enquiry last year, the airport did not clearly take its public responsibility very seriously, and now the CEO is moving on, its clear he does not view the application seriously either, and did not intend to stay around to even bother to try to implement it.

No clear plan, no clear explanation how the airport would work, no addressing of current capacity issues including water, drainage and housing, no care for the community or all the travel issues on the ground, no addressing of current parking issues, or motorway accidents on M23, insufficient railway capacity, no consideration or information around noise, no clear mapping of flight paths and noise, no demonstration how sustainable flights could be provided, an insufficient budget to deliver an acceptable solution, and the fact the airport would probably run out of money mid project, mean that it is in everybody's interest that this project does not proceed, ever.

Yours Faithfully

Nigel Tanner