

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Gatwick Airport](#)
Subject: Gatwick Airport, second runway, SOS consultation
Date: 05 June 2025 15:31:57

[REDACTED]
Dear ,

I write in response to the request from The Secretary of State for Transport (SoS) for interested parties to respond to the applicant's responses to the Department's letter of 27th February.

I wish the following to be noted:

Gatwick Airport has not provided a strong enough case for why there is a 'need' for a new runway, so the SoS should take the Planning Inspectorate's recommendation not to support a new runway.

Gatwick calls for an earlier approval of a new runway at Gatwick, before 27th October. This is unacceptable as due process must be adhered to.

Additionally I note the following:

Noise

Noise must be fully re-examined in view of the applicant detailing that the robust investigations by the Planning Inspectorate did not understand the applicant's submissions. Throughout the hearings, CAGNE has detailed the inconsistencies of the applicant's submissions. The applicant is now proposing new noise criteria, with a consultation of interested parties as the alternative. This would not be legally binding and seriously questions the merit of the planning process, as it will not have been independently examined with findings produced for all to examine before any planning permission is given for a new runway. Any noise restrictions should be continuous throughout the year for arrivals and departures, not just for the summer months.

Gatwick consultations tend to favour the airport over residents, and a simple airport consultation post 27th October does not override PINS' rigorous examinations of the poor data responses provided by the airport during the hearings. The applicant seems to wish to dismiss tranquility as 'lack of ambient noise', using a flawed Noise Management Board report produced by the Gatwick noise expert. The report was very narrow in its investigation, so was not accepted by residents as factual during the NMB.

Ground and plant noise

CAGNE do not believe that ground and plant noise has been fully examined, so this must be re-examined, along with noise from aircraft in flight. It is not sufficient to acknowledge the noise without robust criteria of how it will be addressed, allowing for restrictions should the noise be an issue-there seems to be no baseline for the noise created.

Compensation

CAGNE do not accept the applicant's argument on a reduction of mitigation and an 'agreement on case by case' basis, as this offers residents no assurances of what they will receive or what the applicant feels obliged to provide. Residents should be assured of a robust DCO agreement that is legally binding, that can be appealed against should a resident feel inadequately compensated by the applicant for increase in noise and devaluation of their home. We do not understand how the economic projection can be reached without the modernisation of airspace, so this must be included in the SoS decision. The compensation being offered by the applicant does not account for changes to flight paths, and no compensation is being offered for greater concentration of flights, or new flight paths over new communities.

Regards,

Francine Blythe

[REDACTED]