

Rec'd 10/6/25

The Planning Inspectorate,

Mr Steven Parker,
National Infrastructure Planning,
Case Officer,
Temple Quay House, 2 The Square,
Bristol BS1 6PN

My Ref, GATW-007
Your Ref. TRO20005

5th June 2025

Dear Mr Parker,

RESPONSE COMMENTS REGARDING GATWICK AIRPORT Limited response of
24.4.25 to the Secretary of State for Transport letter of 27.2.25.

I live very near to Gatwick Airport and I am already badly impacted by frequent flightpath noise and emissions. I live along a Gatwick flightpath which will be very significantly closer still if the Government grants permission for a second Northern runway. If the Government grants permission for this second runway, noise and fuel emissions will be much higher even than the so-far 1919 peak. In 1919, there was a plane passing my home every c. minute and a half, using the garden was impossible because of noise. At present plane intervals are more variable. Already, on some days there is a stench of aviation fuel in the air. I have double glazed windows but this does not block out noise sufficiently. Air is required but opening a window is problematic due to noise. Any device for air change will not be possible for me as [REDACTED] and the device will likely entail non-ionising electromagnetic radiation; besides, the air input will itself be polluted by aircraft emissions... Noise, air pollution are known to be potential causes of serious ill-health and potential death. At issue is also non-ionising electromagnetic radiation from aircraft per se and airport radar and other high frequency emissions.

Anyone living near the area impacted by a second Northern runway if permission is granted could find life unbearable but with nowhere to move to. We would be totally robbed of the use of our gardens, the values of our homes would plummet,... Noise impacts also on sleep and the medical effects of this are also well known.

The main beneficiaries of such airport expansion would be overseas pension funds.

Gatwick suggestions for limiting noise impact are not convincing, and do not extend to gardens. Of what right does Government destroy health and lives?... Should Government not protect the lives and health of its citizens?...

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
MSc PhD

NB. 1. I have 30 NHS medical statements to the effect that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
tivity is not limited to people with these conditions, as is well established medically. Were medical research not focussed on animals, more would be known of these conditions and sufferers would be better catered for.

2. Regarding a separate issue, the decision to vary flightpaths is very unwise. Many people must not be overflowed for important medical reasons and will have chosen their homes carefully on this basis. People with homes overflowed should be offered compensation generous enough to allow for moving. Should be borne in mind is that finding elsewhere to live has become very difficult. Government has a duty to protect its citizens.

3. Thank you Mr Paker and the Planning Inspectorate for helping me overcome the medical problem of no-longer being able to go online due to [REDACTED]. I am presuming that ~~these~~ comments should be addressed to yourselves rather than to the Secretary of State (can they please be sent to the latter if I am wrong on this).

4. This will be posted first class by signed for delivery. As I cannot use email, can allowances please be made re reception date (which will I hope be 9.6.25).