

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Gatwick Airport](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Gatwick Northern Runway : TRO20005-003996  
**Date:** 08 June 2025 18:02:39

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 June 2025 17:59  
**To:** 'gatwickairport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk.'  
<gatwickairport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk.>  
**Subject:** RE: Gatwick Northern Runway : TRO20005-003996

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 June 2025 17:43  
**To:** 'gatwickairport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk.'  
<[gatwickairport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:gatwickairport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk).>  
**Subject:** Gatwick Northern Runway : TRO20005-003996

---

**Interested Party Reference number: 20044809**

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to submit comments on the latest proposals from GAL.

**I do not support the expansion of Gatwick Airport** in any form and should any expansion be approved then this should be subject to strict environmental and noise restrictions which GAL seeks to avoid.

It is clear from GAL's letter of 24 April 2025 that whilst they want to ensure that the scheme is "investable and can be implemented whilst also minimising impacts on local communities", the emphasis is on "investable" rather than having any respect for the true environmental impact of the increased proposed activity and the suggested mitigations.

1. The ExA's noise and surface access proposals should be seen as a MINIMUM and not be brushed off by GAL citing erroneous assumptions made by ExA. For example, if these requirements lead to a restriction of long-haul connectivity in the first years after commencement of dual runway activity then that is an acceptable consequence of such restrictions. I fully support the ExA's proposals and indeed these should go further with respect to noise mitigation.
2. The proposed noise limits, even as amended by the SoS, do not achieve the policy requirements that the benefits of growth should be shared between the aviation industry and local communities and achieve a balance between growth and noise reduction. To achieve this policy the limits should be reduced further at a pace and to an extent that achieves a genuine sharing of the benefits of growth or the government should mandate

alternative noise benefits, such as a ban on night flights.

3. In any event expansion should be accompanied by a ban on night flights as mandated for Heathrow. Over the past few years GAL has flouted all regard for local communities and has increased the number of night flights. I am regularly woken at 01.00am; 02.00am; and 03.30am by incoming flights which show no regard for the local community. These start again at 04.30 and whilst this used to be an occasional problem it is not a regular daily or nightly event.
4. GAL mentions the dark night skies across the South Downs National Park – simple solution – DO NOT ALLOW any NIGHT-TIME flights.
5. Noise limits should be in place at ALL times of the year and not just during the peak periods – especially because with a projected doubling of flights, peak periods will quickly become all year round.
6. Capacity – why do we need all this extra flight capacity, when the proposed combined volumes of flight capacity between Luton , LHR. GTW and STN far outweigh all the combined flight projections over the next ten years – so these should be limited NOW, because the proposed levels of capacity are unnecessary. They should also be regularly reviewed annually.
7. Destruction of tranquillity and our right to peace in AONB – totally overlooked.

I urge the SoS to reject the proposals made by GAL and enforce far stricter controls on any expansion.

Yours sincerely

Robin Wells

---

**Robin Wells**

M: [REDACTED]

---