

# DfT Consultations

## Runway Consultation

**Name of participant: Hilary Newport, CPRE Kent.**

These are the recorded submissions for Session 1. Only sections to which responses have been recorded are listed below.

### The need for additional airport capacity

**Question 1: The Government believes there is the need for additional airport capacity in the South East of England by 2030. Please tell us your views.**

**Your response:**

CPRE Kent is the Kent Branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England, an independent charity within the national CPRE umbrella. Throughout Kent we represent 2,330 individual members, 144 Town or Parish Councils and 37 local amenity groups and civic societies. CPRE exists to promote the beauty, tranquillity and diversity of rural England by encouraging the sustainable use of land and other natural resources in town and country for the benefit of all.

CPRE Kent does not accept that there is a case for additional runway capacity in the south east. Under-used runway capacity exists within the United Kingdom, and to add capacity in the south east will only further aggravate the north-south economic divide in the UK. From an environmental perspective, additional runway capacity in the south east will bring the region into further conflict with its environmental constraints. Continued unconstrained expansion of the aviation sector will further damage the UK's efforts to control carbon emissions and will unfairly disadvantage other sectors which will have to bear an even greater burden of decarbonisation.

We note and endorse the particular opposition to Gatwick's expansion expressed so trenchantly by local MPs, Kent County Council, and its constituent District and Parish Councils. An increase of capacity at Gatwick would lead to even more inward migration to the local area, which enjoys full employment, with the consequent pressures on housing delivery, public services and infrastructure. The concerns of our members focus on the harm that would be caused to Kent and the people who live there: increased noise and air pollution, not just at or near the airport but over a very large area, both from airport operations and from the additional surface transport impacts. However it remains the case that any expansion of runway capacity anywhere in the south east would have unacceptable environmental and social consequences.

The Government's recent consultation on night flight regimes articulated its intention to limit the number of people adversely affected by night noise. While that particular consultation was for controls during the period ending in 2022 and therefore expressly excluded Heathrow's new runway, expansion at Heathrow runs entirely contrary to the stated aim of reducing noise pollution.

Providing additional runway capacity anywhere, but particularly in the south east, also runs contrary to the Government's legal obligations with regard to achieving compliance with air quality standards.

We are also particularly concerned at the expectation within the Draft NPS (at para 5.61) only expects a ban on night flights for a period of six and a half hours, which we consider too short to allow for undisturbed sleep. Furthermore this ban on night flights is restricted to scheduled flights, and would therefore carry no weight against delayed daytime flights.

Finally we take particular issue with the concept that 'the community will wish to participate fully in the development and delivery of expansion, and the Government expects them to be able to do so.' This statement entirely fails to acknowledge that many in the community are strongly committed in their opposition to expansion.

---