

**From:** Mole Valley Green Party [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** 11 June 2025 16:05  
**To:** NI Enquiries <[NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Gatwick Airport <[gatwickairport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:gatwickairport@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Re: TR020005 – Gatwick Airport Northern Runway

Some people who received this message don't often get email from  
[REDACTED]

**Interested Party Reference number: 20044419**

Mole Valley borders Gatwick airport on two sides, hence our residents are impacted directly and in many ways, some of which are not felt by others and we hope you will accept our request that you REFUSE the application.

The local Charlwood Parish Council does not feel the proposal will bring benefits that would outweigh the damage that would be caused.

It is widely acknowledged that airport expansion:

1. takes tourism money out of the country to a greater extent than which is brought in.
2. increases cost to the NHS and economy due to ill health from respiratory, oncological, cardio-vascular and other pollution-induced illnesses
3. is incompatible with our urgent need to reach net zero. The longer we take to reduce our emissions, the higher the level of future damage will be and the higher the cost. This increase is exponential not linear.
4. there is no identified way to mitigate the external air pollution that our residents will be forced to breathe outside of their homes
5. following the approval of London City Airport to increase the number of business flights, there is now an even further reduction in business travel demand from Gatwick
6. the compensation for local residents for increased noise and disruption to daily life s woefully inadequate
7. we not believe there is sufficient capacity on the rail network to enable a 54% passenger travel mode. We draw your attention to the detailed explanation in the objections from Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council.
8. Gatwick appears to be single counting car journeys but double counting journeys by bike? The 54% does not appear to be achievable and should be required to be on-going

**Mole Valley Green Party**  
[REDACTED]